

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

Minutes of Forty-second Meeting

Date : 27 September 2022
Time : 3:00 p.m.
Venue : Room 1303, 13/F, Wing On Kowloon Centre, 345 Nathan Road, Kowloon

Present (attending in person)

Prof Becky LOO	Chairlady
Mr Vincent NG	Chairman, Harbourfront Commission
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Mr Sam CHOW	Representing the Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Dr CHUNG Shan-shan	Representing the Conservancy Association
Ms Christina LEE	Individual Member

Present (attending online)

Mr Benny CHAN	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Mr Jacky CHEUNG	Representing the Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Ms Sam LOK	Representing the Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Sr Francis LAM	Representing the Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Ir Ringo YU	Representing the Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Jeff TUNG	Representing the Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong

Official Members (attending in person)

Mr Vic YAU	Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning & Lands) ¹ , Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Horman CHAN	Assistant Director (Leisure Services) ¹ , Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Mr Peter POON	Senior Engineer/2 (South), Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Mr Derek TSE	District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan & West Kowloon, Planning Department (PlanD)
Mr William LEUNG	Secretary

Official Members (attending online)

Ms Anny TANG	Senior Manager (Tourism) 21, Tourism Commission (TC)
Mr Vincent CHOW	Senior Engineer/Kowloon District Central, Transport Department (TD)

In Attendance

Ms Leonie LEE	Commissioner for Harbourfront, DEVB
---------------	-------------------------------------

Absent with Apologies

Mrs Margaret BROOKE	Representing Business Environment Council
Dr Vivian WONG	Representing Friends of the Earth (HK) Charity Limited
Ms Iris HOI	Representing the Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Ir Janice LAI	Individual Member
Dr Lawrence LI	Individual Member

For Item 3

Ms Joyce LAU	Deputy Project Manager (West), CEDD
Ms Fiona LIU	Chief Engineer/West 2, CEDD
Ms Joyce TANG	Senior Engineer/2 (West), CEDD
Ms Suki ZHANG	Engineer/12 (West), CEDD
Mr Samuel KWAN	Project Director, Ove Arup & Partners Ltd.

For Item 4

Ms Jenny CHAN	Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Nelson CHU	Architect (Harbour) 1, DEVB
Miss Novella MAN	Landscape Architect (Harbour), DEVB
Ms Amy TONG	District Leisure Manager (Kowloon City), LCSD
Mr Edmund WONG	Deputy District Leisure Manager (Kowloon City)2, LCSD
Ms CHAN Wing-chi	Senior Executive Officer (Planning)14, LCSD
Ms Kathy WONG	Executive Director, Playright Children's Play Association
Ms Aby CHAU	Service Director (Playwork and Academy), Playright Children's Play Association
Mr Chris YUEN	Head of Play Environment, Playright Children's Play Association
Mr Min Sham	Assistant Manager (Play and Playwork), Playright Children's Play Association

For Item 5

Mr Alex LUI	Project Director, PolyU
Mr MAK Chi-biu	Associate Director, PolyU

Mr Kan CHAN
Mr Davis LEE
Mr Peter CHAN
Mr Derek TSANG
Mr Freddie HAI

Senior Project Manager, PolyU
Project Manager, Arup
Deputy Project Manage, Arup
Project Coordinator, Arup
Director, Rocco Design and Associates

Welcoming Message

The Chairlady welcomed all to the 42nd meeting of the Task on Harbourfront Developments in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing (KTF), in particular the following new member who was appointed on 1 July 2022 and attending the Task Force meeting for the first time-

- (a) Dr Lawrence LI (李國祥醫生), Individual Member.

She also informed the meeting that -

- (a) Mr Vincent CHOW, Senior Traffic Engineer of the Transport Department (TD), attends on behalf of Mr Gary WONG, Chief Traffic Engineer /Kowloon; and
- (b) Ms Anny TANG, Senior Manager of the Tourism Commission (TC), attends on behalf of Ms Elsa HUNG, Assistant Commissioner for Tourism (2).

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 41st Meeting

- 1.1 **The Chairlady** informed Members that the draft minutes of the 41st meeting were circulated on 23 September 2022. No comment had been received from Members. There being no further amendment, the draft minutes were confirmed at the meeting.

Item 2 Matters Arising

- 2.1 No matters arising were raised at the meeting.

Item 3 Cycle Track between Tsuen Wan Bayview Garden and So Kwun Wat (Paper No. TFK/03/2022)

Introduction

- 3.1 **The Chairlady** welcomed representatives of the project proponent to the meeting, and invited Members to declare any conflict of interest. **Mr Sam CHOW** declared that his company was involved in the project. **The Chairlady** decided that Mr CHOW could remain at the meeting but shall not participate in or make comments on the project concerned.

- 3.2 Upon **the Chairlady's** invitation, **Mr William LEUNG** briefed Members on the background of the project as follows:
- (a) The cycle track between Tsuen Wan Bayview Garden and So Kwun Wat would form a part of the New Territories Cycle Track Network (NTCTN). The NTCTN comprised two backbone sections, namely (1) that from Tuen Mun to Ma On Shan; and (2) that from Tsuen Wan to Tuen Mun, with a total length of appropriately 82 km; and
 - (b) The entire 60-km Tuen Mun to Ma On Shan cycle track backbone section was connected and opened for public use in 2020. The 2-km Tsuen Wan waterfront cycle track section was also opened in 2021. The proposed cycle track between Tsuen Wan Bayview Garden and So Kwun Wat, approximately 17km long, would be the final missing link to be implemented.

Presentation by the Project Proponent

- 3.3 With the aid of a PowerPoint, **Ms Joyce TANG** from CEDD presented to Members the proposal.

Discussion

General Comments

- 3.4 **Dr CHUNG Shan-shan, Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN, Ms Sam LOK, Mr Jeff TUNG, Sr Francis LAM, Mr Benny CHAN and Mr Jacky CHEUNG** supported in principle the proposed design of the cycle track and looked forward to its early implementation.
- 3.5 **Mr Benny CHAN** enquired whether the proposed cycle track, which would be regarded as a leisure facility, would establish an overriding public need for reclamation. He considered that the reclamation might cause permanent damages to the ecology even if the working platforms were removed afterwards and suggested conducting an environmental impact assessment in a prudent manner.
- 3.6 **Ms Joyce LAU** responded that with reference to the Boardwalk underneath the Island Eastern Corridor (IEC Boardwalk), the project should be able to establish an overriding public need. The design of the project would minimise the possible impact on the environment. Besides, a public engagement exercise would be carried out in the near future. Upon obtaining public

support, they would kick off the relevant work including the environmental review.

- 3.7 **Sr Francis LAM** commented that the reclamation was understandable, and expressed his hope that the project would cause minimal damage to the marine ecosystem. **Ms Sam LOK** appreciated that the final missing link of the cycle track network was to be implemented in the future, while enquiring if any alternative routes had been considered which would not require reclamation.
- 3.8 **Ms Joyce LAU** responded that all possible alignments had been carefully reviewed. They had considered the possibility of the inland alignment, but concluded that since there were a lot of high and steep slopes with existing residential buildings nearby, cutting these slopes to make way for a cycle track was not feasible. They had also considered the possibility of providing an elevated bridge in the middle of the Castle Peak Road, but found that there was no sufficient space to build it. As for the tunnel option, additional land intake would be required. In light of the above, the proposed design was recommended in view of the site constraints.

Design

- 3.9 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** suggested providing a footpath for pedestrians in addition to the cycle track from Tsuen Wan to So Kwun Wat. **The Chairlady** enquired if the pedestrian walkway would be close to the waterfront. **Ms Joyce LAU** responded that the whole cycle track was designed to be aligned with the pedestrian walkway. According to the current design, about half of the pedestrian walkway would be close to the waterfront while another half would be close to the hinterland.
- 3.10 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired about the interfacing issue and the design of pedestrian crossings. **Ms Sam LOK** also expressed her concerns about the interfacing issue.
- 3.11 **Ms Joyce LAU** replied that CEDD attached importance to the design of cycle track and safety of cycling. For the safety of pedestrians and cyclists, they had consulted various parties, for design enhancement including cycling groups, cyclists, district councillors and road safety auditors. Besides, they also paid attention to education. When the Tsuen Wan waterfront cycle track was opened in 2021, they commissioned an organisation to launch a bicycle ambassador scheme for

conducting workshops and for providing safety information and assistance to the public in order to promote safe cycling and related etiquette. The scheme received positive feedback. They would continue to promote safe cycling by organising similar activities.

- 3.12 **Mr Jeff TUNG** recommended that part of the cycle track be shared by pedestrians and cyclists. **Mr Jacky CHEUNG** suggested no physical boundary between pedestrians and cyclists along the track in view of the narrow space.
- 3.13 **Ms Joyce LAU** replied that some pilot schemes such as the IEC Boardwalk had adopted the co-use cycle track, and they would make reference to those designs. The width of co-use cycle track should normally be at least 6m. The project team might consider adopting the co-use approach for the wider part of the track in future, subject to the recommendations of these pilot schemes. In addition, consideration was given to minimising the crossings needed. A good example for reference was the Tsuen Wan waterfront cycle track, in which cyclists were not required to dismount the bicycles at the crossings when there were no pedestrians. This helped maintain accessibility to the waterfront while reducing the impact on cyclists.
- 3.14 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** suggested improvements on the nodes for enhancing the interactions with the community.
- 3.15 **Mr Jeff TUNG** opined that more efforts should be put into Tsuen Wan's section as it would likely be more popular. To expedite the project programme, he suggested implementing those sections without requiring reclamation first.
- 3.16 Regarding the proposed cycle bridge between Tsuen Wan and Ting Kau, **Mr Jeff TUNG** suggested a double-deck design with one deck for pedestrians and the other for cyclists in order to segregate the pedestrians and the cyclists. **Sr Francis LAM** concurred and suggested the lower deck be designed for the pedestrians so as to provide them with shade and shelter. **Ms Joyce LAU** responded that the double-deck design might involve higher costs, and the project team would review and explore a possible scheme for the public to enjoy the harbour and the harbourfront at the detailed design stage.
- 3.17 **Sr Francis LAM** expressed the concern that the seawall might not be fully reinstated upon completion of the works. He suggested converting the temporary working platforms into a glass house as a scenic spot for entertainment.

- 3.18 **Dr CHUNG Shan-shan** suggested adopting sustainability elements and recommended using durable and environmentally friendly materials that could withstand extreme weather. Besides, she enquired about the measures to safeguard the safety of pedestrians and suggested developing a mobile application for instant reporting of improper cycling.
- 3.19 **Mr Benny CHAN** enquired about the maximum gradient of the elevated cycle track and expressed concern about the safety of cyclists. **Ms Joyce LAU** responded that for the safety of the cyclists, the gradient would not be too steep, and the maximum gradient along the track would be about 4%.

Provision of Facilities

- 3.20 **Dr CHUNG Shan-shan** enquired about the number of toilets to be provided and the furthest distance between toilets. **Ms Joyce LAU** replied that toilets would be available at each cycling entry and exit hub, as well as along the track too. The furthest distance between two toilets would be about 1,500m, meaning that the longest walking distance to a toilet would be about 750m. They would consider adding some smaller toilets along the track where appropriate for the convenience of the public.
- 3.21 **Mr Jacky CHEUNG** suggested allowing some flexibility at the edge of the track, such as providing a space for pedestrians or cyclists to rest or take photos there. **Ms Joyce LAU** agreed and would consider providing more space for the public to enjoy while complying with the Protection of Harbour Ordinance (PHO).
- 3.22 **Sr Francis LAM** opined that there were many scenic spots along the track that might attract a lot of people. Also, some events such as marathons might be held there in future. Hence, more first aid stations, rescue service points, as well as food and beverage (F&B) services should be provided. **Mr Jeff TUNG** echoed that al fresco F&B facilities should be provided at the scenic spots.
- 3.23 **Ms Joyce LAU** responded that the Sham Tseng section was relatively spacious with the proposed promenade for the public to enjoy. There would be opportunities for providing al fresco F&B facilities. Regarding the first-aid service, the cycle track was mainly built along the Castle Peak Road where Fire Services Department (FSD) could provide emergency and

rescue services. First-aid stations could be provided along the cycle track in areas near the Castle Peak Road. Also, they would continue to work with FSD to ensure that the emergency and rescue service would be provided along the track.

Way forward

- 3.24 **The Chairlady** expressed appreciation to CEDD for their efforts on this project and looked forward to the early completion of the 82-km-long cycle track, which would allow the public to enjoy the harbour view and access to the harbourfront from the hinterland. She concluded that apart from the co-design workshop and public engagement exercise, the project team should also provide more activities to educate the public. She invited the project team to refine the design with due regard to Members' comments, especially providing more space and al fresco dining for public enjoyment.

Item 4 Hung Hom Urban Park (Paper No. TFK/04/2022)

Introduction

- 4.1 **The Chairlady** welcomed representatives of the project proponent to the meeting, and invited Members to declare any conflict of interest, if any. **Mr Benny CHAN** declared interest that he was an executive committee member of Playright Children's Play Association which was a party to the project team. **The Chairlady** decided that Mr CHAN could remain at the meeting but shall not participate in or make comments on the project concerned.
- 4.2 Upon **the Chairlady's** invitation, **Mr William LEUNG** briefed Members on the background of the project as follows:
- (a) Situated adjacent to the Hung Hom Ferry Pier, the Hung Hom Urban Park (formerly the Hung Hom Ferry Pier Public Transport Interchange (PTI)) occupied an area of about 0.9 hectares. The site was zoned "Open Space" and primarily intended for the provision of outdoor open-air public space for active and/or passive recreational uses serving the needs of local residents as well as the general public;
 - (b) After the relocation of the PTI in 2019, the Government opened the site for public use under the "incremental approach". A more flexible management arrangement was adopted for the site so as to enable the public to enjoy the

harbourfront space in various ways and carry out a wide variety of activities; and

- (c) In 2019, the Government conducted a market sounding exercise. After taking into account the comments received and the development in recent years, the Government considered it inappropriate to develop the urban park under the public-private partnership approach.

Presentation by the Project Proponent

- 4.3 With the aid of a PowerPoint, **Ms Jenny CHAN** presented to Members the proposal.

Discussion

Greening

- 4.4 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** suggested providing more trees and adequate shading at the site. **Mr Vincent NG** and **Mr Jeff TUNG** concurred and suggested arranging cluster of trees for effective shading. **Mr Sam CHOW** suggested planting trees with larger canopies for shade and native species, such as *Ficus microcarpa*, while palm trees should not be considered.
- 4.5 **Ms Jenny CHAN** responded that more trees, preferably in cluster, would be added. Native tree species were proposed in the design and the palms are existing trees on site.
- 4.6 **Mr Jeff TUNG** suggested combining the existing triangular planter and the open lawn to create a larger lawn for public enjoyment. Feature trees should also be planted, which could attract people to come and take photos.
- 4.7 **Ms Jenny CHAN** responded that it was necessary to maintain the existing public footpath from the hinterland to the ferry pier. Hence, the existing planter outside the park area would have to be separated from the open lawn. However, the existing planter shall be modified into a sloping lawn and some of the existing shrubs shall be removed, providing sufficient space for people to sit and enjoy the harbour view.

Design

- 4.8 **Mr Saw CHOW** supported the overall design as it had lots of creative elements; **Mr Vincent NG** and **Sr Francis LAM** concurred. **Ms Christina LEE** opined that the proposal had a

vibrant design, which echoed with the history of the site. She suggested providing pet and elderly friendly facilities in the park. Besides, according to the result of the market sounding exercise, approximately one-third of the public preferred to have landscaped area in the park. Hence, she suggested providing more greenery area at the site.

- 4.9 **Ms Jenny CHAN** responded that there were two open lawns in the design. As to whether the park would be inclusive for pets, LCSD would decide on it at a later stage prior to the opening of the park, having regard to the views of the public.
- 4.10 **Dr CHUNG Shan-shan** commented that popular play equipment/facilities tended to be worn out or damaged quickly, such as the ones in Belcher Bay Promenade, and expressed concern over the high maintenance cost. She suggested using non-toxic and durable materials for the facilities and play equipment. **Ms Jenny CHAN** replied that non-toxic and durable materials would be used.
- 4.11 **Mr Jacky CHEUNG** enquired about the background and rationale for displaying the retired fire engine at the park. **Mr Jeff TUNG** suggested considering rotations of exhibitions after the display of the fire engine. **Sr Francis LAM** suggested moving the fire engine to the existing triangular planter.
- 4.12 **Ms Jenny CHAN** responded that the display of a retired fire engine was proposed as a distinctive feature of the park, vehicular traffic being the design theme, so that the general public could get a chance to interact with a fire engine in close distance. Besides, fire safety ambassador would be arranged alongside to educate the public on fire safety.
- 4.13 **Mr Jeff TUNG** suggested arranging the rain shelters around the circular pattern at the balanced bike track to facilitate parents to watch over their children. Besides, he recommended a dynamic design with different gradients. Some sloped areas or installations could be provided so that people could walk up and enjoy the harbour view from a distance. Given that the site was previously a PTI, he suggested building a basement for parking to meet the community need. **The Chairlady** responded that the budget might be a concern.

Provision of Facilities

- 4.14 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** suggested providing F&B facilities at the site. He opined that the result of the market sounding

exercise was not against commercial elements, but against the development of a theme park, which might cause nuisance and disturbance to the neighbourhood.

- 4.15 **Mr Vincent NG** suggested providing toilets and adequate shelters at the site. He commented that F&B facilities could be provided at a later stage with increased pedestrian flow after the park opening. Taking the Water Sports and Recreation Precinct in Wan Chai as an example, additional F&B facilities including an onshore restaurant and a floating restaurant were provided by the end of 2022. Nonetheless, the sewage connection works were of higher priority, so as to facilitate the toilets and future development of F&B or other facilities.
- 4.16 **Mr Jacky CHEUNG** concurred and supplemented that since there were already many restaurants in the vicinity, the need for additional F&B facilities could be considered later.
- 4.17 **Mr Jeff TUNG** opined that while there might be concerns about the business viability of the F&B facilities, he stressed the importance of provision of all essential infrastructure and utilities, including but not limited to water supply, drainage system, electricity and gas supply, etc., so as to support a flexible design of the site, especially the possible inclusion of F&B facilities in future.
- 4.18 **Ms Jenny CHAN** replied that the project proponent would incorporate water and electricity supply to support possible F&B facilities in future. Regarding the sewage connection works, they had been coordinating with the Drainage Services Department to explore if the drainage facilities could be improved. Besides, they would also provide a toilet in the park area, in addition to an existing public toilet near the Hung Hom Ferry Pier.

Playing Field Provided by Non-government Organisation (NGO)

- 4.19 **Sr Francis LAM** opined that the area for the NGO should be larger. **Ms Christina LEE** enquired if the covered area occupied by the NGO would be used flexibly for other purposes in future.
- 4.20 **Ms Kathy WONG** responded that in addition to children who would play at the indoor area, their family members were welcomed to use the premises. The indoor area would also be used for providing experiential workshops for different groups of people, such as parents, the elderly and the youth, to

educate them on the importance of play. They would also allow other NGOs, groups or corporates to hold workshops and events at the indoor area, which could bring the whole community together and allow the community to enjoy the space. Arrangements would be made depending on the nature of the activities.

- 4.21 **Mr Jacky CHEUNG** supported the design; and he recognised the need to provide a playground for the children since the site was expected to be a thriving area. He enquired about the timeframe for Playright to operate the playing field under the short term tenancy, and suggested allowing public access to the roof of the indoor workshop. **Ms Kathy WONG** responded that they would further review their proposed design accordingly.

Way Forward

- 4.22 **The Chairlady** concluded that Members were supportive to the proposed design and looked forward to its early completion to create an energetic and vibrant open space. She invited the project team to take into account Members' comments in refining the current proposal, in particular, the provision of basic utilities including water and electricity supply, as well as the sewage connection. She added that if the infrastructure of the two adjacent Hung Hom Ferry Piers could be improved, the accessibility to the Hung Hom harbourfront would be further enhanced. She also remarked that if the two nearby coach parking sites could be relocated, F&B facilities as well as other facilities might possibly be provided in future.

Item 5 Hong Kong Polytechnic University: Project Development Study of the Green Deck (Paper No. TFK/05/2022)

Introduction

- 5.1 **The Chairlady** welcomed representatives of the project proponent to the meeting, and invited Members to declare any conflict of interest, if any.
- 5.2 Upon **the Chairlady's** invitation, **Mr William LEUNG** briefed Members on the background of the project as follows:
- (a) Hong Kong Polytechnic University (PolyU) commissioned a study to build a deck over the Hung Hom Cross Harbour Tunnel Toll Plaza to enhance connectivity to surrounding

neighbourhoods and facilitate public transportation modal-transfer as well as provide more open space for community facilities. PolyU would present their study and seek Members' comments for inclusion in the study.

Presentation by the Project Proponent

- 5.3 With the aid of a PowerPoint, **Mr Freddie HAI** from Rocco Design and Associates presented to Members the proposal.

Discussion

Design

- 5.4 **Dr CHUNG Shan-shan** opined that additional energy would be needed for the proposed green deck, compared with existing condition. She suggested adding green and energy-saving building elements such as solar panels and planting to offset the energy used. She also suggested that some areas, such as the Islet, be designated as zero-carbon zones.
- 5.5 **Mr Peter CHAN** responded that in addition to an indoor walkway through the Mezzanine Level (M/F), the proposed design also included a covered open-air walkway with a landscaped garden connecting Hung Hom station to the Podium Level of PolyU. Regarding sustainability, the current design adopted all the prevailing energy saving measures, such as rainwater harvesting system, solar panel and natural lighting. They also aimed at making the project carbon neutral further down the line. They would use recycled materials for construction, and adopt energy efficient measures to minimise carbon footprint. Furthermore, the proponent would conduct a study on the environmental aspect in the future.
- 5.6 **Mr Vincent NG** recommended putting more efforts into the design of the Islet to enhance the accessibility of the harbourfront. **Mr Jeff TUNG** and **Mr Benny CHAN** concurred and suggested providing a direct access connecting the Islet and the pedestrian bridge nearby the Hung Hom Bypass.
- 5.7 **Mr Jeff TUNG** suggested making good use of the available open space in the project for enhancing and vitalizing the area.
- 5.8 **Mr Freddie HAI** agreed that there would be great potential for improving the Islet area. The project team would take into account Members' comments and study the technical

feasibility to improve the design of the Islet.

Implementation

- 5.9 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired about the estimated cost and the financial viability of the project. He enquired if the project was affordable and to what extent the Government would support its implementation. **Mr Benny CHAN** also raised the same questions.
- 5.10 **Mr Vincent NG** enquired about the ownership of the project and asked whether any Bureau/Department (B/D) would be responsible for the project. He opined that the owner should be identified prior to its implementation.
- 5.11 In response to Members' comments, **Mr Peter CHAN** indicated that the project team had demonstrated the technical and engineering feasibility of the project. The estimated construction cost of the project was between \$6 billion and \$8 billion. The financial viability of the project would hinge on various factors, for example, whether the project would be carried out with surrounding developments, such as Hung Hum MTR station as part of an integrated plan, and whether other commercial elements would be incorporated. He replied that the Government supported the project and B/Ds concerned appreciated their efforts in conducting the technical study.

Other Comments

- 5.12 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired about the current status of the adjacent site, which was formerly the International Mail Centre (IMC), and suggested planning the green deck with the ex-IMC site in a holistic manner. **Mr Jeff TUNG** shared his views and added that the adjacent finger pier, i.e. MTRC Freight Yard, should be optimised to create a public open space for citizens and visitors. **The Chairlady** also enquired about the planning for the IMC and the finger pier.
- 5.13 **Mr Freddie HAI** considered that the finger pier was rather far away from the proposed green deck, but he agreed that the green deck could be considered together with the IMC site in a holistic perspective for an integrated planning.
- 5.14 **Ms Leonie LEE** responded that the three sites concerned, namely the Cross Harbour Tunnel Toll Plaza, the ex-IMC and the finger pier, were all government lands. While the Hung

Hom District Study completed in 2008 had provided some recommendations on the potential development of these sites, given the lapse of time, the Government would need to review the use of these sites in a holistic manner. In addition, upon completion of PolyU's feasibility study, relevant departments would review the proposal and consider the way forward.

Way Forward

- 5.15 **The Chairlady** concluded that the study on the proposed green deck had made significant progress since 2014. She appreciated the project team for the presentation, which could serve as a reference for future harbourfront development. She emphasized the importance of carefully considering the financial capacity and execution of the project, while also expressing the hope that the project could be carried forward. Additionally, greater efforts should be made to enhance the connectivity of the project to improve accessibility to the harbourfront areas.

Item 6 Any Other Business

- 6.1 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** suggested updating the status of the ex-IMC site and reporting on the progress of the walkway linking between Tai Kok Tsui and West Kowloon Cultural District. **The Chairlady** invited Harbour Office to follow up on the suggestion.
- 6.2 **The Chairlady** said that the Secretariat would inform Members of the date of the next meeting in due course.
- 6.3 There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

**Secretariat
Task Force on Harbourfront Developments
in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing
Harbourfront Commission
April 2023**