

# **Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island**

---

For discussion  
on 25 May 2016

TFHK/08/2016

## **Reassembly of Queen's Pier**

### **PURPOSE**

The purpose of this paper is to report on the public views collected from the Community Engagement Exercise of the Reassembly of the Queen's Pier (QP).

### **PROPOSAL AND PREVIOUS CONSULTATION**

2. The Development Bureau and Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) consulted the Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island (HKTF) and the Central and Western District Council (C&WDC) on the proposal to reassemble QP on 29 February 2016 and 10 March 2016 respectively.

3. To recap, we put forward the proposals for the reassembly of QP at the earmarked location between Central Piers No. 9 and 10 to restore its pier function in accordance with the recommendation of the Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (UDS) completed by the Planning Department in 2011. To refurbish the exterior of Central Piers 9 & 10 (with curved glass roofs) to achieve a coherent design with the reassembled QP, we proposed three architectural design options -

- (a) Option A - remove curved roofs of Central Piers 9 & 10 and replace them by pitched roofs;
- (b) Option B - add gable wall in front of curved roofs of Central Piers 9 & 10; and
- (c) Option C - retain Central Piers 9 & 10 as they are.

4. Given the proposed location of the reassembled QP, only the three seaward landing steps of the five landing steps could be restored for marine use, views on the arrangement of the two side landing steps were also sought under the proposal -

- (a) Option I - reassemble with glass decking;

# Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island

---

TFHK/08/2016

- (b) Option II - reassemble with raised glass deck with seating and planters; and
- (c) Option III - reassemble with at grade display and seating.

## COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT EXERCISE

5. With the general support of HKTF and C&WDC over the reassembly project, CEDD launched a 2-month community engagement exercise on 18 March 2016. The public was invited to express their preference on the two issues on architectural designs and arrangement of side landing steps as set out in paragraphs 3 and 4 above. Their other views on the project were also welcomed.

6. CEDD set up a project website ([www.queenspier.hk](http://www.queenspier.hk)) and put up display boards detailing the project background, conservation principles and the reassembly proposals at Government Offices, open areas near both Central and Tsim Sha Tsui Star Ferry Piers, Hong Kong Museum of History and selected MTR stations. CEDD also distributed information pamphlet cum survey form to brief the public on the reassembly proposal at the exhibition venues and the same survey form (at **Appendix I**) was also available at the project website. A summary of all the community engagement activities is at **Appendix II**. The community engagement exercise ended on 17 May 2016.

## PUBLIC VIEWS COLLECTED

7. By the end of the community engagement exercise, a total of 1,955 survey forms were completed by members of the public either online or at exhibition venues. Separately, CEDD also received 1,058 other written submissions by email or post during the community engagement exercise. DEVB/CEDD has also monitored views expressed in the media about the reassembly proposal.

8. In the 1,955 survey forms completed, regarding the question of architectural design (paragraph 3 above), 52% opted for Option C, 16% opted for Option A and 21% opted for Option B, while 5% indicated no preference and 6% preferred none of the above. Regarding the question on arrangement for side landing steps (paragraph 4 above), 46% opted for Option III, 12% opted for Option I and 31% opted for Option II, while 6% of the respondents indicated no preference and 5% preferred none of the above.

# Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island

---

TFHK/08/2016

9. Most of the respondents (1803) did not offer any other comments on the reassembly proposal. As for those who have expressed other comments, some considered the present reassembly location is not suitable. There were suggestions that QP should be restored at its original location in front of the City Hall, or other locations including the western coast of the West Kowloon Cultural District, the former Kai Tak Runway (near Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter), or any other harbourfront site other than the current proposed location. There were some who opposed the reassembly proposal, whilst some others supported the reassembly proposal and considered that it should be started as soon as possible. Some considered the cost for reassembly was too high. Some commented that the original appearance of QP should be maintained. Some suggested that display panel on the history of QP should be erected and the open space surrounding QP should be better planned.

10. The 1,058 other written submissions received during the community engagement exercise, mostly submitted via standard template, expressed mainly the view that QP should be reassembled at its original location, that the community engagement period should be extended, and that the cost comparison between reassembly at the proposed location and at the original location of QP should be provided.

11. As for the views expressed in the media, they were mainly on the location of the reassembly. Some supported reassembly of the QP at its proposed location to restore its pier functions. Some suggested reassembly of QP at its original location in front of the City Hall along Lung Wo Road to restore its authenticity. One suggestion was made that QP should be reassembled at other locations along waterfronts of newly developed areas, citing the precedent of Blake Pier in Stanley.

12. A breakdown of the comments received from survey and written submissions is at **Appendix III**.

## **WAY FORWARD**

13. The Government will analyse and consider carefully the views received during the community engagement exercise before deciding the way forward. Once we have decided on the way forward, we will develop a reassembly scheme and further consult the Task Force in due course.

## **ADVICE SOUGHT**

14. Members are invited to note the results of the community

# **Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island**

---

TFHK/08/2016

engagement exercise.

## **Attachments**

**Appendix I** - Information pamphlet cum survey form

**Appendix II** - Summary of the community engagement activities

**Appendix III** - Breakdown of the survey results and details of the written submissions

**Development Bureau**

**Civil Engineering and Development Department**

**May 2016**

# Survey on Architectural Design of the Reassembled Queen's Pier

## Question 1 –

### Architectural design options for connecting the Queen's Pier with Central Piers 9 & 10

In the Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (UDS) conducted by the Planning Department and completed in 2011, it was recommended that the Queen's Pier dismantled for the Central Reclamation Phase III would be reassembled between Central Piers No. 9 and 10 to revive its pier function, and the exterior of Central Piers 9 and 10 would be refurbished to achieve a coherent design with the reassembled Queen's Pier. Taking into account that the existing curved roofs of Central Piers 9 & 10 are well received by the public and that Queen's Pier and Central Piers each has its own architectural styles, three design options are proposed:

<b>Option</b>	A. Remove Curved Roof of Central Piers 9 & 10 and to be replaced by Pitched Roof	B. Add Gable Wall in front of Curved Roof of Central Piers 9 & 10	C. Retain Central Piers 9 & 10 as they are
<b>Points to Note</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Achieve a coherent design</li> <li>• Existing curved roof of Central Piers 9 &amp; 10, which only came into use in 2007, will have to be replaced</li> <li>• Incur higher costs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Achieve a visual transition between Central Piers 9 &amp; 10 and the reassembled Queen's Pier</li> <li>• The gable wall structures will block part of the views of the harbour when looking from the open area fronting Central Piers 9 &amp; 10</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimal modification to existing Central Piers 9 &amp; 10</li> </ul>
<b>Duration of closure of Central Piers 9 &amp; 10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Estimated 6-months closure for each of Central Piers 9 &amp; 10</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Estimated 3-months closure for each of Central Piers 9 &amp; 10</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No need to close Central Piers 9 &amp; 10</li> </ul>
<b>Estimated Project Cost</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• About HK\$303M</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• About HK\$248M</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• About HK\$230M</li> </ul>

Please tick one of the following boxes to indicate your views/preference:

- Option A     
  Option B     
  Option C  
 No preference     
  None of the above (please elaborate your views)

**My view on Question 1:**

# Survey on Architectural Design of the Reassembled Queen's Pier

## Question 2 – Arrangement for Side Landing Steps

Given the new location of the reassembled Queen's Pier, amongst the five landing steps of Queen's Pier before demolition, three at the seaward side could be restored for marine use but not the two side landing steps which are at the landward side. Three options regarding the two side landing steps are developed for consideration.

Option	I. Reassemble with Glass Decking	II. Reassemble with Raised Glass Deck with Seating and Planters	III. Reassemble with At Grade Display and Seating
<b>Points to Note</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allow direct viewing of the landing steps.</li> <li>• More maintenance is required for the anti-skid glass and the enclosed compartment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Raised glass deck to allow ventilation via louvre for the enclosed compartment</li> <li>• Provide additional benches and planters</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Salvaged units of landing steps to be reconstructed as at grade seating</li> <li>• Allow the public to touch the salvaged landing steps</li> <li>• Form of the landing steps will be changed</li> </ul>

Please tick one of the following boxes to express your views/preference:

- Option I       Option II       Option III  
 No preference       None of the above (please elaborate your views)

**My view on Question 2:**

Your comments on the Reassembly of Queen's Pier are welcomed:

**My comments:**

**Summary of Community Engagement Activities**

<b>Activities</b>	<b>Date</b>
Launch of project website	18 March 2016
Display boards exhibition - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● G/F Lobby of North Point Government Offices</li> <li>● G/F Lobby of High Block of Queensway Government Offices</li> <li>● Open area near Star Ferry Pier, Kowloon (near 5 flag poles)</li> <li>● Open Area near Star Ferry Pier, Central (near Central Pier No. 7)</li> <li>● MTR Hong Kong Station</li> <li>● 1/F, Main Lobby, Hong Kong Museum of History</li> <li>● MTR Kowloon Tong Station</li> <li>● MTR Tsim Sha Tsui Station</li> <li>● G/F Lobby of Revenue Tower</li> </ul>	24 March – 31 March 2016 24 March – 31 March 2016 1 April – 17 April 2016 1 April – 17 May 2016 17 April – 20 April 2016, 22 April – 24 April 2016 20 April – 27 April 2016 25 April – 29 April 2016 1 May – 7 May 2016 30 April – 14 May 2016

意見調查結果及其他提交意見分類  
**Breakdown of the survey results and details of the submissions**

問題一 「連接皇后碼頭與中環九號及十號碼頭之設計方案」之調查結果

Survey Results of Question 1 – "Architectural design options for connecting the Queen's Pier with Central Piers 9 & 10"

方案 Options	投票數目 No. of vote	百分比 Percentage
A: 拆除中環9號及10號碼頭現有的弧面屋頂並以斜尖屋頂取代 A - Remove Curved Roofs of Central Piers 9 & 10 and to be replaced by Pitched Roof	317	16%
B: 在中環9號及10號碼頭的弧面屋頂前加上山牆 B - Add Gable Wall in front of Curved Roofs of Central Piers 9 & 10	413	21%
C: 維持現時中環9號及10號碼頭的設計 C - Retain Central Piers 9 & 10 as they are	1011	52%
無意見 No preference	88	5%
以上皆非 None of the above	126	6%
Total:	1,955	100%

問題二「側面登岸梯級的安排」之調查結果

Survey Results of Question 2 – "Arrangement of Side Landing Steps"

方案 Options	投票數目 No. of vote	百分比 Percentage
I: 以玻璃地面覆蓋登岸梯級 I - Reassemble with Glass Decking	231	12%
II: 以升高的玻璃面覆蓋登岸梯級並加入座椅和花槽 II - Reassemble with Raised Glass Deck with Seating and Planters	613	31%
III: 將登岸梯級重置於地面並設計成座椅和供展示 III - Reassemble with At Grade Display and Seating	893	46%
無意見 No preference	119	6%
以上皆非 None of the above	99	5%
Total:	1,955	100%

收集的意見分類

Comments received from survey by category :

問題一 Question 1:

問題一的意見 Comment on Q1	無意見 No Comment	重申他們選擇 Restate their choices	價格昂貴 Expensive Cost	建築設計 Architectural Design	其它重置地點 Another Reassemble Location	加設展示板 Add Display Panel	反對重置工程 Object the reassembly works	工程應盡快展開 Works should be started ASAP	喜歡原有外貌 Prefer original appearance	其它 Others	總數* Total*
數量 Number	1,675	112	49	20	23	4	20	14	6	46	1,969

問題二 Question 2:

問題二的意見 Comment on Q2	無意見 No Comment	重申他們選擇 Restate their choices	價格昂貴 Expensive Cost	建築設計 Architectural Design	其它重置地點 Another Reassemble Location	加設展示板 Add Display Panel	反對重置工程 Object the reassembly works	其它 Others	總數* Total*
數量 Number	1,798	86	5	23	7	3	6	28	1,956

對項目的整體意見 Overall comment on the project:

意見 Comment	無意見 No comment	價格昂貴 Expensive Cost	建築設計 Architectural Design	其它重置地點 Another Reassemble Location	加設展示板 Add Display Panel	反對重置工程 Object the reassembly works	工程應盡快展開 Works should be started ASAP	支持重置工程 Support the Reassembly works	皇后碼頭及周邊空間用途 Usage of QP and open space	喜歡原有外貌 Prefer original appearance	其它 Others	總數* Total*
數量 Number	1,803	12	4	15	4	14	16	11	8	6	65	1,958

\*有些意見歸納多於一類

\* Some comments received fall within more than one category

個別人仕/組織/團體經電郵或信件提出及從傳媒發表的意見數目<sup>註</sup> :

No. of comments from individuals/organization/groups received by email or post, and expressed through media <sup>note</sup> :

在原來地點 重置皇后碼頭 Reassemble QP at original location	其它重置地點 Reassemble QP at other locations	公共空間的建築設計意 見 Opinion on Architectural Design of Open Space	支持重置工程 Support the reassembly works	價格昂貴 Expensive Cost	總數 Total
1049	3	1	4	1	1058

註：個別人仕從傳媒發表的意見已分別作出統計

Note : Individual comments expressed through media have been counted separately.