

Harbourfront Commission
Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island

Minutes of Sixteenth Meeting

Date : 19 May 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 |
| Mrs Karen BARRETTO | Representing Friends of the Earth |
| Mr LAM Kin-lai | Representing the Conservancy Association |
| Mr Andy LEUNG | 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 LAU Chun-kong | Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors |
| Dr Sujata GOVADA | Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design |
| Ir Peter WONG | Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers |
| Mr Shuki LEUNG | Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong |
| Mr CHAN Hok-fung | |
| Mr Walter CHAN | |
| Ms Lily CHOW | |
| Ms LI Chun-chau | |
| Mr Vincent NG | |
| Mr Alvin YIP | |
| 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) |
| Mr Harry TSANG | Chief Executive Officer (Planning) 1, Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) |
| Ms Ginger KIANG | District Planning Officer/Hong Kong, Planning Department (PlanD) |
| Mr Larry CHU | Secretary |

In Attendance

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Mrs Winnie KANG | Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB |
| Mr Frederick YU | Assistant Secretary (Harbour) SD, DEVB |
| Miss Venus TSOI | Assistant Secretary (Harbour) 2, DEVB |
| Mr Peter MOK | Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB |
| Mr AU Chin-pang | Town Planner/Studies and Research 7, PlanD |

Absent with Apologies

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Mr LEUNG Kong-yui | Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong |
| Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN | Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour |
| Ms Jacqueline CHUNG | |
| Mr Eric FOK | |
| Mrs Ayesha Macpherson LAU | |
| Mr Brian David LI | |
| Mr Raj Sital MOTWANI | |

For Agenda Item 3

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Mrs Winnie KANG | Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB |
| Mr Peter MOK | Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB |
| Ms Alice YEUNG | Chief Architect/2, Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) |
| Ms Athena FUNG | Senior Project Manager 122, ArchSD |
| Mr TSANG Wai-lun | Architect/208, ArchSD |
| Miss Mandy LAM | Project Manager 165, ArchSD |
| Ms Randa WAN | Chief Manager (Urban/Cultural Services), LCSD |

For Agenda Item 4

| | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Mr Leon SNEP | Swiss AEX Holding Limited |
| Mr Timothy J PEIRSON-SMITH | Executive Counsel Limited |
| Ms Stef LO | Executive Counsel Limited |

For Agenda Item 5

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Miss Elsa CHEUK | Chief Town Planner/Special Duties, PlanD |
| Ms Polly YIP | Senior Town Planner/Special Duties 2, PlanD |

For Agenda Item 6

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Mr Theodore P ALGIRE | Executive Director, The Servicemen's Guides Association (SGA) |
| Ms Irene IP | Vice Chairman, SGA |
| Mr Leland SUN | Treasurer, SGA |
| Mr Tom FARNEN | Secretary, SGA |
| Mr Yip CHAN | Development Manager, Headland Developments Limited |

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Ms Elaine LEE | Senior Architect, Aedas Limited |
| Ms Cindy TSANG | Director, Townland Consultants Limited (TCL) |
| Ms Stephanie CHAN | Town Planner, TCL |
| Mr Vincent LAU | Assistant Town Planner, TCL |

Action

Welcoming Message

The Chair welcomed all to the meeting. He informed Members that Mr Edward LEUNG, Senior Manager (Tourism) 2 of TC was attending this meeting on behalf of Ms Emily MO; and Mr Harry TSANG, Chief Executive Officer (Planning) 1 of LCSD was attending on behalf of Miss Olivia CHAN.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 15th Meeting

- 1.1 **The Chair** said that the Secretariat circulated the draft minutes of the 15th meeting to Members on 9 May 2014. After incorporating the proposed amendments received, the revised draft minutes were circulated to Members on 15 May 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 (IEC) Link - Appearance of CWB Noise Mitigation Measures at the Harbourfront of North Point (paragraph 2.1 of the minutes of the 15th meeting)

- 2.1 **The Chair** updated Members that the Highways Department (HyD) was finalising the design of some options to facilitate the opening of the landscaped deck for public access in future, and would report its findings at a separate working session in due course.

HyD

(Post-meeting note: An informal working session was arranged on 20 June 2014 for HyD to brief Members on its findings on the design options to facilitate the opening of the landscaped deck for public access in future.)

- B. Topical Study on the Proposed Boardwalk underneath IEC (paragraph 2.8 of the minutes of the 15th meeting)

Action

2.2 **The Chair** said that the preliminary implementation timetable of the project was circulated to Members on 9 May 2014. He suggested discussing the issue under “Any Other Business” of this meeting.

C. Amendments to the Approved Wan Chai North Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H25/2 (paragraph 2.10 of the minutes of the 15th meeting)

2.3 **The Chair** said that PlanD would consult the Task Force on the draft planning brief for the comprehensive development area on top of the Exhibition Station of Shatin to Central Link under agenda item 5 of this meeting.

D. Urban Design Study for the Wan Chai North and North Point Harbourfront Areas – Proposed Study Scope (paragraph 5.17 of the minutes of the 15th meeting)

2.4 **The Chair** said that a Task Group would be formed under this Task Force as suggested by Members at the last meeting to provide an interactive platform to gauge Members’ views on the study after the consultant was on board.

Item 3 Proposed New Piazza Fronting City Gallery and City Hall (Paper No. TFHK/04/2014)

3.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives of the project team to the meeting. **Mrs Winnie KANG** of DEVB and **Ms Alice YEUNG** of ArchSD presented the paper, with the aid of a PowerPoint and a physical model.

3.2 **Mr Evans IU** queried whether it would be necessary to take two years to complete this project which was relatively small in scale.

3.3 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** opined that the proposed design layout looked overcrowded with more than half of the site occupied by the proposed lawns and water features which might not add vibrancy to the area. To meet the Harbour Planning Principles (HPPs), he suggested that the project team should consult the Task Force again with an enhanced scheme.

3.4 **Mr Vincent NG** remarked that the area had become less vibrant after the shifting of shoreline northward due to Central

Action

Reclamations works, and it should be reactivated after completion of works. The proposed design had respected the heritage conservation principle to preserve the historic axis from City Hall through Edinburgh Place (EP) to the former Queen's Pier (QP), reflect the old shoreline of 1950s, and commemorate the history of QP. He opined that the proposed design could provide quality open space offering a relaxing ambience with occasional outdoor performances.

- 3.5 **Mr Andy LEUNG** said that it would be difficult for the project team to reconcile the demands from all members of the public as some might have their own memories of and sentiments about the area. As the site context and circumstances had changed, he suggested adopting a pragmatic approach to take forward the enhancement and add vibrancy to this site. He added that the piazza should be designed in a holistic manner to complement the current cultural and community activities offered by City Hall.
- 3.6 While agreed with the proposed use of the site, **Mr CHAN Hok-fung** suggested fine-tuning the design of some individual elements, such as the timber boardwalk which might look incompatible with the old concrete pavement fronting City Hall. The canopy and feature walls to commemorate QP might be enhanced to harmonize with the overall design of the piazza.
- 3.7 **Ir Peter WONG** said that the project should highlight the cultural status of City Hall and commemorate the history of the site, and he opined that the proposed layout was occupied by too many general public park features such as trees and facilities.
- 3.8 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** remarked that although Members had diverse views, the site should be enhanced for converting into an attractive open space for people to enjoy.
- 3.9 **Mr Alvin YIP** opined that given the site constraints, prioritisation of different messages had to be decided, and the design should clearly convey such messages. While appreciating the intention to conserve the historic elements, he suggested not planting any tree to emphasize the historic shoreline explicitly. He opined that the piazza could be more thematic and educational like the Sheung Wan Pak Tsz Lane Park, and to commemorate the civic campaign of preserving QP in 2007. The cultural sector and some ethnic minority groups

Action

which were frequent users of the piazza should also be engaged in the design process.

- 3.10 **Mr LAM Kin-lai** said that it might not be necessary to include too many features in this small piazza. He suggested adding suitable features on the floor to commemorate the history of the site so as to avoid obstructing pedestrian accessibility and allowing flexibility when allocating the available space. He added that the permeability and connectivity to the north should be enhanced as the existing footpath along Lung Wo Road was not wide enough.
- 3.11 **Mr Shuki LEUNG** welcomed the proposal which could turn the area into a civic square, thus encouraging more outdoor performances to supplement the indoor activities of City Hall. He suggested further strengthening the heritage elements and connectivity to the waterfront through the proposed footbridge to the east.
- 3.12 **Dr Sujata GOVADA** said that urban design approach should be adopted to integrate the site with the larger surrounding area. She opined that the design of the proposed canopy should either look like the old QP or be removed. She suggested keeping the overall design simple to enhance visual permeability to the harbourfront, and adding some food and beverages (F&B) facilities like kiosks within the site.
- 3.13 **Mr LAU Chun-kong** asked whether there would be sheltered connections such as a footbridge linking the piazza, City Hall and City Gallery on the eastern side of the site.
- 3.14 **Mrs Winnie KANG** made the following responses:-
- (a) the future footbridge would connect the Central hinterland from AIA Central building across Connaught Road with a landing on the east-northern corner of the piazza and also connect to Site 4 of the new Central harbourfront, but there was no concrete implementation timetable at the moment;
 - (b) instead of an ordinary public open space project, the piazza would be an extension of City Hall to be managed by the same management team of City Hall to create synergy, and a number of cultural events and performances could be extended to the piazza;

Action

- (c) as the existing toilets, F&B facilities and vending machines inside City Hall and City Gallery could be used by the public including the piazza users, it was not necessary to provide additional facilities within the small footprint of piazza. There was also a round-the-clock public toilet in the vicinity;
- (d) the construction of the piazza was permanent in nature and it would be a public works project which had to undergo the standard resources bidding and tendering process. As the site was located next to City Hall, there would be limitation in the number of hours for construction works at the site, and hence the project would take about two years to complete; and
- (e) while noting that Members from different professional backgrounds might have different views on the design, she was glad that Members were in general supportive to the overall approach of the project. The project team would try its best to engage different stakeholders, and consider how to incorporate Members' comments in the design.

3.15 **Ms Alice YEUNG** responded that:-

- (a) the footprint of the site was comparatively small but basic sitting-out and sheltered areas would be provided for frequent users of the site such as workers of nearby construction sites and foreign domestic helpers; and
- (b) to respect the existing setting of EP, the original concrete pavement would be maintained in accordance with the recommendation of the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) conducted during project planning stage. The proposed timber boardwalk along the water features was intended to provide a leisure ambience for users.

3.16 **Mr Shuki LEUNG** suggested that the project team should also engage the cultural team of LCSD when preparing the programme for performances within the site.

3.17 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** said that the piazza was a very important harbourfront site so the proposed enhancement works had to take into account solid urban design, landscaping

Action

and architectural considerations. It should be a genuine place of public gathering and related to activities of City Hall. He reiterated that the proposed water features and lawns would not be desirable for the site. He suggested that the project team should review the scheme and provide a few options for Members' consideration.

3.18 **Mr Vincent NG** said that as the site had various limitations, it was a difficult task for the project team to produce a design that could accommodate all requests, or it would simply create a hybrid which might not be acceptable to the community. He opined that the history of QP, the historic axis, existing setting of EP, the old shoreline, etc. were important elements for the design, and the project team should explain its intention and objectives of the design clearly to the community during the public engagement, rather than being arbitrarily driven by public views. He added that as the old QP had been dismantled and would be resembled between Central Piers Nos. 9 and 10, the proposed canopy to commemorate the old QP might not necessarily have the same appearance as the old QP.

3.19 **Mr Alvin YIP** agreed that the message to deliver to the public was important. Given the high symbolic meaning of this project, he suggested the project team to consult some independent third parties such as history departments of the universities, on the information to be embedded and conveyed through this project. **Mrs Winnie KANG** responded that the Chinese University of Hong Kong was engaged to conduct the HIA for the project, and the recommendations of HIA which would be implemented through this project were submitted and confirmed by the Antiquities and Monuments Office.

3.20 **Dr Sujata GOVADA** reiterated that while the proposed structure to be put at the original location of QP had not to be a replica of the old QP, it should be more closely related to the old QP. She suggested the project team to come up with a few design options for Members' consideration.

3.21 **Mr Andy LEUNG** suggested the Secretariat to arrange a design workshop for Members to contribute further and facilitate the project team to fine-tune the design.

**the
Secretariat**

3.22 **Mrs Winnie KANG** responded that the project team would also consult the Central and Western District Council (C&WDC) on the project later this month. After gathering all the comments,

Action

the project team would review and decide on how to refine the design, and would be pleased to attend a design workshop to further gauge Members' views.

- 3.23 In closing, **the Chair** remarked that City Hall should be a key driver of this project, and the design should respect the history of the site. The message to bring out the symbolic meaning of the site and the design objectives were also important. He asked the Secretariat to arrange a workshop for Members to provide further input on the design after collecting views from C&WDC and the community.

**the
Secretariat**

(Post-meeting note: Dr Peter Cookson SMITH circulated his further written comments to Members on 28 May 2014. The Secretariat has conveyed the comments to the project team. An informal working session was arranged on 20 June 2014 for Members to provide further input on the design of the piazza to the project team.)

Item 4 Hong Kong Observation Wheel at the New Central Harbourfront (Paper No. TFHK/05/2014)

- 4.1 Before discussion, **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** declared that his company was involved in this project. **The Chair** agreed that he could stay at the meeting, but should not participate in the discussion on this item.
- 4.2 **The Chair** welcomed the presentation team to the meeting. **Mr Timothy J PEIRSON-SMITH** of Executive Counsel Limited presented the paper, with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 4.3 In response to the Chair's enquiry on whether the required licences and approvals for the operation of the wheel had been obtained, **Mr Timothy J PEIRSON-SMITH** said that the Buildings Department's approval on the foundation had already been obtained. After assembling and erecting the wheel on the site, the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department would perform on-site testing and a public entertainment licence would be obtained. They were confident that the wheel could be ready for operation in September 2014.
- 4.4 **Mr Walter CHAN** opined the wheel would become an icon of Hong Kong to enhance the vibrancy to the harbourfront given the successful experiences of other overseas cities. In view of the rainy and humid climate in summer, he suggested

Action

increasing the shaded area, which only covered around 10% of the site in the proposed design, for people to wait for the ride.

- 4.5 **Mr Vincent NG** said that Members were eager to see the actual operation of the wheel which could meet the Commission's vision for a diversified, vibrant and accessible harbourfront. As many local residents and tourists, including those who might not be interested to take a ride, would also be attracted to visit the new Central harbourfront, he suggested providing more ancillary facilities such as F&B facilities, shelters and sitting-out areas within the site for public enjoyment.
- 4.6 **Dr Sujata GOVADA** said that the wheel could become a good attraction of Hong Kong due to its prominent location. She queried about the future plan for the wheel after the expiry of the three-year short term tenancy (STT), whether shelter would be provided for people to queue up, and whether there would be any discount package offered for children and the disadvantaged groups.
- 4.7 **Mr Alvin YIP** commented that the wheel would add new value to the new Central harbourfront. He suggested the tenant to work with experienced designers and artists to provide visual and acoustic information about the future development plan of the waterfront inside the cabin.
- 4.8 **Ir Peter WONG** queried whether the 60-metre height of the wheel was limited by capital investment concern or physical concern along the harbour.
- 4.9 **Mr Shuki LEUNG** welcomed this unique facility which could become a magnet to attract people from all walks of life to the waterfront. Apart from the new year countdown event jointly run with C&WDC, he asked about the planned events to be conducted within the site. **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** asked whether the planned events would be small in scale but running throughout the tenancy or just a few large scale one-off events.
- 4.10 **Mr LAU Chun-kong** enquired the time required for taking a ride. **Mrs Karen BARRETTO** asked whether there would be bathroom facilities as well as smoking and non-smoking areas in the waiting area.
- 4.11 **Mr Timothy J PEIRSON-SMITH** made the following responses:-

Action

- (a) the wheel was situated at one of the best waterfront sites in Hong Kong, and would be an icon to energise this area which was currently not very vibrant;
- (b) they were having meetings with the Fire Services Department with a view to fine-tuning the roof design to provide adequate shading for the waiting area;
- (c) the pricing of \$100 for adult and \$70 for children was intended to be affordable to the vast majority of the community, and there would be discount for senior citizens, students and the disabled;
- (d) the first event to be held at the site was a winter wonderland type of event to provide visitors with a family-friendly experience. After that, there would be a mixture of large and small scale events. When there was no event, people could enjoy and relax on the event plaza paved with grass;
- (e) the term of the tenancy was three years commenced from May 2013, and was renewable quarterly thereafter. The wheel was specially designed to stand for the unique climate in Hong Kong and the cabin would be air-conditioned. They hoped that the wheel would be well received by the community so that it could be operated longer in Hong Kong. This intention had been incorporated into the design of the wheel and the event plaza;
- (f) this was a community project to bring people to the waterfront. They had already been working with designers on the materials to be used in the cabins which would be equipped with speakers, and it might be a great opportunity to share some key information of the harbour with visitors during the ride;
- (g) visitors could enjoy a wide view of the harbour during the ride. They would take on board Members' comments for the designers to further enhance the experience of visitors;
- (h) the height of the wheel was 60 metres, which struck a balance between the cost and admission fee, intended to

Action

provide a fantastic experience at an affordable price. A bigger wheel would not add much to the experience but would raise the cost significantly. The wheel was highly specialized for Hong Kong and it was not appropriate to compare Hong Kong with other locations. They would welcome Members to have a ride during the soft launch;

- (i) a ride would take about 15 to 20 minutes, and the ticketing and queuing would take about 10 minutes;
- (j) there would be special promotion and advertising campaign during special holidays such as the Valentine's Day; and
- (k) adequate crowd management measures would be implemented during peak hours and the wheel could be loaded and unloaded from two points at the same time, and the operation of the wheel would be conducted by a team of well-trained customer services representatives with the company's successful experience from operating the wheel in Bangkok.

4.12 **The Chair** said that the Government had just leased the adjacent site for event purpose. Having yet to be briefed by the successful tenderer of the event site, he suggested that the two tenants might commence some dialogue to avoid having similar events at both sites. **Mr Timothy J PEIRSON-SMITH** replied that the team was aware of that tender, and believed that the two parties could work together well to create synergy with a common interest of attracting more people to the waterfront.

4.13 In response to the Chair's enquiry, **Mr Leon SNEP** said that the estimate of one million passengers a year was a realistic projection which based on the experience from operating a wheel in Bangkok since 2012 which attracted a million passengers in the first 14 months, albeit it was only opened from 6:00 pm to night time daily. The wheel in Hong Kong was situated at a better location, and would be opened from 10:00 am to 11:00 pm daily.

4.14 In response to Mr Andy LEUNG's enquiry, **Mr Leon SNEP** said that the wheel was not built to be relocated within Hong Kong every year, but they would consider relocating the wheel every 3 to 5 years. **Mr Timothy J PEIRSON-SMITH** supplemented that they were delighted to be awarded of the tenancy, and

looked forward to having the term of the tenancy extended after the initial three years so that the wheel could operate longer at the new Central harbourfront.

- 4.15 In closing, **the Chair** said that Members fully supported the project for launching in September 2014, and asked the team to approach the Task Force for assistance if necessary. **Mr Timothy J PEIRSON-SMITH** thanked Members' comments, and said that the relevant government departments had been supportive to the implementation of the project.

Item 5 Draft Planning Brief for the "Comprehensive Development Area" Site at the Exhibition Station Site of the Shatin to Central Link in Wan Chai North (Paper No. TFHK/06/2014)

- 5.1 **The Chair** welcomed the presentation team to the meeting. **Ms Polly YIP** of PlanD presented the paper, with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 5.2 **The Chair** said that Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN could not attend this meeting but had submitted written comments on this item, which was tabled for Members' reference. He asked the team to respond to the written comments in addition to those expressed by Members at the meeting. He commented that the draft planning brief (PB) seemed to focus more on the at-grade development, but less on the development at the podium level. Also, the draft PB did not contain details of the building such as its building mass.
- 5.3 **Mr LAM Kin-lai** suggested that the underground commercial space of the topside development should connect with the proposed underground space under Victoria Park, so as to attract tourists and reduce pedestrian flow at the ground level. To better utilise the future public transport interchange (PTI) and alleviate air pollution and traffic jam in Central, he suggested TD and PlanD to consider making this PTI for all buses and coaches coming from the eastern side of Hong Kong Island.
- 5.4 **Mr Andy LEUNG** said that the site would be a very significant pedestrian connection to the waterfront sites in Wan Chai North but only one connection was planned in the draft PB. The proposed connection with the Hong Kong Convention and

Action

Exhibition Centre (HKCEC) extension on the western side also seemed arbitrary. He suggested leaving more flexibility in the draft PB to better interface with the Urban Design Study for the Wan Chai North and North Point Harboufront Areas.

- 5.5 **Dr Sujata GOVADA** said that the preparation of the draft PB should adopt a three dimensional approach to guide the development at different levels, the visual corridors, the layout of building on the top, and how the site would be related to the existing environment, the hinterland, the waterfront and Causeway Bay. Only one north-south connection in the draft PB was not adequate, and the connection with HKCEC extension would be important. She agreed with Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN's suggestion of setting up an urban design panel to ensure that the PTI would not be a standard design but setting an example for future projects.
- 5.6 **Mr Evans IU** asked how the pedestrian connections at the street level would be integrated at different levels.
- 5.7 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** said that the idea of having 20% of the site covered by landscaping to improve the streetscape and provide a pedestrian-friendly environment was acceptable in principle, but the question was how it could be achieved. He shared Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN's view that the proposal should be considered holistically having regard to elements such as connectivity, usability, interface between buildings, etc. The waterfront open space and the PTI should be carefully designed and integrated to achieve better urban design. He commented that while some project teams used terms in the HPPs to illustrate the proposals in their presentations, but these principles could not be illustrated in their proposals. In response, **Mrs Winnie KANG** clarified that it was the Commission's requirement for all proponents to focus on the compliance of their projects with the HPPs when conducting their presentation to the Commission.
- 5.8 **Miss Elsa CHEUK** made the following responses:-
- (a) the draft PB provided an overall guideline for the future proponent to prepare a Master Layout Plan (MLP) with detailed information for the site after conducting the relevant technical assessments (TAs);
 - (b) while recognising the importance of the site to the

Action

harbourfront, the draft PB emphasised on public facilities, urban design and landscape aspects, pedestrian corridors, connectivity and integration with the harbourfront and surrounding environment;

- (c) the proposed PTI would be a transport node for relieving the traffic congestion in Wan Chai North together with the Exhibition Station. The proponent would be required to adopt an integrated approach when preparing the layout design for the entire development. It was a requirement for the proponent to submit the proposed design as well as the associated TAs including the traffic, environment, visual, air ventilation aspects to the Town Planning Board (TPB) for approval. These details, such as design, location and layout of those facilities such as public toilets, storerooms and the PTI would be included in the MLP to be submitted to TPB;
- (d) at-grade connections would be provided at both the eastern and western ends. At the podium level, the site would be connected to the waterfront open space to the north via the proposed landscaped deck and to the Wan Chai MTR Station to the south. Apart from these, the proponent would be required to provide a public pedestrian walkway connecting to the HKCEC extension and to review and examine the pedestrian connectivity of the site with the surrounding developments in all directions and include any enhancement proposal in its MLP submission;
- (e) the underground space of the site would be occupied by the Exhibition Station. PlanD would reflect Members' suggestion on underground space development to the MTR Corporation Limited;
- (f) due to site constraints such as the ventilation shafts of the station, the draft PB had only stipulated general requirement for the building such as a building height restriction of 50mPD to leave flexibility for the proponent to propose a design that could meet the urban design requirements. The proponent had to submit a visual impact assessment as part of its MLP submission to TPB;
- (g) to provide a connection with HKCEC extension was a mandatory requirement, and the proposed alignment

Action

shown in the draft PB was only indicative; and

- (h) the proponent would be invited to brief the Task Force on the detailed design and incorporate Members' comments, before seeking TPB's approval on its MLP submission.

5.9 In response to the Chair's enquiry about the process, **Miss Elsa CHEUK** said that PlanD would reflect the views collected during public consultation to TPB for consideration and approval of the finalised PB. The future proponent, albeit not decided at this stage, would then conduct the relevant TAs, prepare a MLP and submit a detailed development proposal having regard to the approved PB and the OZP to TPB. In closing, **the Chair** asked PlanD to reflect Members' comments to TPB, keep the Commission posted of the development, and request the future proponent to consult the Task Force on its proposed MLP submission before it was considered by TPB.

PlanD

(Post-meeting note: The Secretariat summarized Members' comments and conveyed them to the TPB on 30 June 2014.)

Item 6 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 (Paper No. TFHK/07/2014)

6.1 Before discussion, **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** said that her company was previously involved in the project and she would not participate in the discussion of this item. **The Chair** decided not to preside for this item. Mr Vincent NG was invited to take over the chairmanship.

(Note: As Mr Vincent NG took over the chairmanship throughout the discussion of this item, "the Chair" to which the remaining paragraphs referred in this item should be understood as Mr Vincent NG, rather than Mr Nicholas BROOKE.)

6.2 **The Chair** welcomed the representatives of the project team to the meeting. **Mr Theodore P ALGIRE** of SGA presented the paper, with the aid of a PowerPoint and a video presentation.

Action

- 6.3 In response to the Chair's enquiry, **Mr Theodore P ALGIRE** confirmed that the Fenwick Pier had submitted a planning application to TPB for rezoning of the site in order to allow SGA to proceed with the proposed major refurbishment for the building.
- 6.4 **Mr Andy LEUNG** queried on the irregular site boundary at the eastern side; how the site would be integrated with the adjoining future extension of the Hong Kong Academy for Performing Arts (HKAPA) after the cancellation of Lung King Street; and how the public could access to the public open space to the north from the site concerned.
- 6.5 **Mr Shuki LEUNG** opined that the proposal to open up the building for public enjoyment was supported. As more local residents would be encouraged to use the facilities while overseas naval personnel would continue visit the premises, he questioned how SGA would reconcile any conflict between the two groups.
- 6.6 Referring to paragraph 22 of the paper, **Mr Alvin YIP** said that as several parts of the site would be designated as open space which would be connected to F&B facilities, he hoped that at least one of those eateries would be affordable to the mass public.
- 6.7 **Dr Sujata GOVADA** asked when the refurbishment would be completed.
- 6.8 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** queried the necessity to provide facilities such as eateries and shops which could be found anywhere in the town.
- 6.9 **Mr Theodore P ALGIRE** made the following responses:-
- (a) the irregular site boundary at the eastern side reflected the minimum circulation area for the future Emergency Vehicular Access which would also enable servicing of the building after the cancellation of Lung King Street;
 - (b) as security measures would only be implemented at the landing steps, the Fenwick Pier building would still be open to the public during visits of naval personnel except when the Fenwick Pier had to be used as an assembly site to facilitate emergency recall of naval personnel due to

Action

typhoon;

- (c) SGA aimed to have all eateries in the building affordable by members of the public to enjoy;
- (d) there would be barrier-free accesses to the building from all directions and the site would be connected to a future footbridge linking to the future HKAPA extension to the east;
- (e) SGA would keep their core retail for visiting naval personnel, such as a barber shop, tailor shop, magazine shop and souvenir shop. As there were only two eateries at present, SGA would expand the F&B facilities for accommodating more visitors and to support activities at the waterfront; and
- (f) it was necessary to maintain the Fenwick Pier for providing basic hospitality service for visiting foreign naval personnel such as free Wi-Fi, television, telephone, information booths, lockers, etc. More F&B facilities could meet the needs of visiting foreign naval personnel and attract local residents to enhance vibrancy of the waterfront.

6.10 **Mr Yip CHAN** of Headland Developments Limited said that they would start hiring consultants and submitting building plans to the Buildings Department if TPB's approval for the rezoning was obtained in Q3 2014. The refurbishment and renovation works were expected to start in Q3 2015 and complete in Q4 2018.

6.11 **Ms Cindy TSANG** of TCL supplemented that a refurbished building was necessary to provide modernised space and services to support SGA's mission to visiting foreign naval personnel. The proposal also aimed to integrate open spaces at different levels of the building with the adjacent Arts Events Plaza for local residents to enjoy.

6.12 **Mr Tom FARNEN** of SGA added that the Fenwick Pier was a consideration factor for foreign navies to decide their visit to Hong Kong as the visiting naval personnel would be well supported by the ancillary services provided by the Fenwick Pier. Spending by naval visitors contributed significantly to Hong Kong's economic activities.

- 6.13 **Ms Ginger KIANG** supplemented that TPB would consider the interface issues such as planned uses of the adjoining areas and the proposed boundary when deciding the rezoning application.
- 6.14 In closing, **the Chair** concluded that Members had no objection to the proposal, and appreciated the opening of areas within the building for public use whilst hoping that the F&B facilities would be affordable to the general public. From harbourfront enhancement perspective, the proposal was not controversial as the Fenwick Pier would maintain the same site area and not propose a bigger building mass. As to the irregular site boundary, TPB should consider the issue from planning perspective.

(Post-meeting note: The Secretariat summarized Members' comments and conveyed them to the TPB on 23 June 2014.)

Item 7 Any Other Business

Topical Study on the Proposed Boardwalk underneath IEC

- 7.1 **The Chair** said that the preliminary implementation timetable of the project was circulated to Members on 9 May 2014, and some Members had expressed disappointment over the length of time to complete the boardwalk.
- 7.2 **Mr MAK Chi-biu** responded that CEDD had reviewed the programme, and confirmed its previous estimation that the project would take about six years as it involved the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (PHO). CEDD had to prepare a preliminary design to consult the public and prepare the cogent and convincing materials if the overriding public need could be established. There were still other uncertainties which might affect the programme including the time to establish the overriding public need and resolve any possible objections after the gazettal of the project under the Foreshore and Sea-bed (Reclamations) Ordinance (FS(R)O). All these steps would take time to complete in sequence. While there was not much room to further compress the programme, CEDD would try its best to adhere to the current programme as far as possible.

Action

- 7.3 **Mr Vincent NG** said that the Commission would not like to see further delay and urged the Government to expedite this harbourfront enhancement project.
- 7.4 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** said that a timetable should be prepared for resolving the PHO issue. He opined that while it was logical to prepare the detailed design after resolving the PHO issue, the project team might consider taking forward the two issues in parallel.
- 7.5 **Mr Thomas CHAN** said that the Government recognised Members' aspiration that the project should be proceeded as soon as possible. He assured Members that DEVB did attach importance to this project, and would work with CEDD to implement it expeditiously. At the same time, the necessary procedures of public works project should be followed and respected, in particular this project involved PHO. Some steps could not be proceeded in parallel as public money should only be spent when a works project could be fully justified in terms of feasibility and other relevant factors. The timetable prepared by CEDD was a realistic and reasonable estimate under an optimistic view that every step, including establishing overriding public need, seeking funding approval, etc. could be completed smoothly. While every attempt would be made to expedite the process if possible, the Government would not be able to circumvent or complete some statutory steps in parallel without upsetting the current control mechanism for the public works programme.
- 7.6 **Dr Sujata GOVADA** said that the boardwalk project was proposed in the Hong Kong Island East Harbourfront Study (HKIEHS) which was completed a few years ago. She queried what could be done to deliver the project within a shorter timeframe, say three years.
- 7.7 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** said that HKIEHS had gone through a two-stage public engagement. CEDD had also conducted a topical study to illustrate that the project was technically feasible. There was obvious public need and he could not see any particular obstacles ahead. He opined that a programme should be set for the PHO issue which would affect the detailed design.
- 7.8 **Mr Thomas CHAN** responded that the proposed works fell within the definition of reclamation under the PHO despite the

Action

fact that the boardwalk structure would actually sit above the existing highway structures. CEDD's timetable had already factored in the necessary steps to conduct the overriding public need test. As the Secretariat briefed Members previously, public consultation and support were not the only requirements for establishing the overriding public need when considering reclamation within Victoria Harbour. Based on previous court judgement, all steps had to be taken through to prepare the cogent and convincing material in anticipation of any possible legal challenge. In the proposed timetable, CEDD had included the time for engaging a consultant to take through the required steps. After the overriding public need was established for the project in accordance with the government guidelines, CEDD could then proceed to the next stage, including preparing the detailed design, arranging gazettal under the FS(R)O and completing the actual works. CEDD had already obtained the funding approval and commenced the preparatory work to engage the consultant.

- 7.9 **Mr MAK Chi-biu** supplemented that the consultant was expected to be on board in Q3 2014 and if every step went through smoothly, the PHO issue could be resolved by Q1 2016. The 1.5 years' time frame estimated for the process was considered appropriate having regard to the experience of the CWB project which took three years. In terms of establishing the overriding public need, the boardwalk project might encounter some difficulties as some members of the public might consider the boardwalk a "nice to have" project.
- 7.10 **Dr Sujata GOVADA** said that the boardwalk was important for public enjoyment, and for this purpose the project should be taken forward as soon as practicable.
- 7.11 **Mr Vincent NG** said that the key consideration that previous transport infrastructure projects could fulfill the overriding public need test as the community previously held the concept that enhancing public transport was of paramount importance. For this project, the objective was to provide transportation means for and return the harbour to pedestrians. It was the moment to shift the focus of harbourfront planning so that pedestrians should be given no less weighting than vehicles. The boardwalk was not a "nice to have" project but an essential initiative with a view to accomplishing the vision to connect the entire 73 km waterfront of Victoria Harbour as a continuous waterfront promenade. This argument should be

Action

put forth when considering the overriding public need for the project.

- 7.12 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

Secretariat

**Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island
September 2014**