

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

Minutes of Thirty-second Meeting

Date : 15 October 2018
Time : 10:00 a.m.
Venue : Conference Room, 15/F, North Point Government Offices,
333 Java Road, Hong Kong

Present

Prof Becky LOO Chair

Members

Mrs Margaret BROOKE	Representing Business Environment Council
Mrs Karen BARRETTO	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Anthony CHEUNG	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
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
Ir Victor CHEUNG	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Ms Elsa Man	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Ms Christina LEE	Individual Member
Mr Alan LO	Individual Member
Prof Raymond FUNG	Co-opted Member
Mr Derek HUNG	Co-opted Member
Ms Nixie LAM	Co-opted Member
Dr Edmund LEE	Co-opted Member
Mr YUEN Hoi-man	Co-opted Member

Official Members

Ms Doris HO	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands) ¹ , Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Edward LEUNG	Senior Manager (Tourism) 21, Tourism Commission (TC)
Mr David NGU	Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon, Transport Department (TD)
Mr Raymond LEE	Chief Engineer /S1, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Mrs Doris FOK	Assistant Director (Leisure Services) ¹ , Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)

Mr Derek CHEUNG District Planning Officer/ Tsuen Wan & West
Kowloon (Atg.), Planning Department (PlanD)
Mr Henry LAI Secretary

In Attendance

Miss Rosalind CHEUNG Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Ian CHENG Assistant Secretary (Harbour)2, DEVB
Mr Peter MOK Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Carlos FUNG Engineer (Harbour), DEVB
Ms Daphne LI Architect (Harbour)1, DEVB
Mr Rex LAI Engineer (Harbour) Special Duties, DEVB
Mr HC TONG Architect (Harbour)2, DEVB

Absent with Apologies

Mr TAM Po-yiu Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Mr Ken SO Representing the Conservancy Association
Ir Janice LAI Wai-man Individual Member
Mr NGAN Man-yu Individual Member
Mr WONG Yiu-chung Co-opted Member

For Agenda Item 2

Mr Raymond LAU Senior Project Manager 332, Architectural Services
Department (ArchSD)
Ms Vicky LAM Project Manager 376, ArchSD

For Agenda Item 3

Mr Tom YIP District Planning Officer / Kowloon, PlanD

For Agenda Item 4

Mr Tim MAK Project Director, Fedder Ltd
Mr PO Ka-lai Project Manager, Fedder Ltd
Ms Pauline LAM Director, Kenneth To & Associates Ltd
Mr David FOK Senior Town Planner, Kenneth To & Associates Ltd
Mr Tugo CHENG Associate, P&T Architects and Engineers Ltd
Ms Judy LEE Architect, P&T Architects and Engineers Ltd
Ms Joyce MOK Architectural Assistant, P&T Architects and Engineers
Ltd
Ms Wendy LEE Deputy Director of Landscape Architectural Design,
Sun Hung Kai Architects and Engineers Ltd
Mr KO Hiu-fai Associate Director of Transportation (Ports &
& Marine), AECOM Asia Company Limited
Mr NG Ka-kui Engineer, AECOM Asia Company Limited

Welcoming Message

The Chair welcomed all to the meeting. She informed the meeting that Mr Derek CHEUNG had taken over the post of District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan & West Kowloon of the Planning Department from Ms Katy FUNG and Mr David NGU had taken over the post of Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon of the Transport Department from Mr LEE Chi-shing. She further informed Members that Mr Edward LEUNG, Senior Manager of Tourism Commission attended the meeting on behalf of Mr Simpson LO.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 30th and 31st Meetings

- 1.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the 30th meeting minutes were confirmed in-principle at the 31st meeting and invited Members who had further comments to relay to the Secretariat for consolidation and re-circulation. No comments were received after the meeting. Besides, the draft minutes of the 31st meeting were circulated on 12 October 2018. **The Task Force** confirmed the minutes of the 30th and 31st meetings.

Item 2 Matters Arising

- A. Enhancement of Tsuen Wan Waterfront (paragraph 2.20 of the minutes of the 31st meeting)
- 2.1 **The Chair** welcomed Mr Raymond LAU and Ms Vicky LAM from the Architectural Services Department (ArchSD).

Introduction

- 2.2 **The Chair** informed Members that an informal session was held on 11 October 2018. ArchSD briefed Members on the proposed design and collected views from Members. Taking into account Members' comments, ArchSD had refined the proposed design.

Briefing by the Harbour Office

- 2.3 Upon Chair's invitation, **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** updated

Members on the latest progress as follows -

- (a) the planning concept of the project was presented at the meeting in March 2018 and as agreed by Members then, the project would be carried out by two phases, i.e. (i) “quick-win” initiatives through minor works, and (ii) long term development to be taken forward as capital works project;
- (b) the design of the “quick-win” minor works would be presented by ArchSD at the meeting. Members would be consulted on the arrangement for the long term development at a later stage;
- (c) having reviewed the scope of the minor works, ArchSD proposed to focus resources on the section of waterfront along Hoi On Road and carried out more elaborated works there, instead of spreading out the limited resources for the entire waterfront promenade as proposed in March; and
- (d) taking into account the physical conditions of the site, ArchSD has suggested doing away with normal railings and having only low curb at section with rubble mounds instead. The Harbour Office had also communicated with relevant departments so as to allow dogs and angling at the site.

Presentation by the Architectural Services Department

- 2.4 With the aid of a Powerpoint, **Mr Raymond LAU** and **Ms Vicky LAM** updated Members on the proposed design.

Discussion

- 2.5 **The Chair** said that Mr PY TAM from Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design was unable to attend the meeting and had his written comment was tabled for Members’ information. He was supportive of the proposal including the relocation of fitness equipment to the “retreat” zone at the western end, as well as the adoption of low curb where possible and the use of new railing design for the remaining sections. He added that the paving materials should minimise glare and heat, and urged for early implementation of the “quick-win” works after necessary minor enhancements to the design.

General comments

- 2.6 **Dr Eunice MAK, Sr Francis LAM, Ms Connie CHEUNG, Prof Raymond FUNG, Dr Edmund LEE and Ms Nixie LAM** supported the project and appreciated the efforts made by the ArchSD on the proposed design. **Ms Nixie LAM** added that the design had addressed the views of local residents expressed through her interviews with them including widening the narrow footpath, provision of additional seatings and tidying up the waterfront by removing weeds on the rubble mounds.
- 2.7 **The Chair** asked whether greening area would be reduced if existing planters and vegetation were removed to give way for a wider footpath with benches provided. **Mr Raymond LAU** responded that the total greening area would remain the same as planters to be removed at the waterfront would be compensated at the hinterland side of the footpath.
- 2.8 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** considered that given the relatively limited budget of “quick-win” project, it was prudent to focus resources on properly enhancing certain nodal points.

Getting the public closer to the water

- 2.9 **The Chair, Sr Francis LAM and Prof Raymond FUNG** welcomed the use of low curb along section with rubble mounds in place of railings so as to create a more friendly water edge. **The Chair** added that it might be even better if a curvy design with smooth rounded edges could be adopted for the low curb. **Sr Francis LAM** added that any safety concerns associated with the adoption of low curb could be addressed by measures such as provision of lifebuoys. **Prof Raymond FUNG** echoed his view.
- 2.10 In response to **Sr Francis LAM’s** enquiry, **Mr Raymond LAU** said that the remaining part of the promenade was designed with a vertical seawall. In the absence of any buffer between the promenade and the nearby water, it was out of safety concerns that railings would be needed.
- 2.11 Noting that the waterfront had been using to host the annual

dragon boat race, **Dr Eunice MAK** and **Sr Francis LAM** suggested that the design for this section should try to encourage more water-land interface.

Reflecting local characteristics

- 2.12 **Dr Eunice MAK** and **Prof Raymond FUNG** agreed that the proposed design concept could reflect the local characteristics of Tsuen Wan by using elements of textile industry which reminded visitors of the past glory days of the district. **Dr Eunice MAK** added that while the local characteristics were currently reflected through the design of railings and seatings, she suggested injecting similar features into the landscaping and lighting design for a more holistic theme.
- 2.13 For the railing, **the Chair** and **Sr Francis LAM** were concerned that children might get trapped in the gaps between the interwoven metal bars. **Dr Eunice MAK** asked about the durability of the proposed railing materials. **Mr Raymond LAU** responded that the railings would be designed in accordance with the relevant requirements, i.e. the gaps between bars would not exceed 4 inches. Durability of the railing had also been considered and steel rods were proposed.

Design of facilities

- 2.14 **Sr Francis LAM** and **Dr Edmund LEE** opined that riding on the opportunity of relocating the existing facilities for the fitness corners, the relevant equipment or facility should also be upgraded. **Sr Francis LAM** further enquired if funding could be sought from Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) for such purpose since the budget of this project was relatively limited. **Mrs Doris FOK** replied that under the usual practice, LCSD could apply for District Council (DC) funding for upgrading fitness equipment under the department's management. That said, although the subject promenade and fitness equipment would not be under LCSD's management, funding from DC's District Minor Works could still be sought for upgrading of such equipment or procurement of additional equipment.
- 2.15 **Ir Victor CHEUNG** observed that the current design had not incorporated any environmentally friendly facilities. He

suggested considering some kind of solar panels for lighting or other environmentally-friendly facilities for the site.

- 2.16 **Ms Connie CHEUNG** opined that as some of the design in the “quick-win” works such as railings would also be adopted in the long term development, it was important to get the design right at this stage. Workshop with DC members on the detailed design could also be considered as necessary. **Ms Nixie LAM** said that the DC would be formally consulted on the design and would work together on the ultimate design afterwards.
- 2.17 **Prof Raymond FUNG** opined that the pergolas looked too heavy and lighter design and/or materials should be considered.

Enhancing attractiveness

- 2.18 **The Chair** welcomed ArchSD’s proposal of adopting richer colour tones in the design following the discussion at the informal session, which could make the promenade visually more interesting. **Dr Eunice MAK** and **Prof Raymond FUNG** suggested making the promenade more colourful through enhanced soft landscaping. **Prof FUNG** added that as compared with colouring the wooden benches and pergolas, the present design would give a more natural effect without creating maintenance issues. **Ms Nixie LAM** said she preferred to use natural colours for the seatings and pergolas since from district perspectives, such colours could create a more relaxing and comfortable environment for local residents and were easier to maintain and manage.
- 2.19 **Ms Connie CHEUNG** was of the view that from a landscape master planning or landscape design perspective, it was vital that local residents could experience and recognize improvements to the space brought by this “quick-win” minor works. In order to achieve this, proper spatial planning was pivotal.
- 2.20 **Dr Edmund LEE** opined that residents would feel the difference if a content-rich design was adopted. He added that co-design should be adopted for collecting local views with intent to enhance desirability of the promenade in future.

Long term Development

- 2.21 In the long run, **Dr Eunice MAK** opined that design of the “Square” zone located at the central part of the promenade could be further developed by aiming to turn the zone into a vibrant gathering point with various activities and interactions.

Way Forward

- 2.22 **The Chair** thanked ArchSD for the presentation and invited them to take into account Members’ comments during implementation. She expected the “quick-win” minor works be implemented as scheduled. She added that this project had made a new attempt in terms of planning and design by engaging Members and the DC at an early stage through informal workshop, sharing session and site visit. She hoped that preparation of the long term development could be commenced early by continuing such good practice and taking into account comments raised by Members in spatial planning and co-design.

Item 3 Hung Hom Urban Park – Market Sounding Exercise (Paper No. TFK/07/2018)

Introduction

- 3.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the Harbour Office had submitted a paper (TFK/07/2018) to update Members on the progress of the market sounding exercise and seek Members’ views on the arrangement, particularly the specific facilities and types of activity they might wish to highlight in the market sounding exercise.

Presentation by the Harbour Office

- 3.2 **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** briefed the Task Force on the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.

- 3.3 In response to **the Chair's** enquiries on avoiding possible allegation of collusion, **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** supplemented that the proposed market sounding exercise would invite ideas from both Non-Government Organisations (NGOs) and business entities. Rather than accepting the full proposal of a particular entity as the basis for the subsequent tender stage, it was more likely the tendering requirements would be formulated with reference to the better ideas collected from various submissions. The market sounding exercise would not involve any remuneration to participants and would not have any implications on an entity's eligibility in bidding for the eventual project. All relevant parties, no matter they had contributed to the market sounding exercise or not, could submit their proposals for developing and operating the site at the subsequent tender stage.

Discussion

General comments on the Market Sounding Exercise

- 3.4 **Mr Alan LO, Sr Francis LAM, Dr Eunice MAK, Mr Anthony CHEUNG, Dr Edmund LEE** welcomed the idea of launching the market sounding exercise as it could engage stakeholders early in the planning and co-design of harbourfront enhancement initiatives. **Mr Alan LO** supplemented that the idea could open up opportunities for new ways to develop public open space at the harbourfront.
- 3.5 **Dr Eunice MAK** said that presuming that "Market Sounding Exercise" aimed at private parties with interest in developing the Urban Park through a Public Private Partnership (PPP), the exercise should eventually help address the question of how to strike a balance between public interest and commercial viability of the project.
- 3.6 **Dr Edmund LEE** considered that the launching of the market sounding exercise was on the right track as it was stemmed from the public aspiration of turning the project site into an Urban Park proposed during the Hung Hom Planning Study. He opined that the Urban Park project could continue to be "design-led" and "aspiration-driven", and could serve as a pilot scheme to incorporate more design thinking process. He added that the site had an ideal location for linking up the

community and creating new possibilities, and adopting a “design-led” approach could help derive a doable solution and create a prototype for the future development of harbourfront sites. It was therefore important to emphasize in the exercise, and make the stakeholders aware of, the aspirations and new possibilities that could be brought about by the Urban Park development.

- 3.7 **The Chair** said that Mr PY TAM from Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design was unable to attend the meeting and his written comment had been tabled for Members’ information. He was supportive of the direction of the exercise and stressed the importance of ensuring that the future development was closely related to the harbourfront and that the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines (HPP&G) would be taken into account.

Parties to be engaged with

- 3.8 **Sr Francis LAM** said that if it was necessary to collect youngsters’ views on the future development of the site, it could be sought through schools. He could share the experience of the Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors (HKIS) in this regard if necessary.
- 3.9 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** said that market sounding exercise was not new and it had proven to be valuable in collecting ideas on issues like preferred design and management model. Specifically, it would help find out whether public-private partnership would work for a specific site, before any efforts were wasted in launching it but to find out that it was not feasible. It should be broad-based and involve a broad range of entities, NGO and private sector alike. **Ms Christina LEE** echoed her views.

Comments on how the project should be brought forward

- 3.10 **Mr Alan LO** said that it was uncertain whether the site would be developed by having the Government entering into a partnership with NGO or being opened up to private sector. Citing the High Line in New York City as an example, he pointed out that a public open space could be professionally run by a foundation or registered charitable organisation with

the backing of patrons and by engaging key stakeholders in the design and commissioning of the site.

- 3.11 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** opined that while creative ideas were welcomed, these ideas should be implementable and be screened using an objective set of criteria. Early engagement with the Harbourfront Commission and DC should also be considered.
- 3.12 **Ms Christina LEE** added that it was important to maintain transparency throughout the whole process and have appropriate milestones

Way forward

- 3.13 **The Chair** concluded that the marketing sound exercise, as Members said, should be an opportunity to open up possibilities in the planning and development of harbourfront areas. The exercise should be more like a “harbourfront aspiration collection exercise”. Apart from the private sector, possible interested parties such as NGOs, professional bodies and educational institutions etc. should also be involved. It was also important to ensure transparency and highlight that the Government would retain ownership of the site. She suggested the Harbour Office keeping Members updated on the progress and engaging Members where appropriate.

Item 4 Proposed Comprehensive Hotel Development at NKIL No. 6550, “CDA(2)” Zone at Lai Ying Street, Cheung Sha Wan (Paper No. TFK/08/2018)

- 4.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives of the project proponent to the meeting and invited Members to declare any conflict of interest. **Ms Elsa MAN** declared that she represented the Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong (REDA) of which the developer was one of its members, but she had no direct relationship with the developer. **The Chair** decided that Ms MAN could remain at the meeting.

Briefing by the Harbour Office and Planning Department

4.2 **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** briefed Members on the background as follows-

- (a) the project was located within the area originally reserved for phase 2 development of the Cheung Sha Wan Wholesale Food Market. The area was rezoned in 2014 and included, amongst others, two waterfront sites zoned "Comprehensive Development Area" ("CDA") and "CDA(2)" respectively. CDA was mainly for residential development and the project proponent had presented their scheme at the last meeting. CDA(2), which was the concerned site of the project to be discussed at this meeting, was mainly for hotel development;
- (b) fronting the "CDA" and "CDA(2)" sites was a 380m waterfront promenade and a disused pier which were zoned "Open Space". Developers of the "CDA" and "CDA(2)" sites were responsible for the design and construction of the respective sections of the promenade fronting their sites; and
- (c) the planning parameters and development requirements of "CDA" and "CDA(2)" sites were set out in the same planning brief (PB), which amongst others, had highlighted the importance of coherent design and seamless integration of the promenade.

4.3 **Mr Derek CHEUNG** supplemented the following information about the site-

- (a) according to the established procedure, developers of "CDA" and "CDA(2)" were required to submit their master layout plans (MLPs) respectively to the Town Planning Board (TPB) for approval before commencement of their developments. The MLPs should be prepared taking into account the broad planning parameters and development requirements as set out in the PB;
- (b) the project proponent of "CDA" submitted its MLP to TPB in March 2018 and further information were submitted by batches between July and September 2018. The application would be considered by TPB in November 2018; and
- (c) the project proponent of "CDA(2)" submitted its MLP to TPB in September 2018. According to the PB, the developer

should, inter alia, conduct a study on the refurbishment works of the disused pier to explore the provision of public landing facilities. For any such facilities to be included, the developer should carry out necessary study to ascertain technical feasibility and environmental acceptability, which should include a Marine Traffic Impact Assessment (MTIA). Whilst landing facilities were indicated on the Landscape Master Plan as part of the MLP submitted to the TPB, the applicant reported that the related study/impact assessment was still underway and could not be provided at the moment.

- 4.4 **The Chair** enquired if the proponents of “CDA” and “CDA(2)” requested any relaxation of building height in their application. **Mr Derek CHEUNG** responded that building height restrictions were imposed on the two sites but the two proponents did not request relaxation of building height in their planning applications.
- 4.5 **Ms Connie CHEUNG** asked if the existing MLP regime could ensure the coherent design and integration of public open space. **The Chair** considered that it was more appropriate to discuss the issue at the Commission level in the presence of all relevant departments. The Task Force could focus on providing comments on whether the promenade now in question was considered having a coherent design after the briefing by the project proponent.
- 4.6 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** had reservations in considering and taking any decision on the design of promenade at this stage since the MTIA was not ready and it was uncertain what would be proposed by the study.

Presentation by the project proponent

- 4.7 With the aid of a PowerPoint, **Ms Pauline LAM**, **Mr Tugo CHENG** and **Ms Wendy LEE** introduced their proposal of the planning and design of the proposed development.

Discussion

Landscape design concept

- 4.8 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** and **Dr Eunice MAK** appreciated the conceptual landscape design. **Dr Eunice MAK** noted that many steps were designed on the south-eastern side of the site, the demarcation between the Public Open Space (POS) and the hotel development was too clear affecting its coherence. The design of steps might not be convenient to and desirable for the elderly and disabled to access the promenade from the hotel. **Ms Connie CHEUNG** shared the same view.
- 4.9 **Ms Connie CHEUNG** said that based on the drawings, the paving pattern of the promenade was not consistent with that fronting the "CDA" site. The connecting point did not seem to be seamless and she doubted if there was a level difference between the two promenades.
- 4.10 As for the proposed area for stage performance, both **Ms Connie CHEUNG** and **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** were concerned whether there was sufficient space for accommodating a large number of audience without affecting the accessibility of the waterfront.
- 4.11 As the site was facing south-west direction, **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** suggested providing more shaded area along the promenade.
- 4.12 **Mr Tim MAK** responded that the proposed site was surrounded by residential development and the site was the only place providing commercial services. Instead of dedicating the promenade for passive recreation, it was proposed to design a promenade with activities and performances so as to create a more vibrant waterfront promenade. Taking into account Members' views, they would finetune the design of the proposed performance stage.

Public landing facilities and disused pier

- 4.13 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** asked whether the proponent could provide supplementary information on the proposed public

landing facilities. He opined that more water-land interfacing should be considered. Noting that it was proposed to use glass as the cover on the disused pier, he was concerned if heat could be dissipated easily. He also enquired about the function of the proposed kiosk on the disused pier. **Mr Tim MAK** undertook to refine the choice of material for the cover at the disused pier.

- 4.14 While the conceptual plan of the disused pier was impressive, **Dr Eunice MAK** was more concerned about allowing active use of the pier. **Ms Connie CHEUNG** had concerns on the visual impact of the kiosk and could not render support to the design without further information.
- 4.15 **Mr Derek HUNG** questioned whether the disused pier would only be enhanced or be completely re-built.
- 4.16 **Mr Derek CHEUNG** reminded the proponent that the PB should be adhered to as far as practicable in preparing the MLP. He expressed concern on the proponent's proposal of providing public landing facilities in the absence of the MTIA.
- 4.17 **Ms Pauline LAM** responded that the provision of public landing facilities would involve complicated procedures, including submission of a MTIA to the Marine Department, as well as various design, safety and statutory procedures. Outcome of the MTIA would be available in the first or second quarter of 2019. In any event, it should not affect the overall design of the pier.
- 4.18 **Mr KO Hiu-fai** supplemented that the MTIA had been submitted to the Marine Department. Other procedures such as submission to TPB and environmental assessment would proceed in parallel. If all relevant procedures went smoothly, the construction of the public landing facilities could be commissioned in 2021, but the construction period was still unknown subject to the eventual proposal.

Enhancement of connectivity

- 4.19 **Mr YEUNG Hoi-man** considered that the connectivity of the proposed site was rather poor since it had to rely on Lai Ying Street alone. With the completion of the surrounding new

residential development, the traffic pressure would become greater. He asked the proponent if the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) had taken into account such circumstances. He further asked if they had considered improving the connectivity to the area by linking Lai Ying Street with the Wholesale Market Street. **Ms Pauline LAM** responded that the TIA study indicated that there would be no adverse traffic impact resulting from the proposed hotel development onto the surrounding road network.. They would further explore with the Transport Department on the feasibility of linking the roads to the existing Cheung Sha Wan Wholesale Food Market.

- 4.20 While appreciating that the proposed covered walkway would link up with the covered walkway proposed by Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) and improve the connectivity between the hinterland and the harbourfront area, **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** asked why the original covered walkway was not connected to the hotel building directly. **Mr Tim MAK** responded that their proposal should be able to better enhance the connectivity between the hinterland and the harbourfront than linking the proposed covered walkway to the hotel building.

Opening hours

- 4.21 In response to **Mr YUEN Hoi-man's** enquiry, **Ms Pauline LAM** responded that the POS along the promenade would be open at all times.

Provision of parking space

- 4.22 **Mr Derek HUNG** enquired if the parking spaces at the basement of the hotel building would be opened for public use. **Ms Pauline LAM** responded and **Mr Tugo CHENG** supplemented that there were about 40 parking spaces, 10 loading/unloading bays and 5 coaches unloading spaces at the basement carpark and they would mainly be for commercial use.

Way Forward

4.23 **The Chair** concluded that Members were not particularly concerned about the design of the hotel building, and considered the proposal of extending the covered walkway leading from MTR Nam Cheong Station to the disused pier as desirable. That said, Members were very concerned that the proponent had not demonstrated how they would achieve coherence in the design of the promenades fronting “CDA” and “CDA(2)” sites as required by the PB. Moreover, Members urged the proponent to inject more water-land interface activities involving the active use of the disused pier, which was a precious asset in the urban harbourfront area. Before such information was available and considered carefully in relation to the HPP&G, the meeting could not lend their support to the project. Members’ comments would be conveyed to the TPB for further consideration.

Item 5 Any Other Business

A. *Date of Next Meeting*

6.1 **The Chair** said that the Secretariat would inform Members on the schedule of the next Task Force meeting in due course.

6.2 There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 12:50 pm.

**Secretariat
Task Force on Harbourfront Developments
in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing
Harbourfront Commission
December 2018**