

23rd Meeting of Harbourfront Commission
held at 3:00 pm on 11 April 2016 at the Conference Room
on Upper Ground Floor, Hong Kong Heritage Discovery Centre,
Kowloon Park, Haiphong Road, Tsim Sha Tsui, Kowloon, Hong Kong

Minutes of Meeting

Present

Mr Nicholas BROOKE	Chair
Mr Paul CHAN	Secretary for Development, Vice-Chair
Mrs Margaret BROOKE	Representing Business Environment Council
Prof Becky LOO	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Dr NG Cho-nam	Representing Conservancy Association
Mrs Karen BARRETTO	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Franklin YU	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Evans IU	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Prof TANG Bo-sin	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Sr Emily LI	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr Ivan HO	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Ir Prof CHOY Kin-kuen	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Shuki LEUNG	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Mr CHAN Ka-kui	
Mr Walter CHAN	
Ms Lily CHOW	
Mr Eric FOK	
Mr Hans Joachim ISLER	
Ms Vivian LEE	
Mr Vincent NG	
Mr Michael WONG	Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)
Mr Daniel CHUNG	Director of Civil Engineering and Development
Mr LING Kar-kan	Director of Planning
Ms Emily MO	Assistant Commissioner for Tourism 2, Tourism

Mr TANG Wai-leung	Commission (TC) Assistant Commissioner/Urban, Transport Department (TD)
Mrs Doris FOK	Assistant Director (Leisure Services)1, Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Mr Michael CHAU	General Manager/Planning, Development and Port Security, Marine Department (MD)
Miss Christine AU	Secretary

In Attendance

Mr Eric MA	Under Secretary for Development
Ms Flora LOH	Press Secretary to Secretary for Development (Atg.)
Mr Larry CHU	Assistant Secretary (Harbour) 1, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Miss Ingrid TJENDRO	Assistant Secretary (Harbour) 2, DEVB
Mr Peter MOK	Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB
Mr LEUNG Kong-yui	Chair, Task Force on Water-land Interface

Absent with Apologies

Mr CHAN Hok-fung
Mr KAN Chak-fun

For Agenda Item 3

Mr LEUNG Tung-choi, Thomas	Assistant Director/New Buildings 1, Buildings Department (BD)
Mr LEE Wai-hou, Truman	Senior Building Surveyor/R2, BD
Mr LEUNG Kwun-hong	Assistant Director (Headquarters), Fire Services Department (FSD)
Mr WAI Kin-fai	Senior Divisional Officer (New Projects), FSD

For Agenda Item 8

Ms Katty LAW	Representatives, Victoria Harbourfront Concern Group
Ms Mary MULVIHILL	
Ms Tanya CHAN	
Ms Claudia YUEN	Representative, Land Justice League

Welcoming Message

The Chair welcomed all to the 23rd meeting of the Harbourfront Commission. He informed Members that Ms Emily MO, Assistant Commissioner of TC, was attending on behalf of Ms Cathy CHU; Mr TANG Wai-leung, Assistant Commissioner of TD, was attending on behalf of Mrs Ingrid YEUNG; Mrs Doris FOK, Assistant Director of LCSD, was attending on behalf of Ms Michelle LI; and Mr Michael CHAU, General Manager of MD, was attending on behalf of Ms Maisie CHENG.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 22nd Meeting

1.1 **The Chair** said that the Secretariat circulated the draft minutes of the last meeting to Members on 2 March 2016 and the revised draft minutes with Members' comments incorporated were circulated on 15 March 2016. There being no other proposed amendment, the revised draft minutes were confirmed at the meeting.

Item 2 Matters Arising

A. Ground Decontamination Works at the Site of ex-Kennedy Town Incineration Plant/ Abattoir (Paragraph 4.3 of the minutes of the 22nd meeting)

2.1 **The Chair** informed the meeting that CEDD's paper on the ground decontamination works at the site of ex-Kennedy Town Incineration Plant/Abattoir was circulated to Members again on 22 December 2015. To address Members' subsequent comments, CEDD provided further information on the contamination level of Cadogan Street Temporary Garden and the information was circulated to Members on 13 January

2016 and 23 February 2016 respectively. The matter was further discussed at the Task Force on Harbourfront Development on Hong Kong Island meeting on 29 February 2016. He said that as the Task Force Chair, he would report the discussion under Item 5 of the meeting.

B. Tsim Sha Tsui Revitalisation Plan (Paragraph 6.5 of the minutes of the 22nd meeting)

2.2 **The Chair** informed the meeting that LCSD reported to the Task Force on Harbourfront Developments in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing on the views collected during the public engagement exercise and the subsequent revision of the Tsim Sha Tsui Revitalisation Plan at the meeting on 9 March 2016. He said that the Task Force Chair would report the discussion under Item 7 of the meeting.

C. Proposed Amendments to Terms of Reference (Paragraph 8.2 of the minutes of the 22nd meeting)

2.3 **The Chair** remarked that after the discussion at the last meeting, the amendments proposed by Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN to the Terms of Reference (ToRs) of the Harbourfront Commission had been circulated to Members on 23 December 2015, and Members had not expressed objection to the Chair's recommendation of not changing the current ToRs.

Item 3 General Requirements of Emergency Vehicular Access (Paper No. HC/01/2016)

3.1 **The Chair** informed the meeting that during recent discussions on several harbourfront related projects, some Members raised enquiries on the requirements of providing Emergency Vehicular Access (EVA) in new developments and buildings. BD and FSD were invited to brief Members on the general requirements of EVA.

3.2 **The Chair** welcomed representatives of BD and FSD to the meeting. With the aid of PowerPoints, **Mr Thomas LEUNG** and **Mr LEUNG Kwun-hong** presented the general requirements of EVA under the respective purview of BD and FSD.

3.3 **The Chair** noted that BD and FSD made a differentiation on EVA requirements between virgin sites and redevelopment sites. He would like to know if “harbourfront areas resulted from reclamation” and “Kennedy Town” would fall into each of the two definitions respectively. He also enquired about examples of buildings with low fire risk and asked if small harbourfront facilities such as public toilets could fall into this category.

3.4 **Mr Vincent NG** opined that whilst fire happening far from the waterfront would require the deployment of fire engines, fire along the waterfront would be dealt with FSD through the deployment of fire boats. As such, the design of EVA for waterfront promenades could possibly be tackled in a different fashion.

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

- (a) the space currently required for providing EVA in the harbourfront areas was beyond safety needs and the over-provision of EVA as hard-paved surface would prohibit planting of trees and provision of other facilities;
- (b) shared use of space between EVA and other purposes such as alfresco dining and cycle tracks should be considered so that limited space could be utilized more effectively;
- (c) making reference to the ex-North Point Estate

site, the provision of separate EVAs for facilities such as ferry piers, waterfront promenades and residential buildings was unnecessary and one EVA could serve various facilities and buildings; and

- (d) if movable crash gates were permitted on EVAs, movable and light-weighted facilities for alfresco dining such as tables and chairs should also be permitted on EVAs.

3.6 **Mr Thomas LEUNG** said that the Chair's interpretation of the categorisation of (i) virgin site that is newly reclaimed land without building development before and (ii) redevelopment site if the site in Kennedy Town involved demolition of existing building for rebuilding was correct. Different uses required different levels of fire safety provisions. He cited that a less than four-storey house accommodating a single family and single storey public toilets as examples of buildings that would pose a lower fire risk. In principle, non-provision of adequate EVA might be acceptable subject to FSD's comments on fire safety compensatory measures. Usually, the lower the fire risk or the smaller the magnitude of inadequacy, the fewer compensatory measures would be required. He added that as long as a building had at least 25% of the total length of all the perimeter walls of the building accessible by an EVA, the requirement on EVA would be considered having been complied with. The layout of buildings on a site should be designed with every building meeting the EVA requirements without one blocking such access from the other.

3.7 **Mr LEUNG Kwun-hong** responded that-

- (a) deploying fire boats to attend fire at waterfront buildings was not operationally efficient as the arrangement was not comparable to fire engines which were designed to carry different

firefighting and rescue equipment for land incidents. In addition, the travelling time for a fire boat to reach a waterfront site would definitely be longer than a fire engine through the land route. For the sake of protection of life and property in case of fire and to meet the performance pledge of arriving at the scene within six minutes in urban areas, a land route was considered more effective;

- (b) in considering the fire safety risk assessment of buildings, factors such as building height, designed occupancy and the amount of combustible materials would be taken into account. Toilet, pump house and plant room were regarded as having lower fire risk. Each case would be considered on its own merits;
- (c) for EVA not normally used as access for other vehicles to the building, an emergency crash gate could be installed; and
- (d) for alfresco dining, miscellaneous articles might be placed on the EVA, thus hampering the unobstructed access or safe operation of emergency vehicles. The facility management responsible should ensure the EVA was not obstructed. When processing food licence applications referred by the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD), FSD would also make fire safety risk assessment and consider whether the proposed dining area was acceptable from fire safety point of view.

3.8 **Mr Vincent NG** opined that the water route should be equally accessible depending on the design of the waterfront. For example, the proposed Boardwalk underneath the Island Eastern Corridor would be raised to a high level to give

sufficient headroom clearance for fire boats to gain access to the waterfront.

3.9 **Mr Franklin YU** enquired if the width of EVAs at the waterfront could be reduced to 4.5m as there would not be many buildings along the waterfront and the area required for fire rescue should be minimal. If 6m was considered necessary, he asked if 4.5m could be paved by standard paving blocks with remaining 1.5m be paved with other finishing materials.

3.10 **Mr Ivan HO** considered that the response time was of paramount importance in fire rescue work. He shared FSD's view that it must be assured that any objects to be put on EVA could be removed effectively and timely. He enquired if there was any mechanism for project proponents to liaise with BD or FSD on the detailed design of EVA with a view to satisfying both the fire rescue requirements and effective use of waterfront space.

3.11 Making reference to overseas experiences, **Mr Evans IU** enquired if lawn area could also be regarded as EVAs.

3.12 Making reference to the redevelopment at the ex-North Point Estate site, **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** queried if the two separate EVAs along the waterfront park was necessary. He queried the reasons for not allowing cycle tracks on EVAs. He enquired if there was any mechanism to review the design of EVA.

3.13 **Mr LEUNG Kwun-hong** made the following responses-

- (a) Fire boats were mainly designed for attending incidents happening on vessels and other marine incidents. The equipment on fireboats was different from those required for firefighting and rescue operations in buildings, such as ladders ,

fire hoses, breaking-in equipment and pumping facilities;

- (b) although a fire engine was around 3.5m to 4m in width which might not occupy the entire width of an EVA, extra space would be required to extend jacks from both sides of the engine to enable aerial ladder operations. The width of a 6m EVA for redevelopment sites and a 7.3m EVA for virgin sites was needed for siting of fire engines and the staging area in a firefighting operation;
- (c) for redevelopment sites with topographical constraints, localized section of EVA with a width of not less than 4.5m for passage only might be acceptable on a case-by-case basis. For the section fronting a building, an EVA with the minimum width of 6m must be provided to enable the firefighting and rescue operations;
- (d) EVA must be hard-paved to support the loading of fire engines as well as the safe operation of aerial ladders; and
- (e) apart from loading and stability issues, a vehicle manoeuvring on lawn or grass road surface would be prone to skidding during turns and brakes, thus resulting in traffic accidents as well as hindering the safe and efficient operation of the fire engines. The situation was particularly undesirable when a fire engine was responding to an emergency during inclement weather condition.

3.14 **Mr Thomas LEUNG** responded that BD had established channels like the mechanism of enquiry submissions to communicate with project proponents or their technical

advisors on schematic designs of projects including designs of EVA. If necessary, enquiry submission would be circulated to relevant departments for comments.

3.15 **Mr Franklin YU** enquired if the initial section of some harbourfront EVAs such as the one in the Central and Western District Promenade (Central Section) could be reduced from 6m to 4.5m so that the 1.5m width could be released for greening or leisure facilities.

3.16 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** requested a response on the shared use between EVA and cycle tracks.

3.17 **Mr LEUNG Kwun-hong** responded that FSD might accept a localized reduction of EVA width to 4.5m on a case-by-case basis provided that it was not directly serving the building's façade. As for the proposed shared use between EVA and cycle tracks, he said it would depend on whether the proposed design of cycle track was compatible with the EVA requirements as well as the buildings to which the EVA was provided for and the level of fire risk .

3.18 **The Chair** invited BD to work together with FSD in exploring possible ways to share EVA with other uses and organising a working session to further discuss with Members the matter.

BD and FSD

3.19 **Prof Becky LOO** suggested and **the Chair** agreed that the proposed cycle track at the Tsuen Wan waterfront could be a case for further deliberation at the working session. **The Chair** also suggested that the redevelopment at the ex-North Point Estate site could be studied.

(Post-meeting note: a working session hosted by BD and FSD was conducted on 13 June 2016.)

Item 4 Progress Report from Task Force on Harbourfront

Developments on Hong Kong Island (Paper No. HC/02/2016)

4.1 The Chair, in his capacity as the Chair of the Task Force, briefed Members on the progress report.

4.2 **Ms Vivian LEE** declared that she was a member of the organising team of the Formula E race.

4.3 On the reassembly of Queen's Pier (QP), **the Chair** requested to provide Members with the three proposed architectural design options for reference.

CEDD

(Post-meeting note: The link to the website containing information on the three architectural design options for the proposed reassembly of QP was sent to Members by email on 12 April 2016.)

4.4 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that in addition to the items covered in the progress report, a team of students from the Worcester Polytechnic Institute (WPI) briefed Members on the findings of their study on pedestrian connectivity along the Victoria Harbour. The Harbour Unit was asked to work out a timetable to enhance pedestrian connectivity and look into the WPI team's recommendations. Separately, he expressed disappointment that the Government had not grasped the opportunity of conducting road modification works relating to the Formula E race to convert Lung Wo Road into a tree-line boulevard.

4.5 **The Chair** said that it was his intention to mention the study conducted by the WPI team under Any Other Business of this meeting as it was a territory-wide issue and presented to the Task Force meeting as the WPI team was not able to stay in Hong Kong to attend this meeting. He suggested the presentation made by the WPI team be circulated for HC Members' reference.

the Secretariat

(Post-meeting note: The WPI team's presentation was circulated to Members on 10 May 2016)

4.6 **Miss Christine AU** responded that the presentation by the WPI team and Members' discussions would be properly recorded in the minutes of the Task Force and the recommendations made by the WPI team would be duly considered by relevant departments. On road works related to the Formula E race on Lung Wo Road, they were minor and ad hoc in nature and mainly aimed to ensure car safety during the race. Members' comments on enhancing the landscaping feature along Lung Wo Road were noted and conveyed to the relevant departments. Members might wish to note a previous reply made by relevant departments stating that they would assess the traffic situation after the completion of the Central-Wan Chai Bypass and consider how to enhance Lung Wo Road as appropriate.

4.7 **Ms Emily MO** supplemented that TC had been coordinating departments in facilitating the organisation of the Formula E race, including the carrying out of minor road modification works at certain sections of Lung Wo Road to facilitate the setting up of a temporary circuit in compliance with the international safety standards. Scale of the works was minor in nature, costing about \$20 million. Detailed information about the minor road works had been presented to Task Force Members earlier.

4.8 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** requested the Government to provide updated information on the minor road works at Lung Wo Road and any plan to replace the concrete profile barriers separating the dual carriageway with stone planters. **Ms Emily MO** agreed to provide updated information on the minor road works relating to the Formula E race.

TC

(Post-meeting note: A paper provided by the Highways Department on proposed greening measures related to minor road modification works in respect of the Formula E race was

circulated to Members on 10 May 2016.)

4.9 On enhancement of landscape at Lung Wo Road, **the Chair** said that the Commission could consider the matter before the completion of the Central-Wan Chai Bypass.

4.10 **Mrs Karen BARRETTO** said that the organiser of the Formula E race mentioned that the footbridge along Man Yiu Street would be closed during the race due to safety considerations. She considered that the footbridge which could provide a good view for the public to enjoy the race should not be closed. The Government could implement crowd management measures at the footbridge instead of closing it altogether.

4.11 **Ms Emily MO** responded that the organiser was exchanging views with the Police on crowd management measures, and Members' comments would be relayed to the organiser for consideration.

4.12 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** commented that the Government should explore beautifying Lung Wo Road before the completion of Central-Wan Chai Bypass. **Miss Christine AU** said that there might be traffic safety concern if the concrete profile barriers were replaced by other types of barriers with greening elements.

4.13 **The Chair** said that relevant departments might take on board Members' comments and study the issue further.

Harbour Unit

(Post-meeting note: A joint response from relevant bureau and departments was circulated to Members on 20 June 2016.)

Item 5 Progress Report from Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development (Paper No. HC/03/2016)

5.1 **Mr Vincent NG**, the Chair of the Task Force, presented the progress report.

5.2 On behalf of the Society for Protection of the Harbour (SPH), **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** expressed objection to the proposal of making use of the Public Open Space in Private Development (POSPD) approach in developing the waterfront open space adjoining the runway hotel sites in Kai Tak, out of wariness that it could become a repetition of the Avenue of Stars (AoS) incident. He counter-proposed that signing a tenancy agreement with a maximum term of two years with the future hotel developers for building and managing the public open space (POS) sections adjoining their hotel sites would be a better arrangement. This would allow flexibility for the Government to adjust the rules to meet the changing public needs and aspirations if necessary. He informed Members that the same remarks had been made at the last Task Force meeting and he simply reiterated it at the current Commission meeting.

5.3 **Mr Vincent NG** noted that it was the first time for SPH to express objection to the proposed POSPD approach, and considered that the progress report presented at the meeting had fully reflected the gist of discussions made by Members on the matter at the Task Force meeting.

5.4 **Miss Christine AU** responded that with the development opportunity presented by the hotel development at the runway, the proposed POSPD approach was an attempt to tap private sectors' participation for creating a vibrant and diversified harbourfront. Members could rest assured that the ownership of the land concerned would remain with the Government and the Government would have the discretion to take back the management responsibility over the POS if deemed necessary. In addition, with nearly 100-hectare of land zoned as Open Space in Kai Tak, it was considered pragmatic to adopt the POSPD approach for the 3.1-hectare area of the POS for diversified development. She added that Members' comments expressed at the last Task Force meeting

were noted. After further deliberation with relevant departments, the project team would refine the basic requirements to be imposed on the part of the private developers, such as the design of suitable street furniture and railing. As requested under land lease, the future developers would have to submit their design and management plans of the respective POS section to the Government, both of which would be subject to review by the relevant departments and consultation with HC and District Council(s) before they could be approved for implementation.

5.5 **The Chair** informed Members that the Harbour Unit was arranging an informal session to update and solicit Members' views on the refined design of the open space concerned. Members would be invited to join the session in due course.

Harbour Unit

(Post-meeting note: Having considered Members' comments expressed at the meeting, the Harbour Unit organised an informal session with the Task Force on 21 April 2016 and updated Members on the refined design of the POS concerned. In order to hear public views, a public discussion session was also hosted on 7 May 2016 and all members of the public were invited to join.)

Item 6 Progress Report from Task Force on Harbourfront Developments in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing (Paper No. HC/04/2016)

6.1 **Prof Becky LOO**, the Chair of the Task Force, took Members through the progress report.

6.2 **Mr Ivan HO** informed Members that a portion of the promenade opening to the public would only lead to a dead end as observed from a recent visit to the Tsim Sha Tsui waterfront. Some visitors had to walk the same way back for around 300m to 400m before leaving the promenade as there was no signage

showing that it would lead to a dead end. He requested LCSD to improve the signage along the route.

6.3 **Mrs Doris FOK** responded that LCSD would look into the matter.

LCSD

(Post-meeting note: LCSD responded that they have reviewed the existing provision of directional signs/maps in the area. Currently, there are 72 directional signs/ maps in 42 locations along the TST waterfront. With a view to enhancing connectivity, 14 directional signs/maps would be added at 12 new locations along the route from the Star Ferry Pier/Hong Kong Cultural Centre to the construction sites of the Museum of Art and New World Centre. The maps would show the alignment of the walkway, locations of nearby subway, footbridge, MTR Exits, public roads, etc. The department would also improve the size and attractiveness of 12 existing directional signs/maps. The new signs/maps are expected to be displayed at the end of June 2016.)

Item 7 Progress Report from Task Force on Water-land Interface (Paper No. HC/05/2016)

7.1 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui**, the Chair of the Task Force, presented the progress report.

7.2 **The Chair** enquired if the three berths at Western District Public Cargo Working Area to be released by MD would be easily accessible by the public.

7.3 **Miss Christine AU** responded that the Harbour Unit would work with relevant departments to take forward the development of the site concerned into POS in consultation with the Commission, the Central and Western District Council and relevant stakeholders.

7.4 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** commented that the space

concerned was popular among the public especially on holidays and people could freely enjoy all kinds of activities such as kite-flying, dog-walking, cycling and scootering in the area without interference from any authority. He reminded the Government that when redeveloping the site concerned, it would be important to avoid over-design and over-management which might adversely affect the attractiveness of the area.

7.5 **Mr Vincent NG** and **Mr Franklin YU** suggested and **the Chair** agreed using the above case as a starting point to deliberate on how POS could be suitably managed.

Item 8 Any Other Business

A. Presentation from the Victoria Harbourfront Concern Group

8.1 **The Chair** informed Members that a request had been received from the Victoria Harbourfront Concern Group (the Concern Group) for a presentation at the Commission. Relevant submissions from the Concern Group had been circulated for Members' reference. He welcomed **Ms Katty LAW**, **Ms Mary MULVIHILL** and **Ms Tanya CHAN** from the Concern Group, as well as **Ms Claudia YUEN** from the Land Justice League to the meeting.

8.2 **Ms Katty LAW**, Convenor of the Concern Group, said that the group was formed by members of the public who were concerned about protection and enhancement of harbourfront areas. The Concern Group was set up to monitor the work of the Government and HC. The Concern Group would like to maintain a close communication with HC and the future HFA. She outlined the four issues that they would like to discuss at this meeting –

- (a) the Tsim Sha Tsui revitalisation plan;

- (b) the POS fronting the hotel sites in Kai Tak;
- (c) reassembly of QP; and
- (d) the role of the future HFA.

8.3 **Ms Mary MULVIHILL** expressed the following views, in addition to those which were tabled at the meeting, on the Tsim Sha Tsui revitalisation plan –

- (a) the lift shaft connecting to the underground shopping arcade was a 2-storey structure and the buildings around the area were not kept to the minimal height;
- (b) she questioned the need for the New World Development Company Limited (NWD) to occupy a large area at the Tsim Sha Tsui East promenade as its site office and she opined that the existing building at hub 1 should be re-opened for public enjoyment;
- (c) she considered that an information booth with ambassadors recruited by TC or LCSD should be set up near the closed part of the waterfront to answer enquiries from visitors on the temporary rerouting arrangements for the area; and
- (d) she was aware that at least eight trees would be removed from the Tsim Sha Tsui East promenade to facilitate coach parking. She opined that harbourfront areas should not be used for coach parking. She urged that the landscape and trees be reinstated as soon as possible and the public should be properly consulted if coach parking spaces were to be added.

8.4 **Ms Tanya CHAN** added the following comments and

questions -

- (a) the Town Planning Board (TPB) approved the planning application submitted jointly by LCSD and a subsidiary company of NWD in August 2015 with conditions while the letter to TPB announcing the revision of the revitalisation plan was solely submitted by LCSD. She sought clarification on the legal status of the planning application on whether the approval was still valid until 2018;

PlanD

(Post-meeting note: According to PlanD, applicants of the planning application No. A/K1/250 (i.e. LCSD and the Sustainable Foundation Company Limited) have advised via its letter on 16 February 2016 that they would not proceed with all the proposed works requiring planning application in respect of hubs 1 to 3 along the Tsim Sha Tsui promenade. The Metro Planning Committee of TPB at its meeting on 19 February 2016 noted the decision of the applicants.)

- (b) HC should follow up on the alleged misinterpretation made by the proponents to TPB in relation to HC's discussion of the project and the conclusions made in January 2015;
- (c) there was no professional report or advice supporting the need to close AoS for three years;
- (d) LCSD had announced the revision to the Tsim Sha Tsui revitalisation plan before the release of the report of Phase 1 Public Engagement (PE) Exercise. The public had not been informed on whether Phase 2 PE exercise would be conducted although there was a suggestion that an informal briefing should be held with public participation; and

- (e) those members of the public who had opined that food and beverage facilities should be provided along the Tsim Sha Tsui waterfront should be given an opportunity to re-consider whether an active or a passive POS along the waterfront would be preferred. The Government should also inform the public on the details of the revised project such as how the statues and handprints would be reinstated.

8.5 **Ms Claudia YUEN** said that the project proponents should submit the revised revitalisation plan to TPB for consideration, re-open the part that had been closed for renovation and justify the required renovation period, the works and the cost involved.

8.6 On the POS fronting the hotel sites in Kai Tak, **Ms Tanya CHAN** commented that after deducting the area used for the timber boardwalk and cycle track reserve, the percentage of area designated for commercial activities at the POS seemed to have exceeded the limit allowed under POSPD Design and Management Guidelines. She suggested the Government to review the proportion of commercial activities along the POS and asked HC to take the initiative in conducting public engagement on the proposal.

8.7 On reassembly of QP, **Ms Katty LAW** opined that all three of the architectural design options provided by the government were not good enough as they were of similar design. She commented that many members of the public had indicated preference for in-situ reassembly of QP because from the heritage conservation perspective, it would allow QP to return to its original heritage cluster with the City Hall and Edinburgh Place which had been built in the same period. The Government should also consider that once a heritage building was relocated to a different location (such as the Murray House from Central to Stanley), it would cause a drop or cancellation

of its grading. In this connection, the Government should add the option of in-situ reassembly in the public consultation for further deliberations by the public. She opined that reassembling QP between Central Piers No. 9 and No. 10 would be decorative rather than functional as the existing two public piers were already providing adequate berths for public use.

8.8 Separately, noting that the two-phase Public Engagement Exercise for the proposed establishment of HFA was completed, **Ms Tanya CHAN** enquired about the schedule of establishing the proposed HFA, its role, power, structure and relationship with the community.

8.9 **Ms Katty LAW** supplemented that the Concern Group expected the proposed HFA would be empowered to oversee the development, enhancement and protection of prominent harbourfront areas.

8.10 **The Chair** invited Members to give general responses to the issues raised.

8.11 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** concurred with the Concern Group that HC should actively initiate public consultation on harbourfront development projects such as the Tsim Sha Tsui revitalization plan, the area from the Star Ferry Pier at Tsim Sha Tsui to Hung Hom station and the POS fronting the hotel sites at Kai Tak. He added further responses and comments as follows-

- (a) the Concern Group's suggestion on stationing ambassadors at the Tsim Sha Tsui waterfront to answer enquires from visitors on the closure of AOS was supported;
- (b) TD had plans to increase road-side parking for coaches in Tsim Sha Tsui instead of providing fee-paying car parks by way of short-term tenancy;

- (c) Members of HC had enquired about the cost to implement the Tsim Sha Tsui revitalisation plan but an answer was yet to be given;
- (d) if the Concern Group would accept a two-year short term entrustment of the POS along the hotel belt in Kai Tak to hotel operators; and
- (e) whether the Concern Group had any comments from the heritage conservation angle regarding the proposal to reassemble QP near City Hall but at a location that would be slightly deviated from its original location due to changes in site constraints.

8.12 **Mr Evans IU** opined that when deciding whether to reassemble QP at its original location, one should be prepared that the City Hall might be relocated one day in future.

8.13 **Mr Ivan HO** said that comments made by the Concern Group in relation to AOS were useful for HC to monitor the implementation of the Tsim Sha Tsui revitalization plan. He urged relevant departments to take into account views from the Concern Group when enhancing the Tsim Sha Tsui harbourfront. On reassembly of QP, he recalled that the Government conducted a public engagement exercise under the Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront from 2007 to 2009. It was concluded at that time that public in general supported to reassemble QP at the waterfront to resume its pier function.

8.14 **Prof Becky LOO** said that –

- (a) an informal session with HC Members on the design of AoS was suggested at the Task Force meeting. She had later suggested that the informal session could be opened to the public;

- (b) LCSD had clearly expressed at the Task Force meeting that the proponents jointly agreed that section 16 application approved by TPB would not be further pursued and the planned Phase 2 PE would not be necessary; and
- (c) the suggestions regarding the Tsim Sha Tsui waterfront on the lift shaft, setting-up of information booth, re-opening of hub 1, coach parking and handprints, etc. could be further discussed at the informal workshop and future Task Force meetings.

8.15 **Ms Tanya CHAN** said that while AOS was not well managed by NWD, the area was not taken back by LCSD. She therefore opined that it was premature to decide whether entrusting the management of the POS in Kai Tak to nearby hotel operators as suggested by Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN would be a practicable approach. She urged the Government to conduct public engagement and draw up a holistic list of specifications to be included in the land lease. The lease of the Palace Mall in Tsim Sha Tsui, which stipulated that the management should be handed over to the Government after development by the private sector, could be a useful reference.

8.16 **Ms Mary MULVIHILL** pointed out that there was no precedent for the Government to take back management of POS from the private sector due to poor management performance. She also doubted about the effectiveness of a short-term entrustment as it would not offer sufficient incentives for hotel operators to upkeep the POS in a good condition.

8.17 **Ms Katty LAW** said that the public had diverse views on the location to reassemble QP in the 2007-2009 public consultation. In-situ preservation had been supported by professional institutes but the Government ignored them. The current three options were not a real choice at all. The

Government should offer the option of reassembling QP at its original location for the public to discuss further.

8.18 **The Chair** thanked the Concern Group for the presentation and welcomed the exchange of views between the community and HC. Written responses from relevant departments would be provided to the Concern Group when ready.

the Secretariat

(Post-meeting note: Supplementary information from the Concern Group including photos of the work sites at the Tsim Sha Tsui waterfront and a copy of Lease for Palace Mall were circulated to Members on 12 April 2016.)

8.19 There being no other business, the meeting ended at 6:00 pm.

**Secretariat
Harbourfront Commission
June 2016**