

Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island

Minutes of Seventh Meeting

Date : 30 August 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 Lam Kin-lai	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 Lam Cheuk-yum	
Ms Patricia Or	
Ms Gracie Foo	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands) ¹ , Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Vincent Fung	Assistant Commissioner 2, Tourism Commission (TC)
Mr Alan Tam	Chief Traffic Engineer/Hong Kong (Acting), 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) ² , Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Ms Brenda Au	District Planning Officer/Hong Kong, Planning Department (PlanD)
Mr Chris Fung	Secretary

In Attendance

Mrs Winnie Kang	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
Mr David Chan

For Agenda Item 3

Ms Jacinta Woo Chief Town Planner/Studies & Research, PlanD
Mr Edward Leung Senior Town Planner/Studies & Research 3 (Acting), PlanD
Mr Alan Macdonald Director, Urbis Limited

For Agenda Item 4

Mr Peter Tsui Senior Engineer 11 (Hong Kong Island Division 1), CEDD
Mr Kenneth Mok Chief Transport Officer/Planning/Ferry, TD
Mr Albert Leung Director, Jacobs China Limited
Mr Nicholas Lai Associate Director, Leigh & Orange Limited

For Agenda Item 5

Mr Bosco Chan Chief Engineer/Hong Kong 2, CEDD
Mr Lam Chi-keung Senior Engineer 5 (Hong Kong Island Division 2), CEDD
Mr Kenneth Mok Chief Transport Officer/Planning/Ferry, TD
Ms Leander Tsang Senior Transport Officer/Planning/Ferry 1, TD
Mr Stephen Lai Associate, AECOM Asia Company Ltd
Mr Wilson Lee Associate Director, ADO Design & Public Art Consultants (HK) Ltd

For Agenda Item 6

Mrs Karen Loh Representative, The Hall Organisation Ltd

The Chair informed Members that Mrs Winnie Kang had taken over the post of Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour) from Ms Maisie Chan with effect from 15 August 2011. He welcomed Mrs Kang to the meeting and put on record the Task Force's appreciation for Ms Chan's service.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 6th Meeting

- 1.1 The draft minutes of the 6th meeting were circulated to Members on 1 August 2011. No comments have been received from Members by the deadline. As no further amendment was proposed, the draft minutes were confirmed.

Item 2 Matters Arising

Proposed Improvement at Western Fire Services Street (paragraph 2.5 of the confirmed minutes of the 6th meeting)

- 2.1 At the Chair's invitation, **Mr Alan Tam** of TD briefed Members on the proposed improvement with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation.
- 2.2 In response to the Chair's question, **Mr Tam** said that there would be a 2-month public consultation on the proposal.
- 2.3 **Mr Lam Kin-lai** supported the proposal but considered that it was too long to take three years to complete the project. **Mr Chan Hok-fung** shared Mr Lam's view.
- 2.4 **Mr Chan Hok-fung** enquired how the problem of level difference between the road and pavement could be resolved. He asked if any beautification works would be undertaken after the walkways were widened.
- 2.5 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** was fully supportive of the project. He suggested keeping the concrete level difference at the footpath for conversion into a big bench covered by mini-shelters. To deter illegal parking, Mr Zimmerman suggested that the amenity railings to be removed on the south side of Western Fire Services Street be replaced by a bollard system.
- 2.6 While supporting the proposed improvement, **Mr Leung Kong-yui** recommended TD to review the works schedule after

Action

public consultation and to provide the best estimate on time required for finishing the works.

2.7 In response to Members' comments, **Mr Tam** said that:-

- (a) DSD would soon commence the drainage upgrading work of the Central Preliminary Treatment Works occupying the southern footpath of Western Fire Services Street for 3 years. As such, the proposed improvement work at Western Fire Services Street would be implemented in phases, with those work at the southern footpath of Western Fire Services Street to be done after DSD's drainage upgrading work;
- (b) Members' views on the proposed improvement were noted. TD would review and fine-tune the works programme when further details were available; and
- (c) it was too early for TD to address the design issue at the present stage.

2.8 **The Chair** suggested keeping the proposal as an item of matters arising at the next meeting, so that TD could update Members on the progress.

TD

2.9 **Mr Zimmerman** suggested that the Task Force write to DSD to check if they could set back from the boundary at the southern footpath so that TD could have flexibility to speed up the proposed improvement works. **The Chair** agreed to include Mr Zimmerman's suggestion in the action list.

Secretariat

Draft Checklist for Processing Advertisement/Signboard Applications at Harbourfront Areas (paragraph 3.17 of the confirmed minutes of the 6th meeting)

2.10 **The Chair** reported that the subject draft checklist had been circulated to Members on 4 August 2011. The revised draft with comments from Members incorporated was tabled at the meeting.

2.11 **The meeting** had no further comments on the revised draft checklist. **The Chair** proposed and **Members** agreed that the revised draft would be submitted to the Commission for endorsement as part of the Progress Report.

Action

(Post-meeting note: The draft checklist was endorsed by the Commission at its 7th meeting held on 7 September 2011.)

Central Pier No. 3 (paragraph 5.4 of the confirmed minutes of the 6th meeting)

2.12 **The Chair** informed Members that TD's note on the subject issue was tabled at the meeting.

2.13 **Mr Tam** explained that TD could not support the proposal of laying an elevated floor panel to cover the gondola railing at the restricted area of Central Pier No. 3 for facilitating public access, due to the limited area and width of that restricted area.

Hoi Yu Street Temporary Promenade (paragraph 8.18 of the confirmed minutes of the 6th meeting)

2.14 **The Chair** informed Members that an informal briefing had been held on 29 August 2011 by CEDD to brief Members on the details of the latest design of the temporary promenade.

**Item 3 Hong Kong Island East Harbour-front Study
(Paper No. TFHK/11/2011)**

3.1 Before discussion, **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** declared that he was a Director of Urbis Ltd, the consultant commissioned by PlanD in undertaking the Study. **The Chair** proposed and **Members** agreed that Dr Smith could continue to stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion on the item.

3.2 **Ms Jacinta Woo** of PlanD and **Mr Alan Macdonald** of Urbis Limited presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.

3.3 **The Chair** remarked that the Study was important to the Commission's work. He raised the implementation issue and asked if the consultant had attempted to prioritise the various proposals made in the Study.

3.4 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** opined that the future development at the ex-North Point Estate (ex-NPE) site had not been sufficiently addressed in the Study. He also enquired about the specific comments raised by the public regarding the proposed developments on the two key sites.

3.5 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** had the following views/enquiries:-

- (a) proposals should be sub-divided into independent projects so that there would be different implementation agencies taking up the works accordingly;
- (b) it was regrettable that the proposed Sky Trail was terminated with a dead-end. Despite opposition from the Heng Fa Chuen residents and some Eastern District Council (EDC) Members in the run up to the elections, the Task Force should vigorously pursue connecting the proposed Sky Trail with Shing Tai Road in order to ensure connectivity and accessibility along the harbourfront;
- (c) information on marine uses, and marine supporting facilities and land uses such as public and private piers, landing steps and barging points were missing in the study and should be provided so that the Harbourfront Commission could verify accessibility of the harbour for people and cargo in Eastern Hong Kong Island;

(Post-meeting note: The issue would be further discussed at the Task Force on Water-land Interface.)

- (d) LCSD should co-operate with the project team to ensure full integration of the Hong Kong Museum of Coastal Defence (HKMCD) and Lei Yue Mun Park with the Sky Trail;
- (e) to make the boardwalk a success there must be sufficient connection points with the hinterland. More information was required on the number and location of proposed and considered connection points between the proposed boardwalk underneath the Island Eastern Corridor (IEC) and the hinterland;

(Post-meeting note: As advised by PlanD, the proposed connections between the boardwalk and the hinterland were shown on Plan 2c of Paper No. TFHK/11/2011.)

- (f) whether a better design of the waterfront could be achieved with the Marine Police Regional Headquarters (MPRH) becoming a site under permanent allocation;

and

- (g) whether the maximum width of the proposed boardwalk underneath the IEC of 5 metres was a physical/engineering constraint, if so why, and whether a clear plan drawing could be provided.

(Post-meeting note: The preliminary design of the proposed boardwalk was illustrated in PlanD's powerpoint. Technical feasibility of the proposed boardwalk would be further examined in the topical studies to be conducted by CEDD.)

3.6 In response to Members' enquiries and comments, **Mr Macdonald** said that:-

- (a) the enhancement proposals would be taken forward according to their levels of complexity. Streetscape enhancement proposals would be undertaken first along with CEDD's greening initiatives; followed by other proposals such as the boardwalk and Sky Trail;
- (b) only the proposed 20m-wide promenade along the northern edge of the ex-NPE site was included in the key site of North Point Ferry Piers. The future use of the ex-NPE site was outside the scope of the Study;
- (c) various locations had been explored by the project team to connect the proposed boardwalk with the hinterland;
- (d) some landing fronts were readily available for public access to boats along the waterfront. If necessary, additional railings and other security features at these landing points could be incorporated;
- (e) the piers occupied by the MPRH could be well integrated with the surroundings. Subject to the future relocation of the MPRH, the piers could be revitalised as an interesting destination with potential initiative of the private sector; and
- (f) having considered loading weight and other factors, the maximum width of the proposed boardwalk would be about 5 metres.

3.7 **Ms Jacinta Woo** of PlanD supplemented that:-

Action

- (a) after several discussions with the EDC and local residents, PlanD considered it a more pragmatic option for the Sky Trail to terminate at the lookout point, given the physical constraints, interface with HKMCD and strong opposition from the Heng Fa Chuen residents. Nonetheless, a continuous pedestrian connection could be achieved from the Wan Chai Development Phase II to Shau Kei Wan if the boardwalk underneath the IEC were to be implemented as recommended in the Study;
- (b) on implementation, the current strategy was to kick-start with the easier proposals first, such as the streetscape enhancement. As the boardwalk proposal was accorded top priority in the Stage 3 of the Public Engagement Programme, the government would also proceed to take forward the proposal upon completion of the Study;
- (c) CEDD would further explore the technical feasibility of the proposed boardwalk, including the implications of the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance on considering the detailed proposal;
- (d) the general public was supportive of the proposals of the two key sites. Though there were some local concerns about the nuisance arising from the proposed tourism and entertainment uses of the Hoi Yu Street site, such issues could be addressed through proper design at the implementation stage. An opportunity had been taken to build an advance waterfront promenade at the Hoi Yu Street site, which was anticipated for completion by end 2012. In the longer term, the feasibility of adopting public-private collaboration (PPC) model for implementing the proposals of the two key sites could be further explored;
- (e) other enhancement measures would be implemented by the government subject to resource availability. However, PlanD would maintain contact with the concerned bureaux and departments to keep track on the progress of implementation of the various proposals; and
- (f) the temporary barging point at Hoi Yu Street had ceased operations in 2008 when the one in Chai Wan had commenced operation. There was no intention to reopen

**The Task
Force on
Water-land**

- Action**
- the barging point. The overall provision of barging points along the waterfront could be reviewed by the Commission's new Task Force on Water-land Interface. **Interface**
- 3.8 In response to Mr Zimmerman's remarks, **Ms Olivia Chan** of LCSD said that LCSD was always prepared to work with the departments concerned to improve the connectivity of HKMCD and Lei Yu Mun Park. She would bring the issue back to her department for follow-up. **LCSD**
- 3.9 **Mr Zimmerman** suggested that the Task Force continue to press ahead the Sky Trail project. He requested PlanD to provide the following information on the Study after the meeting:- **PlanD**
- (a) a plan showing all the connections between the proposed boardwalk and the hinterland;
- (Post-meeting note: As advised by PlanD, the proposed connections between the boardwalk and the hinterland were shown on Plan 2c of Paper No. TFHK/11/2011.)*
- (b) a plan showing the locations of all piers and landing points along the Island East harbourfront when all works proposed in the Study were to be completed; and
- (c) an overview of the options which had been considered for connecting the Sky Trail to the ground level bypassing Heng Fa Chuen.
- (Post-meeting note: PlanD's responses to para. 3.9 (b) and (c) above were circulated to Members on 22 December 2011.)*
- 3.10 In concluding the discussion, **the Chair** said that the Task Force was supportive of the recommendations made in the Study and suggested that the relevant Government bureaux and departments should commence preparation work with a view to taking forward the proposals as soon as practicable.
- Item 4 Proposal for the Construction of Additional Floors above Central Piers Nos. 4 to 6 (Paper No. TFHK/12/2011)**
- 4.1 **The Chair** welcomed the project team to the meeting. **Mr Mak**

Action

Chi-biu of CEDD, **Mr Nicholas Lai** of Leigh & Orange Limited and **Mr Albert Leung** of Jacobs China Limited presented the latest proposal with the aid of a PowerPoint.

- 4.2 **Ms Joanne Chan** asked the project team why it had been decided to include only retail shops and restaurants at the piers, but not others uses such as museum and swimming pool.
- 4.3 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** opined that the piers' integration with the landscaped deck at Sites 1 and 2 was of utmost importance and asked how the present design could achieve such objective.
- 4.4 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** commented that the current design lacked variation and articulation. Public open space was also insufficient. To create more spaces for flexibility and innovative design, he suggested that a minimum of two-and-a-half additional floors be built above each of the three piers.
- 4.5 **Mr Eric Fok** supported the proposal. He said that the ferry piers and the Central harbourfront should be planned holistically. Noting the priority to generate sufficient income to cross-subsidise ferry services, the required magnitude of additional rental floors should be duly studied. A good balance should be struck when demarcating indoor and outdoor spaces of the piers. Different colours could be used for each pier for easy identification.
- 4.6 **Mr Andy Leung** suggested that wider ramps should be provided to promote pedestrian access and point-to-point connectivity in the vicinity. "Indoor-outdoor" integration should be featured in the pier structures to draw people closer to the waterfront. The rooftop of the three piers could be specifically designed as multi-purpose outdoor event venue for rental purpose.
- 4.7 **Mr Lam Kin-lai** considered that the proposal should only be pursued after the release of Sites 1 and 2 for development. He noted a lack of synergy in the proposal since the ferry piers would be managed separately. It was doubtful if the ferry operators had the expertise in managing and making it a commercially viable project.
- 4.8 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** commented that the Taskforce needed to see the business plan for the deck and piers, and review the management model before supporting further works as

Action

“designs should follow functions”. He opined that the ferry companies were not the best managers of retail and food & beverages spaces. He asked if gondolas would be installed at the piers for window cleansing. He also opined that the skylights being proposed for the internal pier structure were not environmentally-friendly due to excessive heat gain. Noting the proposal to use the pier rooftops for events, he pointed out the conflict with suggestions to designate the rooftops as public open space as this would affect their use for hosting events.

- 4.9 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** suggested that the three piers be operated under a single management to achieve maximum synergy. An appropriate business model for running these piers should be further explored and studied.
- 4.10 In response to Members’ comments and enquiries, **Mr Mak** said that:-
- (a) the additional one-and-a-half floors as well as the planned uses were proposed as part of the recommendations of the Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (UDS), which had gone through extensive public consultation;
 - (b) the development of Sites 1 and 2 would take some time to materialise as some parts of the two sites were required for the works associated with the construction of the Central - Wan Chai Bypass until 2015. One of the purposes of constructing additional floors above Central Piers Nos. 4 to 6 was to enhance the financial sustainability of the ferry services for outlying islands by generating more non-fare box revenue to cross subsidize the ferry operation. The project had received support in the public consultation. Against such background, a more neutral and flexible design would be adopted for the piers to facilitate future integration with developments at Sites 1 and 2;
 - (c) connectivity of the three piers would be improved upon commissioning of the landscaped deck, which would link up the piers with the future development at Central harbourfront;
 - (d) CEDD would provide basic infrastructure at the piers to

Action

facilitate any potential application for organising major events. It would also discuss with bureaux and departments concerned to identify other design features which were required for hosting major events and activities;

- (e) the idea of creating an outdoor deck on the second and third floors of the piers was well-received by Members, and would be incorporated in the design later;
- (f) skylight was provided to reduce energy consumption for illumination of the piers. The project team would adopt suitable design to reduce heat gain during extremely hot days;
- (g) the project team would include environmentally-friendly features in the provision of air-conditioning at these piers. If possible, water-cooling would be adopted to save space otherwise required for coolers;
- (h) Members' suggestion of having a management model focusing on the synergy of these three piers would be forwarded to the relevant bureaux and departments for consideration;
- (i) the project team would take into account the comments and suggestions of the current restaurant operators in other piers when finalising the design of food and beverages (F&B) facilities; and
- (j) on accessibility, a car park and a transport interchange would be provided in future development close to the piers. The project team would explore with Lands Department (LandsD) on the feasibility to provide temporary car parking spaces in vacant land in the vicinity upon completion of the reclamation works.

4.11 **Mr Kenneth Mok** of TD supplemented that there would be conditions in the tenancy to require ferry operators to plough back the non-fare box revenue generated from the piers to cross-subsidise their ferry operations.

4.12 **The Chair** said that the Task Force had concerns about the lack of business study to support the proposal. The future management of the piers as well as the feasibility to construct

Action

more floors above the piers should be addressed.

4.13 **Mr Mak** reiterated that the proposed scale and intensity of development were the recommendation by UDS which had gone through a comprehensive public engagement process.

4.14 **The Chair** concluded the item by asking the project team to review the proposal in light of Members' comments and revert to the Task Force with the outcome of the business study. In response, **Mr Mak** said that Members' comments regarding the proposal were noted and would be forwarded to the Transport and Housing Bureau (THB) for further consideration.

the Project Team/ THB

Item 5 Proposal for Accommodating Dining Services in the New Wan Chai Ferry Pier (Paper No. TFHK/13/2011)

5.1 **The Chair** welcomed the project team to the meeting. **Mr Bosco Chan** of CEDD, **Mr Stephen Lai** of AECOM Asia Company Ltd presented the latest proposal with the aid of a PowerPoint.

5.2 **Mr Chan** said that the project team wished to consult the Task Force on the proposal for accommodating retail and dining services at the new Wan Chai Ferry Pier and on the proposed provision of the transformer room which was an essential ancillary facility, before submitting the relevant planning application to the Town Planning Board (TPB) for approval.

5.3 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** fully supported the proposal. Regarding the proposed transformer room, he hoped that its location would be temporary. He said that there was a need to kick start the detailed planning of the Wan Chai harbourfront (including the refinement of the Concept Plan for Wan Chan Development Phase II (WDII)).

DEVB and the departments concerned

5.4 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** said that the pier design should be reviewed carefully. The pier rooftop should be used more proactively rather than simply planting greens. Instead of drawing up three abstract square blocks to signify any future waterfront related commercial and leisure uses, a comprehensive design framework for the whole area was necessary. While acknowledging the need of a transformer room, he hoped that its design would integrate with that of the

surroundings.

- 5.5 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** recalled that the three sites zoned “Other Specified Uses” were incorporated through extensive public engagement activities to demonstrate that there would be commercial development, but not major, at the new Wan Chai waterfront. He opined that the boundaries of the three plots zoned “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) could be refined in due course. Noting that the transformer room would only take up small part of an “OU” plot, its presence would be acceptable. He supported the provision of greening on all sides of the transformer room except for the main entrance. **The Chair** shared Mr Leung’s view that the transformer room should be greened as much as possible.
- 5.6 **Mr Chan** thanked Members’ support of the proposal. In response to Members’ views, he said that:-
- (a) Members’ recognition of the need for a transformer room at the Wan Chai harbourfront was noted;
 - (b) the transformer room was proposed in front of an OU site so that the structure would set back from the harbourfront, which was consistent with the Harbour Planning Principles (HPPs). The room would be designed to satisfy all operational and statutory requirements;
 - (c) a simple, neutral exterior design would be adopted for the transformer room. It would be shielded by proper greening. With these features, sufficient flexibility would be allowed for future planning of the area; and
 - (d) the zoning of “OU” for the three plots were the result of the Harbour Enhancement Review - Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Areas (HER), which had gone through extensive public engagement process. Any refinement to HER’s plan would thus be limited to the detailed design. CEDD would liaise with the implementation agent if the Task Force had any refinement proposal.
- 5.7 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** considered that the conceptual plan marked with three OU sites alone was not sufficient for planning new development. A detailed layout plan would need to be

Action

prepared before putting up any permanent facilities on the construction site.

- 5.8 In closing the discussion, **the Chair** concluded that the Task Force supported the proposal. He also said that the review of the overall design of the Wan Chai harbourfront could be brought up at a later Task Force meeting.

**DEVB and
the
departments
concerned**

**Item 6 A Proposal to Erect an Observation Wheel at the Central Harbourfront
(Paper No. TFHK/14/2011)**

- 6.1 **The Chair** welcomed **Mrs Karen Loh** of The Hall Organisation Ltd, who presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 6.2 **The Chair** asked whether the proposal complied with all relevant rules and regulations in Hong Kong. He also asked about site selection of Central harbourfront for erecting the observation wheel.
- 6.3 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** viewed the proposed wheel as a popular facility which might become a permanent attraction. A unique design was therefore recommended for the wheel proposed in Hong Kong, given there were similar wheels in other Asian cities. The proponent was reminded to reserve considerable space around the wheel for ticketing, queuing, shades and shelters. He also asked whether the wheel could withstand tropical cyclone, particularly during the reign of Typhoon Signal No. 10.
- 6.4 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** opined that the addition of observation wheel would dilute the value of other landmarks in the same area, such as the Star Ferry Pier. He was also of the view that if the wheel was erected on the Kowloon side, there would be a nicer view of the entire harbour with Hong Kong Island as the backdrop.
- 6.5 **Mr Vincent Ng** supported this innovative proposal as it would add vibrancy to the harbourfront. The proponent was requested not to take excessive space on the ground level so that people not paying for a ride could also enjoy the harbourfront. He enquired about the price for a single ride on the wheel.

Action

- 6.6 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** was supportive of the proposal. While various substantial projects at the Central harbourfront took time to complete, the wheel could fill in the gap in the interim.
- 6.7 **Mr Vincent Fung** said that TC supported the proposal in principle. As the wheel was a temporary structure, it could be treated as a quick-win project, which was in line with the spirit of HPPs. From the tourism angle, the location of the proposed wheel could form a cluster with other nearby attractions and become a selling point to tourists.
- 6.8 In response to Members' queries and comments, **Mrs Loh** said that:-
- (a) the proponent had discussed with LandsD to explore suitable sites at the harbourfront for the observation wheel. The proponent finally considered that the current site at Central was the most suitable;
 - (b) the proponent had contacted the West Kowloon Cultural District Authority (WKCD) before but the proposal was not accepted;
 - (c) the wheel could be erected within 10 days. Therefore, it could be flexibly re-arranged for set-up at different locations;
 - (d) the proposed observation wheel at Central was of the same category and similar height as the Ferris Wheel set up in the 2006 Winter Carnival at the Tamar Site;
 - (e) about 2,970 m² of the harbourfront land would be occupied to operate the wheel. TD and the Police would be consulted, with the Traffic Impact Assessment done, before taking the proposal forward;
 - (f) the proposal would be assessed in terms of environmental impact such as noise and light generated in order to satisfy the requirements set out by the Environmental Protection Department and the Marine Department;
 - (g) the proponent would strictly observe the regulations promulgated by the Buildings Department and the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department on

Action

structures and resistance to typhoon. The wheel could withstand typhoon with wind speed up to 120 to 150 km/hour. Suitable structures would also be in place to hold the wheel tightly to the ground; and

- (h) it would charge less than HKD\$100 for a single ride on the wheel.

6.9 While agreeing that the current site in Central was a possible option, **Mr Eric Fok** opined that WKCD could be a better alternative. Synergy would be achieved if the wheel was clustered with the evening light show and other functions organised for tourists at WKCD. He concurred with the idea of moving the wheel around different locations to enhance attractiveness of different areas along the harbourfront. By drawing to the riding experience on the London Eye, he suggested the proponent to provide films or videos along the ticketing queue to educate tourists on Hong Kong's culture and history, and the development of Hong Kong and its harbourfront. He also raised the following questions:-

- (a) the attractiveness and uniqueness that the proposed observation wheel in Hong Kong could offer, as it would be smaller than the Singapore Flyer; and
- (b) whether there were other similar observation wheels in Asia.

6.10 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** opined that the observation wheel was a very good tourist attraction in the short term. However, the proposal should be viewed in light of the permanent projects featured in the Business Viability Study for the Development of Sites 4 and 7 at the new Central harbourfront.

6.11 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** opined that the proposed wheel would not be attractive enough to target the right market niches in terms of pricing. Regarding WKCD as the alternative location for the wheel, he asked why WKCDA had given a negative response and if the proponent had approached the WKCDA's management directly.

6.12 In response to Mr Fok's suggestion, **Ms Brenda Au** supplemented that the expanded Hong Kong Planning and Infrastructure Exhibition Gallery (HKPIEG) at the City Hall Annex would be open in 2012. Educational and useful

Action

information on planning and development of Hong Kong would be showcased to the public at HKPIEG.

6.13 In response to Members' further questions and comments, **Mrs Loh** said that:-

- (a) the proposed wheel in Hong Kong was 60-metre high. The same wheel structure had been set up in many other cities as observation wheel;
- (b) the wheel would offer tourism gimmick and serve as an alternative destination for visitors who wished to have a quick view of Victoria Harbour. With boats and ferries passing by the harbour, the view from the observation wheel at Central was attractive and it could not be offered in other cities in Asia;
- (c) with the support lent by the Task Force, the proponent would be pleased to go back to WKCD regarding the proposal;
- (d) equipment could be installed inside the wheel capsules for playing video, educational information and publicity of the wheel; and
- (e) while financial viability was key to fund the business proposal, the proponent would strike a balance to set the ticket price, which would be less than \$100 per person.

6.14 **Ms Gracie Foo** said that, while some Members opined that the proponent could consider placing the observation wheel at other suitable harbourfront sites (e.g. WKCD), there were also Members supporting the proposal in the present location (i.e. Central) proposed by the proponent. The choice of location would be, after all, a business decision of the proponent and it would be up to the proponent to decide finally. The government departments would play a facilitating role in processing the short-term tenancy submitted by the proponent.

6.15 **Mr Zimmerman** objected to erecting the proposed observation wheel before the Queen's Pier would be reinstated. In response, **the Chair** said that Mr Zimmerman's comments were noted.

6.16 **Dr Smith** suggested the proponent to consider offering rebates

Action

to visitors when the harbour could not be clearly viewed due to air pollution. **Mrs Loh** responded that the proponent would take this suggestion into consideration.

- 6.17 **Mrs Loh** supplemented that the observation wheel was readily available in the United Kingdom and could be shipped to Hong Kong within 30 days. The wheel however could not be set up earlier as the site would only be available in early 2012.
- 6.18 **Mr Zimmerman** asked if the large anchor of the Hong Kong Maritime Museum would be located at the same location as the proposed observation wheel. **Ms Au** clarified that the anchor would be located in the open space outside Central Pier No. 8, which was on the west side of the proposed wheel.
- 6.19 **The Chair** concluded that Members found the proposal innovative but the meeting had mixed views on the chosen location. On the understanding that the observation wheel was a temporary set-up, the Task Force supported the proposal in principle.

(Post-meeting note: The Secretariat received the Hall Organisation Ltd's advice on 1 December 2011 that the proposed observation wheel would be named "the Wheel of Fortune" instead of "the Hong Kong Eye".)

**Item 7 Connectivity at Central and Wanchai Harbourfront
(Paper No. TFHK/15/2011)**

- 7.1 **Mr Alan Tam** of TD briefed Members on the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation.
- 7.2 **The Chair** commented that TD's paper only covered the existing pedestrian connectivity at Central and Wanchai harbourfront without mentioning any planned or future proposals for enhancing connectivity.
- 7.3 **Mr Tam** responded that different walkways would be provided along the public roads in the projects committed by different bureaux and departments for the harbourfront areas.
- 7.4 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the Task Force had not thoroughly examined the elevated walkway system at the Central and Wanchai harbourfront before. He opined that the

Action

walkway system for the entire harbourfront should be comprehensively reviewed to address pedestrian circulation at different levels. He suggested the item be placed on future agenda again.

- 7.5 In conclusion, **the Chair** suggested that TD revert with a presentation which carried a combination of present and future positions of harbourfront connectivity, and advise how the planned connection would work in practice. In response, **Mr Tam** said TD would revert to the Task Force at an appropriate juncture.

TD

Item 8 Any Other Business

Water Quality within the Harbour

- 8.1 Regarding the recent press reports on water quality in the harbour, **the Chair** suggested that representatives of the Environmental Protection Department be invited to make a presentation.

Central Pier No. 3

- 8.2 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that he wanted to visit the restricted area of Central Pier No. 3 to observe the gondola railing before further commenting on TD's note. TD was requested to arrange for a site visit for Mr Zimmerman.

TD

Date of Next Meeting

- 8.3 **The Chair** announced that the next meeting had been tentatively scheduled for 14 November 2011 (Monday).
- 8.4 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

Secretariat

**Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island
January 2012**