

Harbourfront Commission
Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island

Minutes of Seventeenth Meeting

Date : 15 September 2014
Time : 2:30 p.m.
Venue : Conference Room (Room G46) at Upper Ground Floor,
Hong Kong Heritage Discovery Centre, Kowloon Park,
Tsim Sha Tsui

Present

Mr Nicholas BROOKE	Chair
Mrs Margaret BROOKE	Representing Business Environment Council
Mr LEUNG Kong-yui	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Mrs Karen BARRETTO	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr LAM Kin-lai	Representing Conservancy Association
Mr Franklin YU	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Evans IU	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Dr Peter Cookson SMITH	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Mr Ivan HO	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Ms Debby CHAN	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Mr CHAN Hok-fung	
Ms Lily CHOW	
Mr Eric FOK	
Mr Brian David LI	
Ms Jacqueline CHUNG	
Ms LI Chun-chau	
Mr Thomas CHAN	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Edward LEUNG	Senior Manager (Tourism) 2, Tourism Commission (TC)
Mr CHAN Chung-yuen	Chief Traffic Engineer/Hong Kong, Transport Department (TD)
Mr MAK Chi-biu	Chief Engineer/Hong Kong 1, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Miss Olivia CHAN	Assistant Director (Leisure Services) 2, Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Ms Ginger KIANG	District Planning Officer/Hong Kong, Planning Department (PlanD)
Mr Larry CHU	Secretary

In Attendance

Miss Christine AU	Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
Miss Venus TSOI	Assistant Secretary (Harbour) 2, DEVB
Miss Ingrid TJENDRO	Assistant Secretary (Harbour) 2 (Des.), DEVB
Mr Peter MOK	Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB

Absent with Apologies

Mr LAU Chun-kong	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Ir Peter WONG	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Shuki LEUNG	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong

Mr Walter CHAN
Mrs Ayesha Macpherson LAU
Mr Raj Sital MOTWANI
Mr Vincent NG
Mr Alvin YIP

For Agenda Item 3

Miss Cheryl CHOW	District Officer (Central & Western), Home Affairs Department (HAD)
Miss Tiffany LO	Project Manager, Central & Western District Office (C&WDO), HAD
Mr LI Ho-kin	Senior Project Coordination Manager, Architectural Services Department (ArchSD)
Mr Chris LIU	Senior Project Manager 323, ArchSD
Mr Esmond AU	Senior Architect/22, ArchSD
Mr Kevin SY	Architect/209, ArchSD
Ms Deborah LIU	Assistant Architect, ArchSD

For Agenda Item 4

Ms Anne TENG	District Officer (Eastern), HAD
Ms Fiona AU	Assistant District Officer (Eastern), HAD
Miss Lina CHONG	Project Manager (Works), HAD
Mr LI Ho-kin	Senior Project Coordination Manager, ArchSD

For Agenda Item 5

Mr David RULE	Executive Director, Central Venue Management Limited (CVML)
Ms Maureen EARLS	Operations Director, CVML
Mr John BINKS	Strategy Director, CVML
Ms Grace AU	Head of Communications, CVML
Ms Rowena HOY	Head, Corporate Affairs, CVML

For Agenda Item 6

Mr Jonathan LEUNG	Chief Engineer/Railway Development 1-2,
-------------------	---

Mr CHAN Chung-hin	Highways Department (HyD)
Ms Yanny LI	Senior Engineer/Shatin to Central Link 6, HyD
Mr Vincent CHU	Engineer/Shatin to Central Link 7, HyD
Mr Joseph WONG	Design Manager-SCL(NSL), MTRCL
Mr Kelvin WU	Senior Design Management Architect, MTRCL
Mr William CHAN	Senior Liaison Engineer, MTRCL
	Public Relations Manager - Projects and Property, MTRCL

Action

Welcoming Message

The Chair welcomed all to the meeting, and informed Members that Mr Edward LEUNG, Senior Manager (Tourism) 2 of TC was attending this meeting on behalf of Ms Emily MO.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 16th Meeting

- 1.1 **The Chair** said that the Secretariat circulated the draft minutes of the 16th meeting to Members on 28 July 2014. After incorporating the proposed amendments received, the revised draft minutes were circulated to Members on 21 August 2014. There being no further amendment, the revised draft minutes were confirmed at the meeting.

Item 2 Matters Arising

- A. Central-Wan Chai Bypass (CWB) and Island Eastern Corridor Link – Appearance of CWB Noise Mitigation Measures at the Harbourfront of North Point (paragraph 2.1 of the minutes of the 16th meeting)
- 2.1 **The Chair** reported that an informal working session was arranged on 20 June 2014 for HyD to brief Members on its findings on the design options to facilitate public access to the landscaped deck in the future. HyD had recorded the options agreed by Members and passed them to PlanD for further study under the upcoming Urban Design Study for Wan Chai North and North Point Harbourfront Areas.
- B. Proposed New Piazza Fronting City Gallery and City Hall (paragraphs 3.21 and 3.23 of the minutes of the 16th meeting)

Action

2.2 **The Chair** said that an informal working session was arranged on 20 June 2014 for Members to deliberate further on the design of the piazza with the project team. The revised scheme was in general agreed by Members in attendance.

C. *Draft Planning Brief (PB) for the "Comprehensive Development Area" Site at the Exhibition Station Site of the Shatin to Central Link (SCL) in Wan Chai North (paragraph 5.9 of the minutes of the 16th meeting)*

2.3 **The Chair** reported that Members' comments raised at the last meeting were summarised and conveyed to the Town Planning Board (TPB) on 30 June 2014.

2.4 In response to Ms Debby CHAN's enquiry concerning paragraph 5.2 of the minutes of the 16th meeting, **the Chair** said that Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN's comments had been tabled and discussed at that meeting. Major issues he raised such as pedestrian connectivity, at-grade access and design of the public transport interchange, etc. had been incorporated into the comments conveyed to the TPB. A copy of the submission to the TPB would be circulated to Members after the meeting.

**the
Secretariat**

2.5 **Ms Ginger KIANG** added that on 11 July 2014, the TPB endorsed the revised PB to guide the future development at the site. A copy of the endorsed PB could also be circulated to Members after the meeting.

PlanD

(Post-meeting note: A copy of the submission to the TPB and a copy of the endorsed PB were circulated to Members on 5 November 2014.)

D. *Proposed Amendment to the Draft Central District (Extension) Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H24/8 from "Open Space" and "Road" to "Other Specified Uses" Annotated "Site Reserved for Commercial, Cultural, Institutional and Recreational Uses" at No. 1 Lung King Street (aka. Fenwick Pier), Wan Chai, Hong Kong (paragraph 6.14 of the minutes of the 16th meeting)*

2.6 **The Chair** said that Members' comments raised at the last meeting were summarised and conveyed to the TPB on 23 June 2014.

Item 3 Signature Project in Central & Western District: Harbourfront Enhancement and Revitalisation at the Western Wholesale Food Market (WWFM) (Paper No.

TFHK/08/2014)

- 3.1 **The Chair** welcomed the project team's representatives to the meeting. **Miss Cheryl CHOW** of HAD and **Ms Deborah LIU** of ArchSD presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 3.2 **The Chair** enquired whether dogs and bicycles would be allowed to gain access to the open space upon completion; and whether there would be sufficient signage to guide people to walk from the hinterland to the waterfront. He opined that the proposed railing might affect the permeability of the site.
- 3.3 **Mr CHAN Hok-fung**, who was also the Vice-Chairman of the Central & Western District Council (C&WDC), said that C&WDC and C&WDO conducted comprehensive public engagement to collect local residents' views on the project, which had been duly incorporated into the current design. C&WDC planned to commence construction at the earliest in order to meet residents' aspiration. Further views from the public would be sought on the design of railings along the promenade as well as the fencing segregating the site from the wholesale market. To leave more usable space to the public, more vertical greening (instead of lawn) was proposed in the current design. In order to preserve the historical element of the site, an existing crane was retained in pier 1 and a barge-like feature was proposed in pier 2.
- 3.4 **Mr Ivan HO** said that SYSMP was a popular open space for residents as it was conveniently connected to the hinterland. Relevant government departments should provide necessary assistance to C&WDC to enhance accessibility to the project site. He suggested that the proposed playground for children should be accompanied by a sheltered area for parents. Glare of sunlight reflected from the sea and heat radiation generated by the hard paving might discourage people from using this open space in particular during the summer season.
- 3.5 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** considered it unnecessary to retain the old crane, to provide another children's playground and a fishing zone. He enquired about details of the entrance kiosk and themed sitting area, and opined that the multi-purpose area should be designed with people's need in mind. He further suggested anchoring an old ship at one of the piers to become a museum; installing lighting panels as an attraction; reinforcing the piers to construct buildings for food and beverage uses; and

Action

integrating the site with the water basin to the west in the future.

- 3.6 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** suggested that arrangement should be made with operators of WWFM to open pier 5 as an additional pedestrian link to connect SYSMP for certain hours each day.
- 3.7 **Mr LAM Kin-lai** suggested using glass balustrade as railing to enhance permeability, and installing power and water supplies to facilitate the organisation of events. He also suggested operators of WWFM to open some space in the market by selling fresh seafood to attract visitors.
- 3.8 **Ms Debby CHAN** opined that the existing berthing facilities should be retained for anchorage of ships, and the designated location of fishing zone was not convenient.
- 3.9 **Mr Evans IU** suggested that more trees should be planted to shield sunlight and heat. The lighting around the sitting areas should be carefully designed to avoid causing nuisance to users.
- 3.10 In response, **Miss Cheryl CHOW** said that:-
- (a) during the previous engagement with local community, views were collected on the preferred facilities and uses for the site. The majority supported having sitting area, a playground for children and a multi-purpose area so that a multitude of activities would be allowed;
 - (b) some Members' comments were also raised by C&WDC members. The project team had given serious thought to all the ideas but given the site constraints and budget limit, difficult choices had to be made;
 - (c) the connection between WWFM and SYSMP were occupied by two works sites at the moment. As pier 5 was not heavily in use, it was possible to connect the project site with SYSMP in due course when the two works sites were released for promenade development. The project team had left allowance to facilitate such connection in the future;
 - (d) the market operators had already demonstrated their utmost willingness to support the project by releasing as much space as possible in WWFM for promenade

Action

development. While it might be desirable to convert WWFM into facility like the Tsukiji Market in Japan, various technical and management issues such as appropriate segregation with the wholesale area would still need to be sorted out. Such an opportunity might arise when the signature project was completed and that the market operators could see for themselves the merits of further opening up the wholesale market. C&WDC would continue to liaise with the market operators in this regard;

- (e) according to a survey conducted earlier, most residents intended to have access to the project site either on foot from the neighbourhood or by MTR if they were living afar as the site was not far from the future University MTR station. There were already plans to improve the signage along the key pedestrian routes leading to the site; and
- (f) as for pets and bicycles, since there would only be one access point that could be used as both entrance and exit at the moment and given the narrow promenade, after balancing the needs of different users, pets and bicycles would not be allowed in at this stage. If an additional entrance could be identified in the future, the addition of a pet corner within the site could be considered.

3.11 Mr Esmond AU of ArchSD supplemented that:-

- (a) the idea of using glass balustrade as railing for the entire site could not be realised due to budget consideration. In view of Members' comments to enhance permeability of the site, the project team would reconsider the proposal;
- (b) a way-finding consultant would be engaged together with the assistance from relevant government departments to help identify measures to improve accessibility;
- (c) suggestions in respect of landscaping of the site such as adding more lawn area and planting more trees would also be considered;
- (d) the entrance kiosk would be used for selling refreshment and beverages;

Action

- (e) while pier 4 would be designated as fishing zone, people could still fish with angling at other areas; and
 - (f) no excessive lighting would be put around the sitting area.
- 3.12 **Mr Ivan HO** suggested leaving the issue of selecting the railing design to the project team. It could explore using different types of railings at different areas.
- 3.13 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** supported retaining only one crane, and using glass balustrade for railing at the waterfront promenade while installing demountable railings at the piers with a view to retaining the berthing function.
- 3.14 In closing, **the Chair** said that Members appreciated the project team's efforts under the tight budget constraints. He asked the project team to take into account Members' comments while refining the design. He hoped that the project team could keep the Task Force informed when the finalised design was ready.

HAD

Item 4 Signature Project Scheme in Eastern District: Eastern District Cultural Square (Paper No. TFHK/09/2014)

- 4.1 **The Chair** welcomed the project team to the meeting. **Ms Anne TENG** of HAD presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 4.2 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** supported the project which would enhance the northern part of the site which was currently occupied by a car park running on short term tenancy (STT). He commented that the vegetation in the southern part should be retained to provide a pleasant environment. At-grade crossing from Shau Kei Wan Main Street East (SKWMSE) to the project site would be preferred over pedestrian subway. He also suggested that the section of SKWMSE leading to the project site could be closed as pedestrian area for a few hours each day upon project completion.
- 4.3 **Mr Ivan HO** expressed support to the project. To integrate Tam Kung Temple with the project site, he also suggested closing the section of Tam Kung Temple Road as pedestrian area during certain periods each week and when festive activities were organised in the area.

Action

- 4.4 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** echoed the view that the vegetation in the southern part of the site should be retained, and suggested that the performance stage should be simple in design to encourage spontaneous or casual cultural performances activities.
- 4.5 **Ms Anne TENG** assured Members that the performance stage in the Eastern District Cultural Square could be used by organisers who reserved the stage for performances and would explore in consultation with the LCSD, the manager of the venue in future, how the utilisation of the performance stage could be maximised for the use of the general public.
- 4.6 **Ms LI Chun-chau**, who was also a member of the Eastern District Council (EDC), strongly supported the project as it could relieve the shortage of cultural performance venues in the district. The proposed scope of the project had gone through thorough discussions within EDC and consultations with local organisations. Views and suggestions from stakeholders including members of the public from aspects like traffic and culture had been incorporated into the design concept as far as possible.
- 4.7 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** supported the project, and suggested to open the STT car park site for public access at both the eastern and western ends. The promenade should also be extended as far as possible. She suggested that any future enhancement work should be explored at the Shau Kei Wan Preliminary Treatment Works site so that the promenade could eventually be connected to the Shau Kei Wan Wholesale Fish Market further east.
- 4.8 **Mr LAM Kin-lai** suggested that the project should facilitate water activities as the project site had close access to the Shau Kei Wan Typhoon Shelter.
- 4.9 **Ms Debby CHAN** enquired about the difference between the two terminologies of “a park” or “a cultural square”, and opined that railing/fencing to be placed along the perimeter of the site should be minimised to facilitate public access.
- 4.10 In response, **Ms Anne TENG** said that:-
- (a) the name of the project, the “Eastern District Cultural

Action

Square”, was determined after thorough discussions within EDC. The design concept was to put together different components, including open space and a small open-air performance stage without any fixed seating for residents to enjoy;

- (b) the project team would explore with the Lands Department on the possibility of extending the waterfront promenade to the STT car park site ahead of the completion of the entire project in 2018; and
- (c) traffic congestion and illegal parking along SKWMSE had been an issue as the existing street was rather narrow. The project team would seek EDC’s view on the suggestion to pedestrianise the road section in front of the Tam Kung Temple to SKWMSE.

4.11 **Mr LI Ho-kin** of ArchSD supplemented that there were approximately 230 existing trees found in the site. While there was no valuable and rare species, most were in healthy and safe condition and would be kept. To vacate space to accommodate facilities as required in the design brief, some of the existing trees would have to be felled or transplanted. ArchSD was actively discussing with LCSD on transplanting some of the trees to the Aldrich Bay Promenade area. He added that from the architectural perspective, a square was a place where people gathered for activities such as events and performances whereas a park was a place with greening for people to relax. For this particular site, the northern parcel would be an open area suitable for being used as a square. The southern parcel where most trees were planted now would be developed into a park.

4.12 **The Chair** concluded that Members were supportive of the proposal, and would like the project team to take it forward as early as possible. He would like the project team to keep Members informed when the detailed design was available. **Ms Anne TENG** thanked Members for their support and said that the project team would revert with a detailed design and operation details.

HAD

Item 5 Central Harbourfront Event Space (Paper No. TFHK/10/2014)

5.1 **The Chair** welcomed CVML’s representatives to the meeting.

Action

Ms Rowena HOY of CVML presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.

- 5.2 In response to the Chair's enquiry about the types of events scheduled to be held on the site, **Ms Rowena HOY** said that the first series of event, under the theme "Green Summer Festival", was being held at the site for an eight-week period in collaboration with local non-governmental organisations (NGOs), youth art groups, etc. More than twenty activities would be opened to the public free of charge. Upcoming events included the "Electric Run" and a classic car event which would target different sectors of the community.
- 5.3 **The Chair** enquired whether there was any restriction on the types of events that could be held on the site, and whether there would be any competition with the adjacent observation wheel site.
- 5.4 **Mr John BINKS** of CVML responded that the tenancy specified that the site could only be used for events and activities falling within the definition of "entertainment" in Section 2 of the Places of Public Entertainment Ordinance (Cap. 172); events or activities related to trade and industries such as trade exhibitions, conventions and meetings; and Free Public Use as defined in the tender documents; but not all activities. He did not envisage having any across-the-board competition with the observation wheel site. Rather, he would envision that the observation wheel could bring in more people to the harbourfront, and create synergy with events to be held in this site. Together, the mutual goal of both sites was to add vibrancy to the harbourfront. **Mr David RULE** of CVML added that the commercial interest for the site was strong, particularly for periods outside the typhoon season.
- 5.5 **Mr Eric FOK** said that one of the objectives of allocating this site for organising events was to return the harbourfront to the community. He asked about the procedures if a NGO wished to use the site for community events.
- 5.6 In response, **Mr John BINKS** said that any NGO was welcome to approach CVML to host community event on the site, and CVML would try its best to fit such event into the programme. However, NGOs should approach CVML early as the event calendar for the site was already being filled up quickly for the next three years. Under the tenancy agreement, there were

Action

some periods reserved for the Government. CVML had received the Government's advice or indication on these days for 2014 to 2016, and was fitting events around these days.

- 5.7 **Miss Christine AU** added that the tenancy agreement had specified that the site had to be open to the public for a minimum period of time each year. The objective of such requirement was to have more events that would return the harbourfront to the community.
- 5.8 **Ms Debby CHAN** enquired about CVML's company structure and the operation details if the site would be opened to the public when there was no event. She also commented that it was not desirable to hang banners around the site as the harbour view would be blocked.
- 5.9 **Mr John BINKS** responded that CVML was an event venue management company set up specifically to manage the Central harbourfront site. It was a joint venture of Serious Staging Limited (an event organiser for over 20 years) and a company which was an event equipment supplier. Both companies as well as CVML were wholly owned by Mr David RULE. As required by the tenancy agreement, if the site was available, it would be open to the public from 11:00 am to 7:00 pm daily. Since some events were sponsored, it was reasonable that banners were put up around some of the surrounding fences for promotional purposes. These banners would not be erected above the fence ceiling and would be by and large fronting the main road.
- 5.10 In response to Mrs Karen BARRETTO's enquiry on the challenge faced by CVML, **Mr David RULE** said that one of the challenges was the need to reinstate the soft landscaped area within a short period of time after each event, as another event would follow shortly given the huge demand for the site.
- 5.11 **Miss Christine AU** supplemented that a steering committee (SC) had been set up to monitor the operation of the site. The SC had frequent communications and a cordial working relationship with CVML. She emphasised that the site was suitable for the specified short-term use, and same as the usual practice adopted for similar short-term uses, the tenant should accept the site in the condition as it was given. Through an open tender process, CVML was selected on its extensive experience in managing outdoor events and the required ability to manage

and utilise the site throughout the three years of tenancy.

- 5.12 **The Chair** asked CVML to continue its efforts in bringing in quality events to add vibrancy to the harbourfront. In response to his enquiry, **Mr John BINKS** said that they needed the Task Force's support in proceeding further for some running events which also involved the adjacent promenade. **The Chair** said that while CVML could further resolve the issue with the relevant government departments, the Task Force could offer assistance if necessary.

Item 6 Shatin to Central Link - Exterior Design of the West Ventilation Building of the Exhibition Station (Paper No. TFHK/11/2014)

- 6.1 **The Chair** welcomed the project team to the meeting. With the aid of a PowerPoint, **Mr Vincent CHU** of MTRCL presented the paper and an update on the proposed exterior design of the re-provisioned Wan Chai Swimming Pool and Harbour Road Sports Centre. **The Chair** advised Members to focus the discussion on the proposed exterior design of the west ventilation building of the Exhibition Station.
- 6.2 **Mr LAM Kin-lai** enquired about the detailed reason for not allowing public access to the roof of the building. He suggested planting trees on the rooftop or allowing the Wan Chai District Council (WCDC) for placing some distinctive features to signify district identity if public access would not be possible. He also opined that the visual impact of one side of the building could be further softened.
- 6.3 **Mr Ivan HO** pointed out that the height of the ventilation building should be less than 3.4 metres according to the photomontage, but the building height was actually 5 metres according to MTRCL's presentation. He also enquired about the safety concerns for not allowing public access to the top of the building. He opined that as the site would be along the sightline of drivers after the road realignment works, some iconic features, e.g. a clock tower, could be placed within the site for identification purpose if public access to the rooftop would not be allowed.
- 6.4 **Mr Franklin YU** said that despite the three pedestrian crossings proposed, it could still be inconvenient for pedestrians to gain

Action

access to the waterfront from the Renaissance Harbour View Hotel. To enhance building permeability, he suggested dividing the building block into two to allow pedestrian access in between or raising part of the building to allow pedestrian access underneath it. He queried about the physical constraints for not allowing public access to the rooftop.

6.5 **Ms Debby CHAN** opined that the mismatch of the location of the pedestrian crossings proposed to the north and to the south would encourage pedestrians to jaywalk. She suggested moving the southern crossing to the east of the site near Fleming Road, and widening the pedestrian path at the south-eastern corner by setting back the building. She also questioned the reasons for not allowing public access to the rooftop.

6.6 **Mr Vincent CHU** made the following responses:-

- (a) as the site was constrained by the underground tunnel structures of SCL and of CWB, there was limited space available for accommodating the building structure;
- (b) there were stringent technical requirements in respect of the layout of the four ventilation shafts. For example, the footprint of the building should be inside the boundary gazetted under the Railways Ordinance. The performance and operation requirements on the separation of the ventilation shafts, which would serve both intake and exhaust of air under emergency situation, should also be met. Each of these ventilation shafts had to be separated by at least 5 metres to adjacent openings to avoid short circuit in the air and smoke movements;
- (c) fire services facilities, a straight run lift and staircase from the street level to the track level should be put in place for access of firemen. In the design, the plant rooms were placed on both sides of the fireman access which aimed to minimise the footprint of the building;
- (d) the requirement of providing a sightline zone below 1.05 metre on both sides of the road would further constrain the footprint of the building;
- (e) separately, it was a statutory requirement for ventilation shaft to have at least 5-metre separation from any habitant to avoid discharged smoke to be inhaled by

Action

pedestrians around the building. The rooftop was about 5 metres high which was at the same level as the ventilation shafts. Therefore, public access to the rooftop of the building would unlikely satisfy the separation requirement from a safety point of view;

- (f) even if public access to the rooftop was allowed, barrier free facilities, which were required to be provided under building code, would occupy most rooftop area;
- (g) given the above, the space that could be provided for public enjoyment would be very limited. It was then considered that the rooftop should solely be used as a landscaped area; and
- (h) on pedestrian connectivity, the current proposal was formulated based on the overall plan of the Wan Chai Development Phase II works project for which the alignment had been gazetted. On the consideration that there would be a higher demand of pedestrian movement to the future waterfront promenade and the Golden Bauhinia Square, it was proposed to have the pedestrian crossing at the south-western corner which had a larger holding area. MTRCL would discuss with TD further on the arrangement given Members' comments.

6.7 **Mr CHAN Chung-yuen** responded that TD welcomed any enhancement on walkability and connectivity, and would liaise with MTRCL to refine the design with a view to providing a better connection to the waterfront.

6.8 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** said that there was an actual need to open up the landscaped area as an enlarged holding area for pedestrians to cross the Convention Avenue.

6.9 **The Chair** asked whether a low-level design could be adopted for the whole building so that people could access its rooftop easily without ramp and railing. **Mr Vincent CHU** replied that the sightline requirement might not be met if members of the public were allowed to access to the sightline zone which had to be kept below 1.05 metre.

6.10 **Mr Kelvin WU** of MTRCL added that in the current design, a terraced landscaped area was used to reduce the visual impact of the ventilation shafts. As the building had to house the

Action

necessary above-ground equipment, the shield-off effect would be reduced if the terraced planters were lowered. The project team could enhance the design of the landscaped area to mitigate the visual impact.

- 6.11 **Ms Jacqueline CHUNG** said that the present proposal had not been presented to WCDC. While more greening was in general welcomed, the building seemed to have shifted towards Fleming Road, and only a narrow pedestrian path could then be provided at the south-eastern corner. As members of the public could not use a straight-line path to access to the waterfront, some might jay walk and cause traffic safety issue. She queried whether it would be technically feasible to bring at least half of the building underground to lower the height of the rooftop.
- 6.12 To minimize the exclusion zone and free up more space within the site, **Mr Franklin YU** suggested exploring to group the two exhaust shafts together if the 5-metre clearance was not applicable to intake shafts.
- 6.13 **Mr Vincent CHU** responded that as the ventilation shafts would perform both intake and exhaust functions, it would not be feasible to group them. The ventilation shafts adopted a top ventilation model and their top should be at least 5 metres from the adjacent ground level. To satisfy the technical requirements mentioned earlier, adopting an underground design for the building would not be feasible.
- 6.14 **Mr Ivan HO** said that the response could not address all the questions raised by Members. For instance, it seemed that members of the public walking on the street would be able to meet the 5-metre exclusion requirement. Therefore, at-grade access route should be provided within the site to allow more straight access to the waterfront instead of having a terraced landscaped area.
- 6.15 **Mr Vincent CHU** said that while consensus had been reached with the relevant departments on the maintenance issue of the landscaped area, the project team would consider Members' comments and revert.
- 6.16 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** asked the project team to enhance the proposal having regard to Members' comments. Otherwise, the past efforts put in by the Commission and stakeholders in improving the waterfront would be ruined.

Action

- 6.17 **Ms Ginger KIANG** reminded the project team that there would be a need for MTRCL to submit further information or fresh application to the TPB on any revision to be made to the scheme submitted to the TPB.
- 6.18 In closing, **the Chair** suggested and Members agreed to arrange a separate working session for Members to discuss with the project team on the proposed design, in particular to address Members' comments on the footprint of the ventilation building, design of landscaping features, lack of accessibility to the rooftop of the ventilation building and accessibility provided for pedestrians etc. TD should also be invited to attend the session to provide input on pedestrian connectivity. **Mr Vincent CHU** agreed with this arrangement.

**HyD &
MTRCL**

(Post-meeting note: A working session was arranged on 6 October 2014 for Members to provide further input on the design of the west ventilation building to MTRCL. Members were briefed on a revised design proposed by HyD and MTRCL. While recognising that the parties concerned had made some improvements, Members attending the session concluded that the revised design still could not fully address their concerns, and that the footprint of the ventilation building should be further reduced. HyD and MTRCL were asked to provide further information to justify the proposed footprint requirement of the ventilation building with the goal of providing more ground floor space for public access.)

Item 7 Any Other Business

- 7.1 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Secretariat

**Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island
February 2015**