

Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island

Minutes of Fourth Meeting

Date : 27 January 2011
Time : 9:30 a.m.
Venue : Conference Room, 15/F, North Point Government Offices
333 Java Road, North Point

Present

Mr Nicholas Brooke	Chairman
Dr Andrew Thomson	Representing Business Environment Council
Mr Leung Kong-yui	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Mr Ken So	Representing Conservancy Association
Mr Andy Leung	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Tam Po-yiu	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Dr Peter Cookson Smith	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Mr Louis Loong	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Paul Zimmerman	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Mr Chan Hok-fung	
Ms Lily Chow	
Mr Eric Fok	
Mr Vincent Ng	
Ms Joanne Chan	
Mr David Chan	
Mr Lam Cheuk-yum	
Ms Patricia Or	
Ms Gracie Foo	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands) ¹ , Development Bureau (DEVB)
Ms Stephanie Lai	Senior Manager (Tourism) ² , Tourism Commission
Mr H L Cheng	Chief Traffic Engineer/Hong Kong, Transport Department
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 Brenda Au	District Planning Officer/Hong Kong, Planning Department (PlanD)
Mr Chris Fung	Secretary

In Attendance

Ms Maisie Chan Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Ronald Leung Assistant Secretary (Harbour)2, DEVB

Absent with Apologies

Dr Frederick Lee Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Leslie Chen Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Dr Paul Ho Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Ir Dr Chan Fuk-cheung Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Benjamin Cha

For Agenda Item 3

Mr Peter Mok Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Tom Callahan Senior Consultant, GHK (Hong Kong) Limited
Mrs Margaret Brooke CEO, Professional Property Services Limited
Mr Patrick Lau Chairman, EarthAsia Design Group
Mr Sam Farrands Partner, Minter Ellison

For Agenda Item 4

Mr Damian Lee Assistant Secretary (Food)7, Food and Health Bureau
Dr Liu Kwei-kin Assistant Director (Agriculture), Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD)
Ms Wendy Ko Senior Agricultural Officer (Planning & Livestock Farm Licensing), AFCD

For Agenda Item 5

Mr Peter Tsui Senior Engineer 11 (Hong Kong Island Division 1), CEDD
Mr Roy Li Senior Town Planner/Special Duties 2, PlanD

For Agenda Item 6

Mrs Apollonia Liu Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport)5, Transport and Housing Bureau
Mr Daniel Chung Deputy Project Manager/Main Works (2), Highways Department
Miss Fiona Lung Chief Town Planner/Special Duties, PlanD
Mr Conrad Ng Technical Director, AECOM Asia Co Ltd
Mr Kelvin Cheng Associate, AECOM Asia Co Ltd
Mr Stephen Cheng Executive Director, Aedas
Ms Lisa Cheung Senior Associate, Aedas

Action

The Chairman welcomed and informed Members that he, in consultation with the chairmen of other two Task Forces, had invited four individuals to join the Task Force as co-opted members. They were:

- Ms Joanne Chan, the Chief Executive Officer of Le French May Arts Festival and the French Culture Promotion Office;
- Mr David Chan, an incumbent member of the Tsuen Wan District Council and a retired Town Planning Board member;
- Mr Lam Cheuk-yum, a partner of Fung, Wong, Ng & Lam (Solicitors and Notaries); and
- Ms Patricia Or, the Chief Financial Officer of Gammon Construction Ltd.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 3rd Meeting

- 1.1 The draft minutes of the 3rd meeting held on 2 December 2010 were circulated to Members on 20 December 2010. A revised draft, incorporating proposed amendments received, was circulated to the Members on 18 January 2011.
- 1.2 There being no further amendment, the **meeting** confirmed the revised draft minutes.

Item 2 Matters Arising

West Ventilation Building (WVB) of the Central-Wan Chai Bypass
(paragraph 2.4 of the confirmed minutes of the 3rd meeting)

- 2.1 **The Chairman** said that the Transport and Housing Bureau (THB) and Highways Department (HyD) would update the Task Force on the actions taken to reduce the visual, air and noise impacts of the WVB, as well as the challenges ahead, under Item 6 on the agenda.

Site 4 Development (paragraph 2.5(b) of the confirmed minutes of the 3rd meeting)

- 2.2 **The Chairman** informed Members that GHK (Hong Kong) Limited had been appointed by DEVB as the consultant to

Action

undertake the business viability study of Site 4 and possibly Site 7 via public-private collaboration (PPC).

- 2.3 **The Chairman** added that the consultant would brief Members on the methodology, approach and tentative work programme of this study under Item 3 on the agenda.

Advance Promenade at the New Central Harbourfront (paragraphs 2.15, 2.22 and 2.23 of the confirmed minutes of the 3rd meeting)

- 2.4 **The Chairman** said that the Secretariat had already circulated an information note jointly prepared by CEDD and Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) on the advance promenade to Members on 4 January 2011. Comments had been received from two Members and were subsequently forwarded to the two departments.

- 2.5 **Mr Mak Chi-biu** of CEDD said that his department had noted Members' further comments and would take these into account when finalising the detailed design of the advance promenade.

- 2.6 **The Chairman** pointed out that the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) was now working on the provision of supporting facilities at the Green Carpet and its extension areas, such as storage of mills barriers. LCSD was also working with the relevant policy bureaux and government departments, including the Police, to devise appropriate crowd management measures at the Green Carpet and its extension. **Mr Harry Tsang** of LCSD responded that his department would brief Members once its plan was available.

LCSD

Hong Kong Island East Harbour-front Study (paragraphs 3.5(a), 3.5(d) and 3.9(f) of the confirmed minutes of the 3rd meeting)

- 2.7 **The Chairman** informed Members that the action items mentioned in the 3rd meeting would be addressed by PlanD after it had completed the Stage 3 Public Engagement Programme. PlanD would also report on (a) the public views collected in Stage 3 and (b) the formulation of a recommended option before finalising the Final Report.

PlanD

Land-water Interface (paragraphs 3.6 and 4.4 of the confirmed minutes of the 3rd meeting)

- 2.8 **The Chairman** advised that the Commission had already

Action

invited the Harbour Business Forum (HBF) to present its study on land-water interface at the next the Commission meeting scheduled for 9 February 2011. HBF would brief the Commission on its progress and findings in the study.

Marine Police Regional Headquarters Site (paragraphs 4.6 and 4.9 of the confirmed minutes of the 3rd meeting)

- 2.9 **The Chairman** updated Members that the Marine Police had conducted a site inspection previously with other government departments concerned to explore ways for improving physical appearance of the site. The Police would report back to the Task Force with a proposal in due course. **HKPF**
- 2.10 **Ms Brenda Au** of PlanD added that the Marine Police were still studying the suitability of the Chai Wan site, and that PlanD would keep the Task Force informed of any new development in its site search. **PlanD**
- 2.11 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** requested more information on the Marine Police's requirements (in terms of required facilities and space) as well as the availability of alternative sites along the waterfront, so that the Task Force could determine whether the site at Shau Kei Wan occupied by the Marine Police on a temporary basis should be allocated to the Police Force permanently.
- 2.12 **The Chairman** suggested that Mr Zimmerman's view on the Marine Police Regional Headquarters could be dealt with later after the Commission discussed the issue of land-water interface. He agreed that the Task Force should try to accommodate the presence of the Marine Police along the waterfront of Victoria Harbour, having fully understood their operational requirements.

Action Areas Proposals (paragraph 5.4 of the confirmed minutes of the 3rd meeting)

- 2.13 **The Chairman** reported that PlanD would present the action areas proposals for Hong Kong Island under Item 7 on the agenda. He also reminded Members that a list of the inventory of known (planned and proposed) projects at harbourfront on Hong Kong Island had been sent to Members on 21 January 2011 for reference.

Item 3 Update on the Business Viability Study for Development of Site 4 in the New Central Harbourfront

3.1 Before discussion, **the Chairman** declared conflict of interest in this item. He held the position as the Chairman of Professional Property Services Limited which was one of the sub-consultants of GHK (Hong Kong) Limited, the consultant appointed by DEVB to undertake the business viability study for development of Site 4.

3.2 **The Chairman** decided not to chair the discussion of this item. On invitation of **the meeting**, Mr Vincent Ng took over the chairmanship temporarily from Mr Nicholas Brooke on this particular agenda item.

(Note: As Mr Vincent Ng had taken over the chairmanship throughout the discussion of Item 3, "the Chairman" to which the remaining paragraphs in Item 3 referred should be understood as Mr Vincent Ng rather than Mr Nicholas Brooke.)

3.3 **The Chairman** proposed and **Members** agreed that Mr Nicholas Brooke could continue to stay in the meeting as an observer but should refrain from participating in the discussion on this item.

3.4 **The Chairman** welcomed the consultant team and drew Members' attention to the fact that two members of the consultant team, Mrs Margaret Brooke and Mr Patrick Lau, were the incumbent alternate members of the Task Force.

3.5 After brief introductory remarks by **Mr Peter Mok** of DEVB, **Mr Tom Callahan** of GHK (Hong Kong) Limited briefed Members on the methodology and approach of the business viability study, with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation.

3.6 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** had the following enquiries/views after hearing the consultant team's presentation:-

(a) it appeared that development of Site 8 was neither reviewed in this business consultancy study nor included in the scope of advance promenade. He opined that the Administration should clarify how Site 8 would be delivered and whether it would be captured in either

way;

- (b) how the consultant team would identify and work with the Administration on both hard and soft constraints of these sites; and
- (c) how the consultant team would proceed with the market sounding materials, in particular, how the team would see the views from District Council and input from potential operators and the community at large.

3.7 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** questioned whether the scope of this business viability study would include either Site 4 or Site 7 individually, or would entail a combination of the two sites. He also wondered if any reference would be made by the consultant in the study to any proposed sites outside Sites 4 and 7.

3.8 In response, **Mr Tom Callahan** made the following points:-

- (a) the scope of the business viability study only included Site 4, and possibly Site 7, at this stage. Consideration of Site 8 was not included in the scope of this study;
- (b) the consultant would define all site fundamentals for Sites 4 and 7, such as, development parameters and location constraints as Task 1 under their methodology. The site fundamentals would then be agreed and signed-off upon the consultant's submission of the inception report to the Government. The consultant would then examine the business viability of these sites based on the agreed list of parameters;
- (c) the scope of the business viability study only included providing advice on and assisting in the preparation of the market sounding materials for the government and then the evaluation of responses that the government received. The study brief made it clear that this was a market sounding exercise, not a full public consultation exercise; and
- (d) according to the brief of consultancy study, the consultant would examine the business viability of Site 4, and potentially Site 7, both individually and collectively.

Action

- 3.9 **Dr Andrew Thomson** noted that the whole consultancy study was due for completion within 28 weeks, and therefore advised the consultant consider the implications of a tight work schedule and the challenges arising from information overflow. He recommended that information be reverted to the Task Force early.
- 3.10 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** thought that further clarification was necessary to ascertain the way forward of Site 8. In relation to the constraints of Sites 4 and 7, he would like to know which party would sign off the site fundamentals. He requested that the consultant give detailed justifications for each site constraint when briefing the Task Force later.
- 3.11 **Mr Tom Callahan** replied that the consultant would prepare a list of constraints for DEVB to sign off as part of the Inception Report. So far as possible this report would explain the reasons for these constraints and the extent to which they were fixed. Once signed-off by DEVB, these constraints would be assumed fixed for the duration of the Study.
- 3.12 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** of Professional Property Services Limited said that the site fundamentals and constraints were being drafted by the consultant team based on the information currently on hand.
- 3.13 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** said that a review should be done to consider all urban design aspects of the Central waterfront at a preliminary stage for ensuring coherence in the design of these two sites with the surrounding environment.
- 3.14 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** remarked that the land use designated for Site 4 in the Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (UDS) had been incorporated in the brief of the business viability study. She said the land use proposed for Site 4 in UDS would have to be tested by the consultant for business viability under the PPC model. Other than the three non-alterable site constraints, namely, gross floor area (GFA); maximum building height; and non-building areas, the consultant understood that there was room to relax other site constraints. While the preliminary focus of this viability study was on Site 4, the consultant's initial findings indicated that development of Site 4 alone might not be the optimum choice. There might be more attractive PPC opportunities if Site 4 and Site 7 could be considered together. However, the final

Action

recommendations made by the consultant would be dependent upon the results of market sounding exercise and the overall progress of the study.

- 3.15 **Ms Gracie Foo** advised that in the consultancy brief, the scope of this business viability study was to examine the business viability of Site 4, and possibly Site 7. While maintaining that the PPC model was a relatively new idea in harbourfront development, the Administration had been exploring more potential sites for testing this model. With the support of this Commission, it was decided to study the potential for PPC of Site 4, and possibly Site 7. Meanwhile, in order to adopt a holistic approach of developing the harbourfront as originally planned, the permanent development of Site 7 would have to be examined together with that of Site 8. The works on advance promenade, on the other hand, aimed to make available the area for public use and enhance connectivity as early as practicable. The Administration was fully aware of the timing and inter-relationship between these projects. That explained why we aimed to complete the consultancy within a relatively short time, so that the Administration could proceed in determining the long-term development of Sites 7 and 8 altogether, based on the results of consultancy study.
- 3.16 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** was of the view that certain advance works could be done immediately to beautify Site 8, given that it was unsatisfactory to leave the site idle for long.
- 3.17 In response to Mr Zimmerman's query, **Ms Gracie Foo** added that it would be problematic if the Administration advanced the works of design and construction for Site 8, without waiting to see the results of business viability study for Sites 4 and 7. However, if the consultant saw any opportunities for other sites during their study, they might also put ideas forward to the Commission and DEVB for consideration.
- 3.18 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** considered that part of the purpose of this business viability study was to recommend a model for implementing an institutional framework. However, he could not see any production of broad physical concepts, development parameters, as well as alternative spatial definition to Sites 4 and 7 in the consultant's presentation.
- 3.19 **Mr Tom Callahan** pointed out under the methodology proposed by the consultant, the consulting team would develop

Action

indicative development concepts for Site 4 and potentially Site 7, to be tested and revised on the basis of the market sounding exercise. Whether these indicative development concepts would finally be taken up was entirely up to the decision of the Commission and DEVB. He pointed out that the preparation of designs or spatial layout plans was not currently part of the Study scope.

- 3.20 To conclude the discussion, **the Chairman** hoped that the consultant team would update the Task Force on a regular basis on the progress of the business viability study. **Mr Tom Callahan** said that the consultant would be pleased to report its progress regularly in subsequent meetings.

**DEVB and
the
Consultant**

(Supplementary Information: The open space fronting Central Piers Nos. 9 and 10# (Site 8) has already been opened for public use since July 2010. Organisations are encouraged to use the site for holding different kinds of functions/activities.)

Central Piers Nos. 9 and 10 are public piers.

**Item 4 Western Wholesale Food Market
(Paper No. TFHK/01/2011)**

- 4.1 **Ms Wendy Ko** of AFCD presented Paper No. TFHK/01/2011, with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 4.2 **The Chairman** appreciated the administration's effort in taking forward the development of the piece of waterfront at Western Wholesale Food Market (WWFM). Having attended the WWFM Flea Market cum Carnival held on 15 January 2011, the Chairman commented that the Carnival had been a great success with substantial public involvement. The Chairman also made the following points:-
- (a) regular events could be organised at the open areas of WWFM every weekend, as supported by the Central & Western District Council and local organisations; and
 - (b) four currently unused piers and part of the 500m driveway at WWFM could be released for developing a permanent waterfront promenade for community use, subject to the support of market operators.

Action

- 4.3 In response to the Chairman's enquiry, **Ms Wendy Ko** said that the existing waterfront driveway at WWFM was 40ft wide. On balancing public interest and the operational need of market operators, AFCD was currently negotiating with various market operators for releasing as wide as possible the waterfront driveway for public access.
- 4.4 **Ms Maisie Chan** of DEVB added that the Administration was exploring with CEDD and LCSD on the appropriate implementation and management agency to deliver and manage the piece of waterfront promenade fronting WWFM.
- 4.5 **Mr Vincent Ng** welcomed the initiative by the Administration to bring forward this attractive waterfront promenade project at WWFM. Mr Ng thought that an agent had to be identified to co-ordinate the whole project. In particular, he raised the following comments/enquiries:-
- (a) factors such as management, maintenance and overall design of the proposed promenade had to be considered thoroughly before the commencement of works;
 - (b) how the overall design of the new promenade could be compatible with the proposed operations of the logistics company; and
 - (c) given the physical segregation of WWFM entirely from its adjoining sites, how the harmony of the proposed promenade with the neighbouring sites could be ensured.
- 4.6 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** welcomed the Administration's proposal. While supporting the release of four unused piers, he opined that a holistic study was necessary to explore the future use of these piers. He was of the view that the new waterfront promenade fronting WWFM should be connected to the pre-existing promenade system. To improve the venue's attractiveness, the Administration should examine the potential of converting vacant stalls and accommodation for commercial use. Public access and circulation should also be improved.
- 4.7 **Mr Andy Leung** opined that the Administration should set clear operational parameters in the tender document for guiding future operators on wholesale activities, so as to avoid

Action

potential conflict with public enjoyment of the new waterfront promenade.

4.8 **Dr Andrew Thomson** had the following comments/enquiries:-

- (a) the Administration should have proper planning of crowd control along the waterfront areas thereupon;
- (b) sufficient storage space should be provided for keeping crowd control equipment and other ancillary facilities;
- (c) excessive barriers and fences should be removed in order to advocate continuity of the new waterfront promenade; and
- (d) the Administration should consider creating new structures and facilities on top of the unused piers with a view to revitalising the piers for public use.

4.9 **Mr Ken So** saw potential conflict for the venue to be used as operational base of an international logistics company, with the proposed use as waterfront promenade for public enjoyment. Such conflicting uses might have been avoided had there been an overall vision and a comprehensive plan at an initial stage. He wondered if the wholesale food operations could be relocated so that the entire site would be dedicated for public enjoyment and community activities. It seemed unsatisfactory if various functions were put within this tiny area without prioritising any of these options.

4.10 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** had the following enquiries:-

- (a) what the average daily usage of Pier No. 5 was, including the number of vessels actually using this pier;
- (b) where the multi-national logistics company, as mentioned by AFCD, was currently operating; and whether that company had current operations in Hong Kong;
- (c) whether the company had any existing or future need for waterfront access; and
- (d) how tendering out the vacant premises in WWFM was in line with point 5 of the General Circular 3/2010 on

Action

Harbourfront Enhancement issued by the Administration in July 2010.

4.11 In response to Mr Zimmerman's question regarding the usage of Pier No. 5, **Ms Wendy Ko** reported that there were 5 vessels using the Pier to load and unload fresh food produce every day. In particular:-

- (a) 3 vessels would use the pier daily between 3 a.m. and 7 a.m. to unload fresh water-fish and fishery products for distribution;
- (b) 1 vessel would use the pier to load fruits and vegetables at noon for daily delivery to the outlying islands; and
- (c) 1 vessel would arrive at the pier from Cheung Chau to unload shrimps between 2 pm to 3 pm.

4.12 **Dr Liu Kwei-kin** of AFCD thanked Members' comments and responded that:-

- (a) AFCD would pay extra efforts on the interface between wholesale activities and future waterfront promenade development;
- (b) the international logistics company in question had operated in Hong Kong for some time. Based on initial understanding, it was the first time that company attempted to use vacant premises as its wholesale base to supply food. AFCD would welcome all interested parties to bid the lease of such vacant venue by following established practices;
- (c) a condition would be incorporated into the tenancy terms to ensure that the new fresh food wholesale operator would conduct its business in a mode compatible with public access to the waterfront; and
- (d) AFCD would actively consult the District Council concerned, the Harbourfront Commission and other key stakeholders like the WWFM wholesalers on the way forward of opening public access to WWFM. Any ideas from the District Council and this Commission would be taken into account to mediate between the demand of wholesalers and public needs.

Action

- 4.13 **Mr Eric Fok** suggested that sufficient shuttle bus services and carparking space should be provided to improve accessibility of the site. He opined that activities could be held at regular intervals, say weekly, or monthly, to increase publicity. He also opined that the future logistics operator at WWFM might take up these regular activities.
- 4.14 **Ms Patricia Or** enquired whether Pier No. 5 needed to be kept in view of its occasional use. If it did, she suggested it might be better to keep all work-related facilities (i.e., Pier No. 5 and Public Cargo Working Area) to the west of WWFM so as to pave way for a continuous promenade all along the east. She also suggested that the Administration explore possibilities to relocate WWFM in the long run if WWFM did not need to work alongside the waterfront.
- 4.15 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** suggested identifying an agent to propose some innovative design solutions for the waterfront driveway and the four unused piers. He supported moving forward with some quick-wins to link up the harbourfront, even if it would be unlikely to obtain the whole waterfront driveway at WWFM.
- 4.16 **Mr Andy Leung** suggested that AFCD should project the long-term demand for market space of fresh food wholesale activities. He considered that the vacant premises could be released for recreational use if there was no compelling demand from the fresh food wholesale operators.
- 4.17 **The Chairman** enquired whether the unused piers were structurally sound for being used as viewing platforms.
- 4.18 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** said that he did not see the need for the logistics trade to operate at this site from the transportation viewpoint. It might not be desirable for designating this prime site as a logistics hub. He supported the idea of holding weekend retail market at WWFM with a view to attracting more people to enjoy this part of the waterfront. He held that the new waterfront promenade would be too narrow if only half of the 40ft-wide waterfront driveway would eventually be open for public access.
- 4.19 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** had the following comments and suggestions:-

Action

- (a) having so many parties involved made the management impossible and that one implementation and management agent was required. He wanted the Task Force to be briefed on why the Urban Renewal Authority was no longer considered a candidate for implementation and management;
- (b) AFCD should consider combining retail and wholesale trades of fresh food at WWFM in the long term. Any statutory restrictions imposed on retail trades to conduct business in wholesale facilities should be resolved;
- (c) the Administration should review the long term demand of wholesale business before continuing the tender exercise to lease the vacant stalls in WWFM;
- (d) it was not necessary to close down Pier No. 5 for the public, given the little sea traffic and the preference to ensure a continuous promenade. That said, all piers fronting WWFM should be entirely open to the public;
- (e) AFCD should liaise with wholesale operators at WWFM for enhancing traffic circulation thereupon, so that trucks would only use the main entrance in the south while the waterfront in the north would be reserved for public use;
- (f) there should be a fixed schedule of regular community activities such as carnivals and open days, and the food produce for sale in community activities should be closely correlated to foods distributed in WWFM; and
- (g) unless there were ongoing retail trades, he saw no genuine operational need for the wholesale trades to stay at this part of the waterfront.

4.20 **Mr Vincent Ng** saw no need to suspend the tender exercise, but he asked for an indicative planning review of the site. He opined that sufficient part of the existing 40ft-wide waterfront driveway should be allocated as the new harbourfront promenade with due respect to the recommended design and dimensional parameters for promenade in the “Design and Management Guidelines for Public Open Space in Private Developments” issued by DEVB in January 2011.

4.21 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** suggested the tender exercise be put

Action

on hold until AFCD provided a detailed study on the supply & demand of wholesale food operations. He asked that AFCD should also provide Members with information on the structural capabilities of the unused piers; possibility of maximising the 40ft-wide waterfront driveway; actual constraints arising from the continued use of Pier No. 5 to the proposed harbourfront promenade; and any potential conflict between wholesales activities and harbourfront enhancement.

4.22 **Ms Gracie Foo** responded that the tendering exercise would not directly conflict with the initiative to open up the waterfront areas for public enjoyment. As for suggestion to incorporate retail food business to the current wholesale food sales at WWFM, she appealed to Members' support that more time would be necessary for FHB and AFCD to take back all related issues, such as technical feasibility, for further consideration. The lease duration of 2 years to a wholesale operator would not conflict with the objective of enhancing the harbourfront. It would be undesirable to put the area vacant for a long time while the long-term development proposal for the venue was being sorted out. In the interim, AFCD would also ensure conditions be conducive to hosting more weekend activities thereupon by the Government and Central & Western District Council.

4.23 **Dr Liu Kwei-kin** made the following points:-

- (a) unless there would be a more suitable alternative location, it was operationally required to keep the existing site of WWFM along the waterfront for supplying fresh food produce to Hong Kong Island; for transiting fresh food to and from outlying islands; and for receiving food imports by sea;
- (b) in-depth study on the long-term need for wholesale market on Hong Kong Island would be considered;
- (c) relocation of WWFM might have a significant impact on steady supply of food produce and livelihood of people working in the trade;
- (d) WWFM was nearly in full occupation, except for the vacant part in its western block which was still designated for use as wholesale of fresh food;

Action

- (e) all tenancies at WWFM were renewable every two years. Granting a short-term lease would not impede any future planning of the venue; and
 - (f) the four unused piers were simple structures built on the waterfront for loading light cargos. They were only given minimum maintenance. If the piers were released for other uses, expert advice would be required to strengthen the structures.
- 4.24 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** would like to see the full use of the entire width of waterfront promenade by the public.
- 4.25 **Mr Chan Hok-fung** suggested that any proposal regarding the future use of WWFM, which might affect the wholesale food trade and their workers, should also be discussed in detail with the Central & Western District Council.
- 4.26 In response to the Chairman's enquiry, **Dr Liu Kwei-kin** said that the exercise of leasing the vacant part of WWFM for fresh food wholesale operations would commence by public advertisement.
- 4.27 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** agreed to other Members' suggestions that the 40ft-wide waterfront driveway should be maximised for space available to pedestrian flow as far as possible.
- 4.28 **The Chairman** concluded that AFCD should look extensively and holistically into the opportunities, physical constraints and accessibility of the site, and review the long-term future of WWFM, including the possibility of relocation. On the proposed lease of vacant premises, AFCD was reminded that any engagement on the basis longer than 2 years would restrict flexibility of the venue. The Task Force hoped to see implementation of some short-term opportunities, such as weekend market at WWFM, and medium-term measures, such as opening up part of the waterfront for public access. AFCD was requested to take on board Members' comments and revert to the Task Force after it had drawn up a more comprehensive development plan for the proposed promenade.
- AFCD**
- Item 5 Public Engagement Programme for the Construction of Additional Floors above Central Piers Numbers 4 to 6 (Paper No. TFHK/02/2011)**

Action

- 5.1 **Mr Mak Chi-biu** of CEDD presented Paper No. TFHK/02/2011 with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 5.2 **The Chairman** pointed out that the focus of discussion herewith should be confined to the scope proposed in the public engagement exercise, whereas views on the design and layout of these additional floors above Central Piers Numbers 4 to 6 could be provided at a separate working session to be held by CEDD with the Task Force at a later stage.
- 5.3 **Ms Patricia Or** expressed reservation whether the additional 1.5 floors would improve considerably the financial position of ferry operators by generating more non-ferry fare income to cross-subsidise ferry fare income, given that the piers were currently isolated and remote from other facilities. Building these additional floors before the design of the adjacent landscape deck would make it harder to integrate the design in future. She suggested the possibility of bundling the existing essential ferry services with other marine-related services with a view to improving the financial viability of ferry business.
- 5.4 **Dr Andrew Thomson** opined that stakeholder engagement and mapping were essentially important. He proposed that a comprehensive mapping, was necessary to properly identify key stakeholders for inclusion in the engagement exercise.
- 5.5 **Mr Andy Leung** enquired how the additional floors would be handed over to the primary tenant, and whether any potential tenants would actively participate in the engagement process.
- 5.6 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** opined that the Government should adopt more flexible design for better outlook of public ferry piers, having regard to design controls rather than purely financial constraints. While noting that proper stakeholder engagement was important, he enquired the following:-
- (a) the meaning of "adopting a flexible design with a view to minimising constraints for future development";
 - (b) the parties who would be (a) responsible for the design of the additional floors, and (b) in charge of the project;
 - (c) whether the additional floors would be operated by the ferry operators, and what appropriate parameters would

Action

be put in place to ensure good pier outlook; and

(d) reasons for a two-stage public engagement.

5.7 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** considered that it was necessary to approach existing and potential users & retailers of piers for their views. He commented that re-fixing the entire ferry pier structures would be more desirable than just adding 1.5 floors on top of the existing ones. He opined that a clear, broad programme regarding the future operations of piers, together with the potential constraints imposed by the franchised ferry services.

5.8 In response to Members' comments, **Mr Mak Chi-biu** replied that:-

(a) CEDD would engage as many stakeholders as possible in the consultation process, including pier users and shop owners, etc.;

(b) the additional pier structures would be built and owned by the Government and it would be let to the ferry operator for its operational use. According to the lease, the ferry operator might sub-let shops and venues within the additional floors for rental income;

(c) it was anticipated that the ferry piers would become more attractive if proper theme and design were incorporated into the pier structure, which might increase turnover of people thereat. Accessibility to piers was expected to be further improved upon commissioning of Sites 1 and 2 development;

(d) on the flexibility of design, it was considered that a nice and neutral design without any strong character would be appropriate;

(e) CEDD had engaged a consultant, to carry out design for the project and the public engagement exercise. It was hopeful that a pier outlook which would bring vibrancy to the harbourfront could be generated through the process;

(f) a two-stage public engagement would be undertaken with a view to collating public contribution on the design of the additional floors proposed for these piers. On this basis,

Action

the Administration took the view that there should be no pre-determined design for the public engagement exercise;

- (g) the whole public engagement exercise was expected to complete by the first half of 2011. The first stage of the public engagement exercise, including consultation with District Councils concerned and public forums would be held in February & March 2011, while the second stage would be held in May and June 2011; and
- (h) subject to the availability of funds, it was hoped that the construction works would commence some time in 2012.

5.9 In response to the Chairman's enquiry, **Mr Mak Chi-biu** said that CEDD would later approach Task Force Members for some informal briefings and discussions on the proposal. CEDD would return with some design options between April and May 2011 after the public forum has been held.

CEDD

5.10 **The Chairman** concluded that the Task Force was supportive of the proposed public engagement and looked forward to hearing the progress and result of the public engagement.

Item 6 Exterior Design of West Ventilation Building (WVB) of the Central-Wan Chai Bypass and Island Eastern Corridor Link (the "CWB") (Paper No. TFHK/03/2011)

6.1 **The project team** led by THB updated Members on the air quality enhancement and noise reduction measures for the WVB, as well as the refined schemes for integration with the future landscaped deck in the new Central harbourfront, with the use of a PowerPoint. The issues raised by Mr Paul Zimmerman in his email of 25 January 2011 were also addressed.

6.2 **The Chairman** invited Members to declare conflict of interests in this item. Despite their involvement in the presentations on the alternative proposals of the location of WVB in the 1st meeting, **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** and **Mr Paul Zimmerman** declared no conflict of interests in the item this time round.

6.3 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** opined that the statement made by the Administration that the Air Purification System (APS) would be

Action

built below ground was misleading as the structure was built on top of the roof of the Central Wanchai Bypass. He was disappointed at the Administration's unnecessary attempt of misrepresenting the fact that adding the APS equipment would increase the bulk and, given the fixed alignment of the tunnel, the height. As Mr Zimmerman had to leave at this juncture for another appointment, he said he might make additional comments after the meeting.

- 6.4 **Ms Patricia Or** hoped the Administration would clarify the expected level of Respirable Suspended Particulates (RSPs) in the surrounding areas of WVB. In particular, she enquired whether the expected RSP readings had only reflected the pure emission level at source, or had already reflected the accumulated emission level as superimposed with pollutants derived from other sources due to surrounding activities.
- 6.5 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** questioned the possibility of further reducing the height of rooms at the top of the WVB. He considered that Scheme 2 (i.e. landscaped deck echoing with WVB) would be more practical with lower noise level. He also suggested that more dynamic features be adopted in the deck profile, such as a parabolic edge, in Scheme 2.
- 6.6 **Dr Andrew Thomson** commented that the noise problem appeared to be manageable but pollutant emissions remained uncertain in the latest proposal. By referring to the current and future Air Quality Objectives (AQOs), he questioned whether RSPs around the WVB could reach the acceptable level. He doubted whether a 80% efficient scrubber system would be sufficient to maintaining the good air quality expected of in a world-class waterfront. A scrubber system in higher efficiency to further reduce the levels of RSPs and nitrogen dioxide was recommended.
- 6.7 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** considered that adverse environmental impacts arising from WVB should be reduced as far as possible. He had the following enquiries:-
- (a) whether more details regarding the feasibility of the proposed green roof would be available;
 - (b) whether the Administration could rationalise the two integration schemes; and

Action

- (c) why the overall height of WVB could not be reduced further.

6.8 **Mr Chan Hok-fung** appreciated the Administration's efforts in refining the proposed schemes to foster greater integration between the landscaped deck and the green rooftop of WVB. He was of the view that Scheme 2 was much more preferable than Scheme 1. He suggested installing more ancillary facilities at the landscaped deck to facilitate community activities to be held thereupon, particularly with shelters to be put up to shield sunlight and rainfall.

6.9 In response to Members' comments, **Mrs Apollonia Liu** of THB replied that:-

- (a) the height of WVB had already been reduced as far as possible, having regard to the need to accommodate all essential equipment for effective tunnel operations. The APS was to be built underground, and hence would not cause an increase in the height of the WVB, because it was technically and operationally feasible to do so. The Administration would further investigate whether the size of WVB could be further compressed at the detailed design stage of the WVB;
- (b) on the proposed integration schemes, the Administration would refine the design in the light of Members' comments when it worked on the details and specifications in due course;
- (c) PlanD would take into account the ancillary facilities suggested by Members to foster community activities in the landscaped deck, where appropriate, in the planning and design of the landscaped deck; and
- (d) previous assessments had already confirmed that the air quality neighbouring WVB would comply with the prevailing AQOs. The new AQO was still being formulated by the Environmental Protection Department. It was expected that the air quality neighbouring WVB would further improve with continuous improvements to the background air quality resulting from various air quality improvement measures implemented or planned.

Action

- 6.10 **Mr Conrad Ng** of AECOM supplemented that the statistics on RSP levels as presented to Members earlier were accumulated figures taking into account both exhaust air emitted from the WVB and all pollutants derived from adjoining road traffic. On suggestion whether the 80% efficient scrubber system could be enhanced, he replied that such could be explored at the detailed design stage.
- 6.11 **Ms Lisa Cheung** of Aedas added that on the basis of initial advice from possible suppliers, the proposed green planting on sloping roof not more than 30 degree would be feasible. A “fall arrest protection system” would be designed to suit for maintenance purpose.
- 6.12 **Mrs Apollonia Liu** supplemented that given its steep gradient and the existence of an emission outlet for exhaust air, public access to the green rooftop of WVB was unsafe and hence not recommended. However, the Administration would continue to work on the integration schemes with an aim to draw the green rooftop closer to the landscaped deck.
- 6.13 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** hoped that extra efforts could be made to reduce the height of WVB and to improve the efficiency of the air ventilation system.
- 6.14 In response to the Chairman’s enquiry on when the Administration would embark on the detailed design, **Mrs Apollonia Liu** said that a better conceptual outlook and a more detailed idea of the internal settings of the WVB would be available in around early 2012.
- 6.15 **Miss Fiona Lung** of PlanD added that PlanD would work closely with HyD and the consultant to amend the master plan, based on the final choice of integration scheme for the landscaped deck. As the site had been zoned as comprehensive development area under the Outline Zoning Plan, a planning brief would be prepared to control future development thereon. As Sites 1 and 2 would be developed by way of public-private collaboration, Members would have ample opportunities to provide comments on the planning and design of the proposed landscaped deck in the process.
- 6.16 **The Chairman** said that the Task Force wished to maintain working ties with the project team from now to 2012. He asked the team to revert to the Task Force with the detailed design in

THB & HyD

Action

due course. **Mrs Apollonia Liu** said that the project team would proceed with the detailed design of WVB on the basis of the “green roof” scheme having regard to the outcome of the earlier public consultation, while PlanD would amend the master layout plan on the basis of the integration scheme 2 for the landscaped deck as considered preferable by Members. The project team would revert to the Task Force with the detailed design of the WVB, when available.

Item 7 Action Areas Proposals

- 7.1 Due to insufficient time, **the Chairman** proposed and **Members** agreed to defer this item to the next meeting for deliberation.

Item 8 Any Other Business

Date of Next Meeting

- 8.1 **The Chairman** announced that the next meeting had been tentatively scheduled for 29 March 2011 (Tuesday).

(Post-meeting note: The next meeting had been rescheduled to 11 April 2011 (Monday).)

- 8.2 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:55 p.m.

Secretariat

**Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island
April 2011**