

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

## **Minutes of Sixth Meeting**

Date : 25 May 2011  
Time : 2:30 p.m.  
Venue : Conference Room, 15/F, North Point Government Offices  
333 Java Road, North Point

### **Present**

Mr Nicholas Brooke	Chair
Mrs Margaret Brooke	Representing Business Environment Council
Mr Leung Kong-yui	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Mr Ken So	Representing Conservancy Association
Mr Andy Leung	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Patrick Lau	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Mr Tam Po-yiu	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Dr Peter Cookson Smith	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Mr Shuki Leung	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Paul Zimmerman	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Mr Chan Hok-fung	
Mr Eric Fok	
Mr Vincent Ng	
Mr David Chan	
Mr Lam Cheuk-yum	
Ms Gracie Foo	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands) <sup>1</sup> , Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Vincent Fung	Assistant Commissioner 2, Tourism Commission
Ms Ying Fun-fong	Chief Traffic Engineer/Hong Kong, Transport Department (TD)
Mr Mak Chi-biu	Chief Engineer/Hong Kong 1, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Ms Olivia Chan	Assistant Director (Leisure Services) <sup>2</sup> , Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Ms Brenda Au	District Planning Officer/Hong Kong, Planning Department (PlanD)
Mr Chris Fung	Secretary

### **In Attendance**

Mr Peter Mok	Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB
--------------	---------------------------------

**Absent with Apologies**

Dr Frederick Lee	Representing Friends of the Earth
Dr Paul Ho	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Ir Dr Chan Fuk-cheung	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Benjamin Cha	
Ms Lily Chow	
Ms Joanne Chan	
Ms Patricia Or	

**For Agenda Item 3**

Ms Florence Kan	Senior Architect, The Hongkong Electric Co., Ltd. (HKE)
Mr John Corrigan	Consultant
Mr C K Yu	Senior Electrical Engineer, HKE

**For Agenda Item 4**

Mr Alnwick Chan	Executive Director, Knight Frank Petty Ltd
Mr Derek Kwan	Project Manager, CITIC Pacific Ltd

**For Agenda Item 5**

Mr Tony Cheng	Director, Discovery Bay Transportation Services Limited (DBTPL)
Ms Evonne Ko	Manager, DBTPL
Ms Carrie Ng	Consultant, Polarline Development Limited (PDL)
Ms Enid Chu	Consultant, PDL

**For Agenda Item 6**

Mr Norman Ngai	Estate Surveyor (Site Utilisation)13, Government Property Agency (GPA)
Mr Thomas Tam	Survey Officer (Site Utilisation)12, GPA

**For Agenda Item 7**

Mr Chen Che-kong	Officer in Charge (RTS Development), Environmental Protection Department (EPD)
Mr Michael Tsing	Senior Environmental Protection Officer (RTS Development)1, EPD
Mr Roy Anthony Stevens	Consultant Architectural Designer, Ove Arup & Partners HK Ltd

**For Agenda Item 8**

Mr Ronald Leung	Assistant Secretary (Harbour)2, DEVB
Mr Ko Wai-kuen	Senior Engineer 7 (Hong Kong Island Division 1), CEDD
Mr Ma Kit-wah	Senior Project Manager/123, Architectural Services

Mr Eddie Lee	Department (ArchSD)
Mr Paul Lee	Project Manager/141, ArchSD
Mr Clarence Ching	Architect/207, ArchSD
	Executive Officer (Planning)5, LCSD

**Action**

**Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting**

- 1.1 The draft minutes of the 5<sup>th</sup> meeting were circulated to Members on 13 May 2011. A revised draft, incorporating proposed amendments received, was re-circulated to Members on 20 May 2011.
- 1.2 There being no further amendment, the revised draft minutes were confirmed.

**Item 2 Matters Arising**

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

- 2.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the Market Sounding Exercise (MSE) for the Development of Site 4 and Potentially Site 7 in the New Central Harbourfront had already been launched on 19 May 2011 and the deadline for reply was 30 June 2011.
- 2.2 **Ms Gracie Foo** said that in order to raise the awareness of the MSE, DEVB had written to a number of potential participants including developers, construction companies and non-governmental organisations, inviting them to respond to the MSE. DEVB would report to the Task Force the preliminary findings in due course.

*Amendments to the Draft Kennedy Town and Mount Davis Outline Zoning Plan (paragraph 3.13 of the confirmed minutes of the 5<sup>th</sup> meeting)*

- 2.3 **The Chair** reported that Members' views on the amendments to Draft Outline Zoning Plan at the last meeting had been consolidated and passed to the Town Planning Board.

*Connectivity at Harbourfront (paragraphs 4.6, 5.2 and 5.6 of the confirmed minutes of the 5<sup>th</sup> meeting)*

**Action**

2.4 **The Chair** said that TD would make a presentation to the Task Force at the next meeting.

2.5 **Ms Ying Fun-fong** supplemented that TD had checked that the inverted U-rails erected along the Western Fire Services Street could be replaced with tree plantings. TD would work with LCSD and the Highways Department (HyD) for the replacement works. Regarding the proposal of widening the temporary promenade at the street, she said that TD would need to resolve some technical and land issues before reporting its findings and proposed way forward to the Task Force.

**TD**

*Provision of Facilities at Golden Bauhinia Square (GBS) (paragraph 4.13 of the confirmed minutes of the 5<sup>th</sup> meeting)*

2.6 **The Chair** informed Members that the Secretariat had sent a letter to the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre (Management) Ltd to convey the Task Force's suggestions for enhancing the provision of public facilities in the GBS. The Secretariat would update the Task Force in due course.

**Secretariat**

*Shatin-Central Link (SCL) (paragraph 4.16 of the confirmed minutes of the 5<sup>th</sup> meeting)*

2.7 **The Chair** reported that according to the MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL), the pedestrian access between the Noon Day Gun area and Hung Hing Road would be maintained at all times during the construction of the SCL. However, temporary diversion of the pedestrian access would be required at various stages during the construction. The Task Force would remain watchful on the issue.

*Hoarding Design of Central-Wan Chai Bypass (paragraph 5.8 of the confirmed minutes of the 5<sup>th</sup> meeting)*

2.8 **The Chair** reported that in response to Members' concerns on the matter, HyD had prepared a note which had been circulated to Members on 19 May 2011.

**Item 3 A Proposal to Erect Advertisements on Marsh Road Station Building in Wanchai (Paper No. TFHK/05/2011)**

**Action**

- 3.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives of HKE. **Ms Florence Kan** of HKE presented the proposal with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 3.2 **The Chair** asked how HKE would control the types of signage to be placed on the façade of the Marsh Road Station Building (MRSB) when leasing or licensing the advertising areas to a third party.
- 3.3 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** had no objection to the proposal as it would not increase building height and appeared to be consistent with the requirements set out in the “Proposed Guidelines on Industry Best Practices on External Lighting Installations” compiled by the Environment Bureau (ENB’s Proposed Guidelines). He enquired if HKE could improve the site perimeters at street level by widening the roads, increasing pedestrian access, and cleaning up the area.
- 3.4 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** had the following enquiries/views:-
  - (a) whether the large advertisements placed on the building façade of MRSB could be changed in the future;
  - (b) the exact meanings of the two different terms “income used to directly offset the electricity tariff” and “part of the rental shared by the Government” mentioned in HKE’s paper; and
  - (c) visual impact was a key issue. He suggested HKE to green the façade of MRSB, rather than covering the entire façade with advertisements.
- 3.5 **Mr Vincent Ng** raised no objection to the proposal given that it merely involved covering the existing façade of the building by advertisements without adding building height and extra structures. **Mr Eric Fok** also did not object to the proposal in general.
- 3.6 **Mr Shuki Leung**, on the understanding that MRSB was located within a “Government, Institution or Community” zone, reminded HKE to confirm with PlanD whether a planning application was necessary for placing advertisements on the building façade as this proposal was potentially commercial in nature.

**Action**

- 3.7 **Mr Andy Leung** said that the Task Force needed some guidelines when considering future applications. In addition to ENB's Proposed Guidelines, other factors such as nuisance, light pollution, energy conservation, safety, visual impact, building height and vibrancy at harbourfront should also be considered.
- 3.8 **Ms Ying Fun-fong** advised that if advertisements were placed on the façade of the building, the font sizes of advertisement on the southern façade in front of the flyover should be sufficiently large to minimize distraction to drivers.
- 3.9 In response to Members' queries and comments, **Ms Kan** made the following points:-
- (a) HKE was concerned about their own image and would monitor the advertisements to be put on the façade;
  - (b) the income generated from advertisement on the building façade would form part of the total revenue under the HKE's Scheme of Control (SoC), which would directly offset and reduce the tariff levied on electricity users;
  - (c) as a condition of the wavier, a substantial percentage of rental income would be shared directly by the Government, similar to the arrangements for HKE's Tamar Station Building;
  - (d) given the relatively tall and large size of MRSB, the maintenance issue of vertical greening option had to be considered carefully. However, some green planters had been put on Marsh Road side and on the south side of MRSB to complement the existing trees; and
  - (e) since MRSB had been built up to its lot boundary with transformers installed inside the building, it would be difficult to set back the building from the roads.
- 3.10 **Mr John Carrigall** supplemented that the advertisement proposed on south side of MRSB would not have significant impact on the residential development in the area given the sufficient distance in between.
- 3.11 **Mr Andy Leung** suggested that HKE should consider

**Action**

compensating additional energy used for lighting up the advertisement under the proposal by implementing energy conservation measures.

3.12 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** held no objection to the proposal as placing advertisements could add vibrancy to MRSB. However, he shared with Mr Andy Leung's view that energy conservation measures should be implemented.

3.13 **Mr Zimmerman** said that he was concerned about the freedom of speech issue and would withdraw his support for the project if HKE was going to control all messages on the advertisements to be placed on the building façade.

3.14 In response to Members' enquiries, **Ms Kan** said that various energy conservation features, such as photovoltaic panels and mini wind turbines had been incorporated on both the rooftop and street levels of MRSB.

3.15 **Ms Brenda Au** clarified that PlanD did not normally control advertisement signs under the statutory planning control regime. For building plan submissions involving advertisement signs at harbourfront areas, PlanD would offer advisory comments on the visual impact aspect to Buildings Department (BD). As the present case of MRSB involved no increase in building height and bulk, PlanD had no particular objection to the proposal.

3.16 **The Chair** concluded that the majority of Members were supportive of the proposal. There was no fundamental objection to the proposal but HKE should fine-tune the proposal by reviewing the necessity of using all façades for advertisements and; extending energy conservation initiatives of the project.

3.17 **Mr Zimmerman** suggested that a set of pointers should be compiled making reference to comments raised by Members during this meeting, with a view to drawing up a checklist for the Task Force to consider similar applications in the future. **The Chair** agreed to Mr Zimmerman's suggestion.

**Secretariat**

**Item 4 Proposed Rooftop Signage at CITIC Tower, No. 1 Tim Mei Avenue, Central  
(Paper No. TFHK/06/2011)**

**Action**

- 4.1 **The Chair** welcomed **Mr Alnwick Chan**, Executive Director of Knight Frank Petty Limited and **Mr Derek Kwan**, Project Manager of CITIC Pacific Ltd. **Mr Chan** presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation
- 4.2 After listening to the project proponent's presentation, **the Chair** asked whether the proposed signage would be illuminated throughout the night and whether it would be a static or moving sign.
- 4.3 In response, **Mr Chan** replied that the proposal was still at a preliminary stage and hence there was no solid proposal on whether the signage would be illuminated throughout the night and whether there would be moving elements in the signage
- 4.4 **Mr Andy Leung** asked whether only one advertising panel would be put up facing Tsim Sha Tsui. He also expressed concern on the orientation of such panel.
- 4.5 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** objected to the proposal since the signage would increase the building height and would block the view from the buildings behind. This would impair the value and public enjoyment of the harbour, thus breaching the Harbour Planning Principles (HPPs) promulgated by the former Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC).
- 4.6 **Mr Shuki Leung** opined that the proposal was appropriate taking account of the character of the area, scale and orientation of the signage, assuming that the signage would only face the harbour rather than the hinterland.
- 4.7 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** said that the skyline would be blocked if the proposed signage was enormous in size. He also asked whether the proposed signage would cover the plant and machinery on the rooftop of the building.
- 4.8 In response, **Mr Derek Kwan** made the following points:-
  - (a) both sides of the rooftop signage were originally intended for advertisement according to the BD's approved building plan. However, at this stage, they had yet to decide the number and orientation of the signboards; and

**Action**

- (b) in granting the approval for the building plan, BD had advised them to consult the HC on the proposal. They were also asked to consult PlanD on the issue of intrusion into the ridgeline.
- 4.9 **Ms Brenda Au** commented that while the proposed signage did not seem particularly excessive in terms of scale when compared to some large neighbouring rooftop signs to the east of CITIC Tower, PlanD was concerned about the proposal in relation to the protection of ridgeline and had been in discussion with the proponent on the possibility of minimising the scale of the proposed structure.
- 4.10 On the possible impact of the signage to the neighbourhood, **Mr Chan** said that hotel residents in Admiralty might be affected. **Mr Kwan** added that their main intention was to put signage on the rooftop facing the harbour in the north and they were flexible on whether to put signage facing the hinterland in the south.
- 4.11 **Mr Vincent Ng** said that the former HEC had discussed a similar application at the same building where there had been immense deliberation on the additional height issue. He was still concerned about the issue.
- 4.12 **Mr Zimmerman** said that the Commission should adhere to the HPPs and the Harbour Planning Guidelines (HPGs) when considering proposals affecting the harbourfront. The Task Force should be extremely careful in considering the present case which would involve an increase of the building height and might be in breach of the HPPs and HPGs.
- 4.13 In response to Members' comments, **Mr Chan** said that:-
- (a) the impact on residents in the proximity was considered negligible;
  - (b) the air-conditioning units on the rooftop would be screened off by the proposed signage; and
  - (c) they would come back to the Task Force later to address Members' concerns about the building height.
- 4.14 In response to Mr Ng's comments, **Mr Kwan** said that they were well aware of the comments made by the former HEC

**Action**

regarding the excessive size of signboard proposed in the previous application and had reduced the size of proposed rooftop signage in this proposal accordingly.

- 4.15 **Mr Chris Fung** said that the Secretariat had drawn the project proponent's attention to the HPPs and HPGs when inviting him to make a submission to the Task Force. A direct link to both the HPPs and HPGs had been sent to the applicants in advance.
- 4.16 In conclusion, **the Chair** requested the proponent to refine the proposal in the light of the HPPs and HPGs and to address Members' concern over building height and visual impact. **Dr Smith** suggested and **the Chair** agreed that project proponent might be required to conduct comprehensive visual impact assessment on their proposals in the future.

**Item 5 Proposed Use of Advertising Frame on Rooftop of Central Pier No. 3  
(Paper No. TFHK/07/2011)**

- 5.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives from DBTPL and PDL to the meeting. **Mr Tony Cheng**, Director of DBTPL presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation.
- 5.2 In response to the Chair's question, **Mr Cheng** said that the pier was operated on a 24-hour basis and there was no residential building in the vicinity.
- 5.3 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** commented that it would be advisable if all temporary structures on the pier rooftop be removed so that the public could have access closer to the harbour at the front of the rooftop. In response, **Ms Carrie Ng** of PDL pointed out that there were some gondola railings at the front of the rooftop and therefore the public could not enter that area.
- 5.4 **Mr Zimmerman** suggested laying an elevated floor panel to cover the gondola railing to facilitate public access to the restricted area. In response, **Mr Cheng** said that DBTPL had no authority to convert the pier building as DBTPL was only the lessee of the pier. **Ms Ying Fun-fong** of TD clarified that GPA, instead of TD, was the lessor of the pier. **The Chair** suggested the Secretariat to raise the issue of getting public access to the front area of the pier to GPA.

**Secretariat**

**Action**

- 5.5 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** raised the following enquiries/views:-
- (a) whether the frame was originally built for placing signage;
  - (b) whether the intention of the proposal was to generate non-fare revenue to cross subsidise the fare for ferry services between Discovery Bay and Central; and
  - (c) why Central Pier No. 3 was excluded from the project for construction of additional floors above Central Piers Nos. 4 to 6. Consistency of design for the piers along the harbourfront should be considered.
- 5.6 **Mr Vincent Ng** had no objection in principle to the proposal which involved placing advertisement on an existing advertising frame without constructing any additional building structure. **Mr Shuki Leung** had similar views. He commented that the proposal only involved utilisation of the existing structure for advertising without changing the design or increasing the size of the pier.
- 5.7 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** said that the structure of Central Piers Nos. 4 to 6 was so designed such that additional floors could be constructed on the rooftop. However, he was unsure if the same feature was applicable to Central Pier No. 3. If this was possible, he agreed that additional floors should also be built above Pier No. 3. He tended to agree with DBTPL's proposal so that the existing advertising frame could be used to generate non-fare revenue to cross subsidise the ferry service.
- 5.8 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** said that the advertising frame was already there and no new permanent structure was proposed. Pending a more integrated plan for all the Central piers, she held no objection for the proposal to proceed on a temporary basis for a short period of time so that more non-fare revenue could be generated to cross subsidise the ferry service in the interim.
- 5.9 In response to Members' enquiries/comments, **Mr Cheng** said that he believed that the steel frame was intended for advertisement display when the pier was constructed by the Government long time ago. Revenue generated from the advertisement in the future would be ploughed back to the

**Action**

ferry operation which was currently in significant loss situation.

- 5.10 **Ms Ying** pointed out that the revenue generated by the proposal would benefit Discovery Bay residents substantially by cross subsidising the ferry service. TD supported the proposal.
- 5.11 Regarding the reason why Central Piers Nos. 2 and 3 had not been included in the wider plan of building additional floors, **Ms Gracie Foo** said that in addition to technical feasibility, the issue could also be seen in the context of source of non-fare revenue for ferry operation, which was under the purview of Transport and Housing Bureau (THB). DEVB could forward Members' views to THB. She also reminded Members that the proposed construction of additional floors on Central Piers Nos. 4 to 6 was part of the recommendations under the Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (UDS), which had undergone extensive public consultation.
- 5.12 **Ms Brenda Au** explained that Central Piers Nos. 2 and 3 were zoned "Other Specified Uses (Pier)" whereas Central Piers Nos. 4 to 6 formed part and parcel of the "Comprehensive Development Area 2" zone on the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). As reflected by the zoning on the OZP, all along, there was clear planning intention for Central Piers No. 4 to 6 to be an integral part of the comprehensive development. For Central Piers No. 2 and 3, rooftop gardens were provided as planned. This explained why additional floors were proposed on top of Central Piers Nos. 4 to 6 but not for Central Piers Nos. 2 and 3.
- 5.13 **Dr Smith** said that the design consistency of all Central Piers should be reviewed. **Mr Zimmerman** did not support allowing the proposal to go ahead in the interim, because it would be difficult to revert to the original state once revenue was generated from the advertising signage.
- 5.14 In response, **Mr Cheng** said that it might take years to come up with another proposal on the use of the rooftop; and even if rooftop was converted to other uses, the advertising frame might not be so affected as it was installed at the edge of the rooftop. He pointed out that DBTPL was trying to utilise the existing resources to generate some income for the ferry services. This was consistent with the government's policy of allowing ferry service operators to generate non-fare income, and the income would be subject to TD's scrutiny in setting the

**Action**

fare for Discovery Bay residents. He appealed to Members support to endorse the proposal, even on a temporary basis so that the pressure on fare increase could be relieved for the residents.

- 5.15 **The Chair** suggested that support be given to the proposal on a temporary basis, say for a three year term so that a more permanent solution to the rooftop could be come up with. **Mr Ng** fully agreed with the Chair's suggestion of granting a term support to the proposal. He did not see any demerits or nuisance to the public by putting up such advertising signage. However, **Dr Smith** did not agree with the suggestion, as he considered that there was a need for a more consistent and interesting design of the piers at the harbourfront.
- 5.16 In closing the discussion on this item, **the Chair** concluded that the Task Force supported the proposal for a three-year term. The minority views of Dr Smith and Mr Zimmerman regarding the proposal as expressed in this meeting would be recorded.

**Item 6 Application for Licence of the Advertising Area on Portion of Rooftop of the Pedestrian Subway at Connaught Road, Central, Hong Kong (Paper No. TFHK/08/2011)**

- 6.1 **The Chair** welcomed **Mr Norman Ngai** and **Thomas Tam** of GPA to the meeting. **Mr Ngai** presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation. He said that the purpose of the proposed rooftop advertisement signage was to generate rental income to the Government.
- 6.2 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** said that, given that there were already many signages in the vicinity, he did not disagree with the proposal to put up one more signage at the subway. However, he would not be tolerant of such type of signage at the new Central harbourfront.
- 6.3 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** objected to the proposal for the following reasons:-
- (a) the proposed rooftop advertisement would adversely affect the visual permeability of the Statue Square which was an open corridor from Central to the waterfront; and

**Action**

- (b) the metal frames for holding the advertisements were not pleasant in appearance and placing of such structures on the rooftop of public facilities or public open space should not be supported.
- 6.4 Both **Mrs Margaret Brooke** and **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** considered that it was not appropriate to put up signage next to the Statue Square which was a special open space in Hong Kong. **Mr Vincent Ng** and **Mr Ken So** had a similar view.
- 6.5 **Mr Andy Leung** expressed concern about the adverse impact on the streetscape arising from signage. Considering that District Councils (DCs) might be a better platform, he suggested that DCs could set up task forces to discuss such matters and HC Members might sit in when items concerning the waterfront were discussed.
- 6.6 **Mr Shuki Leung** said that signage was important to tourists and business sector. He also drew Members' attention to the fact that the proposed advertising location was within the Central Business District, rather than in the residential area.
- 6.7 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** opined that certain important factors such as historic buildings and heritage sites should be identified as criteria in the proposed guidelines on external lighting at harbourfront. While the Task Force should focus on the HPPs and HPGs, Members could also offer comments from the heritage angle. He said that he would not recommend proposals that would adversely affect heritage sites.
- 6.8 **The Chair** concluded that the Task Force could not support the proposal. **Mr Ngai** thanked Members' valuable comments and said that GPA would take full consideration of the Task Force's views in refining the proposal.

**Item 7 Refurbishment and Modification of the Island West Transfer Station at Kennedy Town, Hong Kong (Paper No. TFHK/09/2011)**

- 7.1 **The Chair** welcomed the project team to the meeting. **Mr Chen Che-kong** of EPD and **Mr Roy Anthony Stevens** of Ove Arup & Partners HK Ltd presented the paper with the aid a PowerPoint presentation.

**Action**

- 7.2 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** raised the following comments:-
- (a) the design of Island West Transfer Station (IWTS) should be kept simple;
  - (b) he was concerned about the future operational impact of IWTS on its neighbourhood in terms of access and truck movement that might arise from the proposed offshore waste management treatment plant; and
  - (c) the proposed project should be supported as the community needed such facilities at this important site.
- 7.3 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** opined that the administration building of the IWTS needed not be at the harbourfront. EPD should consider relocating this building.
- 7.4 **Mr Ken So** appreciated EPD's proposal of putting more vertical greening on IWTS so as to improve its outlook from the harbour. However, he was concerned that putting additional materials on the façade of the building might block the natural sunlight; and that EPD might not have the resources to maintain the vertical greening.
- 7.5 **Ms Brenda Au** supported greening on the building rooftop to improve its outlook as viewed from Victoria Road, and suggested that the design should better blend in with the green setting.
- 7.6 **Mr Shuki Leung** considered that a simple colour approach for the building might be more appropriate than using a different colour which might not be compatible with the background greening.
- 7.7 **The Chair** concluded that the Task Force was supportive of the proposed greening on the building façade and on the rooftop and simple design for the building, despite of concerns about effort and costs required to maintain the vertical greening.
- 7.8 **Mr Chen** thanked Members' comments and support. He further added that the current site was an ideal compact site for a refuse transfer station, with heavy plant and equipment installed inside the cavern. The administration building did not take up much additional space and it allowed for work synergy to house all EPD staff working on waste facilities and

**Action**

programmes, especially those monitoring the operations of the IWTS, in a single administration building. The project team would refine the design scheme, taking into account views from different stakeholders including the Task Force.

**Item 8 Design for the Hoi Yu Street Temporary Promenade  
(Paper No. TFHK/10/2011)**

- 8.1 **The Chair** welcomed the project team to the meeting.
- 8.2 Before the start of the presentation, **Mr Ronald Leung** of DEVB reported significant progress of the project, subsequent to obtaining the Task Force's in-principle support in September 2010 as follows:-
- (a) funding approval had been obtained to proceed with developing the temporary promenade as a government minor works project, with a view to opening up the harbourfront thereupon for early public enjoyment, pending permanent development in the future;
  - (b) the previous land issues had been resolved. The New Hong Kong Tunnel Company Limited (NHKTCL) had recently voluntarily handed over a 90-metre-long, 6-metre-wide strip of land fronting the Eastern Harbour Crossing Ventilation Building to the Government with a view to delivering a continuous promenade. Taking this opportunity, he would like to put on record the Administration's appreciation for the company's support and collaboration; and
  - (c) at the eastern end of the temporary promenade, a 2 meter-wide land strip behind the Quarry Bay Gas Piggling Station would be developed as a passageway for connection to the existing Quarry Bay Park Phase I, which was an arrangement receiving Eastern District Council (EDC)'s support.
- 8.3 **Mr Paul Lee** of ArchSD presented the proposal with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation.
- 8.4 At the Chair's invitation and on behalf of EDC, **Mr Patrick Lau** said that EDC strongly supported the Administration's plan to implement the project as soon as possible. The promenade

**Action**

would improve the accessibility along the waterfront between Taikooshing and North Point; and between the waterfront and the hinterland. Despite the limited budget for this project, the concerned government bureau and departments had put in a lot of effort in the project, which could meet community need. If additional funding was available in future, more features could be added in the promenade. He hoped that Members could lend support to this worthwhile project.

8.5 In response to the Chair's enquiry, **Mr Lau** supplemented that:-

- (a) people bringing their pets to the pet garden in the promenade could reach there through Hoi Yu Street from North Point; and
- (b) consideration could be given to turning the neighbouring vacant government land into Short Term Tenancy (STT) parking site if there was a strong demand for car parking.

8.6 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** had the following enquiries/comments:-

- (a) the proposed public toilets should be located at the west entrance of the promenade rather than at the main entrance in order to offer greater convenience to pedestrian users who would mainly use the west entrance;
- (b) the footpath along Hoi Yu Street should be upgraded as part of the temporary promenade project;
- (c) he was concerned whether visual permeability would be impaired by the hoardings on the south side of the site. If the hoarding was used for noise reduction from the highway, HyD should be requested to put screening along the highway, instead of fencing off the whole site by hoarding in the southern boundary;
- (d) carparks and lay-bys should be provided in the area to cater for the need of pet owners and other users of the promenade; and
- (e) given limited financial resources, he was content with the overall design of the temporary promenade.

8.7 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** was glad to see that this part of the

**Action**

harbourfront would be opened up for public enjoyment and he agreed with Mr Patrick Lau that connectivity was one of the main elements in this project. He also raised the following enquiries/views:-

- (a) what types of pets would be permitted in the proposed pet garden;
- (b) which parties would be responsible for constructing, managing and maintaining the screen wall; and
- (c) he considered that the nine arbours looked like mini containers which were not suitable for the narrow temporary promenade site. He asked the project team to revisit the design of the arbours and come up with alternatives.

8.8 **Mr Andy Leung** enquired about the current status of the vacant government land located to the east of the west entrance. If that vacant plot could be released for temporary use, the whole area would have greater potential for development. He was also concerned about the security at the promenade, which was quite detached from the built up area.

8.9 In response to Members' enquiries/comments, **Mr Ko Wai-kuen** of CEDD replied that:-

- (a) the project team proposed to concentrate the public facilities such as toilets at the main entrance in the middle of the promenade as the site was zoned "open space" in the OZP, otherwise the facilities might be affected when the "Other Uses" site was developed in future. It would also be more convenient to users by providing toilet facilities at the middle of the 500-m long promenade;
- (b) the project team had requested HyD to upgrade the footpath at Hoi Yu Street to support the opening of the promenade;
- (c) while roadside parking along Hoi Yu Street was not feasible as it was a one-lane-two-way road, roadside parking meters and hourly parking facilities were available at Hoi Chak Street and nearby commercial buildings respectively; and

**Action**

- (d) the project team would explore the opportunity of turning the neighbouring vacant government land into STT parking site.
- 8.10 On visual permeability of screen wall, **Mr Lee** responded that the screen wall was basically a transparent screen wall with wire mesh and vertical greening. The project team would work with LCSD and EDC to review the number of the proposed arbours. He also added that the proposed arbours were ventilated on all sides. The arbours could be made as open as possible in order to improve ventilation.
- 8.11 **Mr Ko** said that LCSD had good experience in running pet gardens in Wan Chai and North Point. As the temporary promenade was connected to the Quarry Bay Park Phase 1 by a narrow corridor behind the gas pigging station, the project team would ensure that sufficient lighting and security guards would be provided at that particular area.
- 8.12 **Mr Clarence Ching** of LCSD added that security guards would be on duty 24 hours every day along the promenade and the Park. LCSD would also liaise with the Police to ensure the security in the promenade. He added that some part of the promenade was quite wide and the proposed arbours would not take up a lot of space nor block the park users. LCSD would also work closely with ArchSD to improve the visual permeability, ventilation and shading effect of arbours.
- 8.13 **Mr Zimmerman** said that a simple design with large trees, beautiful walkpaths and drinking fountains but without complicated structures should be adopted for this temporary promenade. In response, **Ms Olivia Chan** said that LCSD shared Members' view on creating a simple yet pleasant waterfront for people to enjoy. LCSD would work closely with concerned government departments to improve the design of the promenade.
- 8.14 Echoing Ms Chan's comments, **Mr Ronald Leung** supplemented that:-
- (a) the concept of proposed arbours was originated from a street furniture competition organised by EDC. The design of the winning entry had been incorporated by the project team's architects into the currently proposed arbours, with a view to encouraging local participation

**Action**

and creativity. The project team would continue to liaise with LCSD with a view to working out a more balanced design in terms of visual permeability, ventilation and openness of the arbours;

- (b) considerations had been given to visitor flows and EDC's views when proposing the locations of public facilities, including toilets at the main entrance; and
- (c) the project team would review the demand for future car-parking with TD and the LandsD in order to determine whether extra car-parking space would be provided in the nearby unallocated site.

8.15 **Mr Ko** said that CEDD had obtained funding approval for the project, which was supported by EDC. To ensure the early commencement of the project, he appealed for the Task Force's support in proceeding with the essential works of the project first.

8.16 In response to Dr Smith's suggestion for an informal meeting to review the design of individual components, including the arbours, of the project, **Mr Ronald Leung** said that there was an urgency to proceed with formulating the detailed design, tendering arrangement and construction of the project, in order to open up the waterfront thereat for early public enjoyment. While an informal meeting had already been held recently to gauge Members' views and incorporate them in the present proposal, the project team could hold another informal meeting with interested Members to gather their further views so that this quick-win project could proceed as soon as possible.

8.17 **Mr Patrick Lau** said that EDC Members agreed that the project should go ahead as soon as possible. The design details could be worked out whilst the project was in progress.

8.18 In concluding the discussion, **the Chair** acknowledged that Members' comments were essentially on matters of detail that should not hold up progress of the quick-win project with the purpose of opening up the waterfront thereat for early public enjoyment. The Task Force was supportive of taking the project forward given the promenade was located on an important part of the waterfront. Meanwhile, the project team should take note of Members' comments and keep a dialogue with the Task Force on the detailed design of the project.

**the Project  
Team**

**Item 9 Any Other Business**

Checklist for Advertisement/Signboard Applications

- 9.1 **The Chair** said that the need for a checklist and/or basic principles to consider advertisement/signboard applications at the harbourfront could be included in the future agenda of the Task Force.

Date of Next Meeting

- 9.2 **The Chair** announced that the next meeting had been tentatively scheduled for 28 July 2011 (Thursday).

*(Post-meeting note: The meeting had been rescheduled to 30 August 2011.)*

- 9.3 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:25 p.m.

**Secretariat**

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