

Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island

Minutes of Eleventh Meeting

Date : 30 October 2012
Time : 2:30 p.m.
Venue : Conference Room, 15/F, North Point Government
Offices, 333 Java Road, Hong Kong

Present

Mr Nicholas Brooke	Chair
Mrs Margaret Brooke	Representing Business Environment Council
Mr Lam Kin-lai	Representing the Conservancy Association
Dr Frederick Lee	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Franklin Yu	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Tam Po-yiu	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Dr Paul Ho	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Dr Peter Cookson Smith	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Mr Paul Zimmerman	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Mr Benjamin Cha	
Mr Eric Fok	
Mr Vincent Ng	
Mr Lam Cheuk-yum	
Mr Thomas Chan	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Ms Stephanie Lai	Senior Manager (Tourism) 2, Tourism Commission
Mr Chan Chung-yuen	Chief Traffic Engineer/Hong Kong, Transport Department (TD)
Mr Mak Chi-biu	Chief Engineer/Hong Kong 1, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Miss Olivia Chan	Assistant Director(Leisure Services)2, Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Ms Ginger Kiang	District Planning Officer/Hong Kong, Planning Department (PlanD)
Mr Larry Chu	Secretary

In Attendance

Mrs Winnie Kang	Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Frederick Yu	Assistant Secretary (Harbour) Special Duties, DEVB
Miss Venus Tsoi	Assistant Secretary (Harbour) 2, DEVB
Mr Peter Mok	Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB

Absent with Apologies

Mr Leung Kong-yui	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Mr Leslie Chen	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Ir Dr Chan Fuk-cheung	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Louis Loong	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Chan Hok-fung	
Ms Lily Chow	
Ms Joanne Chan	
Mr David Chan	
Ms Patricia Or	

For Agenda Item 3

Mr Albert Liu	Deputy Project Manager/Major Works (2), Highways Department (HyD)
Mr Victor Chan	Chief Engineer 4/Major Works, HyD
Mr Conrad Ng	Executive Director, AECOM Asia Co Ltd
Mr Alex Li	Principal Engineer, AECOM Asia Co Ltd
Mr S K Lo	Chief Resident Engineer, AECOM Asia Co Ltd
Mr K C Cheung	Site Agent, Chun Wo - CRGL - MBEC Joint Venture
Mr Vincent Ng	Director, AGC Design Ltd
Mr Terence Kong	Architectural Officer, AGC Design Ltd
Ms Jan Lung	Landscape Architect, Earthasia Ltd

For Agenda Item 4

Mr Shuki Leung	Glory United Development Ltd
Mr Richard Chong	Glory United Development Ltd
Ms Alison Ip	Glory United Development Ltd
Mr Phill Black	Pro Plan Asia Ltd
Ms Veronica Luk	Pro Plan Asia Ltd

Ms Phoebe To	Dennis Lau & Ng Chun Man Architects & Engineers (H.K.) Ltd
Mr Kim Chin	CKM Asia Ltd
Ms Elsa Kwong	ADI Limited
Ms Emma Leung	Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd

For Agenda Item 5

Mr Mak Chi-biu	Chief Engineer/Hong Kong 1, CEDD
Mr Ko Wai-kuen	Senior Engineer 7 (Hong Kong Island Division 1), CEDD
Mr Charles Luk	Executive Director, AECOM Asia Co Ltd

For Agenda Item 6

Update on Temporary Uses of the New Central Harbourfront Sites

Mrs Winnie Kang	Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
-----------------	---

Proposed Design of Areas F and G

Mr Lam Kwai-sang	Chief Project Manager 103, Architectural Services Department (ArchSD)
Mr Simon Chan	Senior Project Manager 121, ArchSD
Mr Rocco Yim	Executive Director, Rocco Design Architects Ltd
Mr William Tam	Director, Rocco Design Architects Ltd
Mr Joseph Kong	Associate, Rocco Design Architects Ltd

Management of Areas fronting Central Piers

Mr Chan Chung-yuen	Chief Traffic Engineer/Hong Kong, TD
Mr Ken Wong	Chief Transport Officer/Planning/Ferry Review, TD

Any Other Business

Mr Mak Chi-biu	Chief Engineer/Hong Kong 1, CEDD
Mr Ko Wai-kuen	Senior Engineer 7 (Hong Kong Island Division 1), CEDD
Mr Chan Chung-yuen	Chief Traffic Engineer/Hong Kong, TD

Action

Welcoming Message

The Chair welcomed all to the meeting. He advised Members that Mr Thomas Chan had taken over the post of Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)¹ of DEVB from Ms Gracie Foo with effect from 6 September 2012 and Mr Larry Chu had taken over the role as the

Action

Secretary of the Task Force from Mr Chris Fung with effect from 16 October 2012. He thanked Ms Foo and Mr Fung for their contributions to the work of the Task Force.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 10th Meeting

- 1.1 **The Chair** said that the Secretariat circulated the draft minutes of the 10th meeting to Members on 17 September 2012 and no comments from Members had been received.
- 1.2 Regarding paragraph 2.13 of the draft minutes, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** asked that the issues which he raised on the temporary uses of the new Central harbourfront sites be listed out, such as the sites should be open and permeable without perimeter fencing and an integrated design should be adopted. For efficiency sake, **the Chair** suggested and **Mr Paul Zimmerman** agreed to put on record in the minutes of this meeting.
- 1.3 As no further amendment was proposed, the draft minutes were confirmed.

Item 2 Matters Arising

Update on Temporary Uses of the New Central Harbourfront Sites (paragraph 2.13 of the confirmed minutes of the 10th meeting)

- 2.1 **The Chair** said that Harbour Unit of DEVB would update Members on the temporary uses of the new Central harbourfront sites under Agenda Item 6 of this meeting.

Briefing on the Planning of Wan Chai Development Phase II (WDII) Project (paragraphs 3.18 and 3.19 of the confirmed minutes of the 10th meeting)

- 2.2 **The Chair** informed Members that PlanD and CEDD were working on the scope of the integrated study to take forward the detailed planning of the Wan Chai waterfront, and would come back to brief the Task Force when ready. As regards the information of works projects being carried out in the WDII site, CEDD would provide the information to Mr Paul Zimmerman separately as requested.

Action

- 2.3 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested that CEDD should arrange a meeting with the Royal Hong Kong Yacht Club and other concerned parties to explore possible changes to the current works contracts under the WDII project with a view to facilitating future harbourfront enhancement in the area. **Mr Mak Chi-biu** replied that such a meeting could be arranged in due course.

CEDD

Proposed Exterior Designs for the East Ventilation Building (EVB), Administration Building (ADB) and East Vent Shaft (EVS) of the Central - Wan Chai Bypass (CWB) Project (paragraph 6.13 of the confirmed minutes of the 10th meeting)

- 2.4 **The Chair** said that HyD would give a presentation on the design of the landscape deck as well as the noise barriers/semi-enclosures to be implemented at the future CWB and Island Eastern Corridor Link at the North Point harbourfront under Agenda Item 3 of this meeting.

Item 3 Central-Wan Chai Bypass and Island Eastern Corridor Link ("CWB") - Appearance of CWB Noise Mitigation Measures at the Harbour-front of North Point (Paper No. TFHK/11/2012)

- 3.1 **The Chair** informed the meeting that Mr Vincent Ng was a Director of AGC Design Ltd which was one of HyD's consultants for the project. Mr Ng would attend this part of the meeting in the capacity as HyD's consultant.
- 3.2 **The Chair** welcomed the project team to the meeting. **Mr Albert Liu** of HyD, **Mr Alex Li** of AECOM Asia Co Ltd and **Mr Vincent Ng** of AGC Design Ltd briefed Members on the paper, with the aid of a PowerPoint and a scaled model.
- 3.3 In response to the Chair's enquiry, **Mr Vincent Ng** said that the present scheme had been presented to the residents in the vicinity during the public engagement exercise.
- 3.4 **The Chair** expressed the need to have a coordinated design for this waterfront area as the proposed scheme was only one of the developments.
- 3.5 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** asked HyD to address the issues which Members raised at the last meeting concerning the area,

Action

including public access to the landscape deck and ground level visual permeability to the harbourfront affected by the administration building (ADB) at ground level, etc.

- 3.6 **Dr Frederick Lee** enquired on the number of participants in the public engagement activities and whether relevant stakeholders had been consulted so as to avoid dissatisfaction from nearby residents after commencement of the project.
- 3.7 **Mr Lam Kin-lai** opined that the residents living on the lower floors of adjacent residential buildings should be specifically consulted as their view would be affected by the proposed scheme.
- 3.8 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** added that the proposed landscape deck would provide little visual or recreational benefits to the public at ground level. He suggested more greenery could be incorporated into the scheme so as to merge it with the public space in the vicinity.
- 3.9 In response to Members' comments and enquiries, **Mr Albert Liu** replied that -
- (a) the Administration would take into account the proposed landscape deck and other noise mitigation structures when designing the waterfront open space in future;
 - (b) the ADB had been designed as a structure underneath the reconstructed Island Eastern Corridor (IEC) westbound flyover in order to maximize the efficiency of land use and to minimize its visual disturbance to the surrounding area. Due to the site constraint, the proposed design would not be able to provide for a view corridor through the building;
 - (c) the landscape deck was located within the tunnel area and according to current practice, it would not be accessible to the public due to operational and traffic safety considerations. Notwithstanding this, the design of the landscape deck would not preclude public access in future. HyD would consider Members' views of enabling public access to the deck;
 - (d) HyD had endeavoured to engage all stakeholders in the

Action

vicinity, including residents and management offices of the nearby residential estates. Public forums had been held and newsletters on the latest developments of the project had been issued quarterly since 2010. Actual number of participants in the public engagement activities could be provided to Members after the meeting;

HyD

- (e) HyD had presented the aesthetic and landscaping design of the proposed scheme including a diagram showing the affected floors of the nearby buildings. HyD would deal with any requests for compensation in accordance with established procedures; and
 - (f) as the expected noise level at some noise sensitive receivers affected by the CWB would exceed the noise limit under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (EIAO), HyD was required to implement noise mitigation measures under the law. Noise barriers and semi-enclosures were effective noise mitigation measures approved under the EIAO and HyD had endeavoured to minimize its visual intrusion as far as possible through various means, such as using transparent vertical noise barrier panels.
- 3.10 In response to the Chair's enquiry, **Mr Vincent Ng** responded that given the site restrictions, the project team had made the best attempt to comply with the Harbour Planning Principles (HPPs) when working out the design of noise mitigation measures, and to integrate the proposed scheme with the future open space in the vicinity.
- 3.11 **Dr Frederick Lee** supplemented that HyD should adopt a more proactive approach in conducting the public engagement exercise so as to reach out to all relevant stakeholders.
- 3.12 **Mr Lam Kin-lai** said that the proposed noise mitigation structures were too bulky and obstructing the view of the residents living in the vicinity. He asked whether it was necessary to install the proposed noise barriers on the part of IEC concerned.
- 3.13 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** asked whether it was necessary to install the noise barrier given the expected noise at some noise sensitive receivers affected by that part of CWB would exceed

Action

the noise limit under the EIAO and the residents living in the vicinity should be well aware of the noise issue when purchasing the properties.

3.14 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** commented that any visual intrusion into the sightline of the harbour, such as noise barriers in this case, would be in contravention of HPPs. He also asked HyD to address other issues such as landing facilities in the area.

3.15 **Mr Franklin Yu** asked whether it was possible to build noise barrier to cover only the newly added part in order to reduce the visual intrusion to other areas.

3.16 Quoting the example of a public viewing platform structure on top of a tunnel in Amsterdam, **Mr Tam Po-yiu** suggested that similar structure could be built on top of the CWB tunnel to allow public access.

3.17 **Mr Eric Fok** asked whether the design of the tunnel would allow sharing use by vehicles in opposite direction during late evening hours, and whether the design had included emergency evacuation route in case of fire.

3.18 **Mr Albert Liu** responded that -

(a) HyD had been in regular contact with the affected parties and trying the best to address their concerns;

(b) HyD was bound by the EIAO to implement noise mitigation measures and had tried the best to minimize the visual intrusion of the proposed measures. The proposed noise barriers and semi-enclosures were required to comply with the EIAO requirements;

(c) in designing the ADB, HyD had attempted to strike a balance between visual permeability and efficient utilization of the space underneath the IEC;

(d) HyD would provide further details on tunnel operation and safety, including its design and emergency evacuation arrangement in case of fire to Members after the meeting; and

HyD

(e) HyD would revisit the issues such as the accessibility to the landscape deck and landing facilities within the site.

HyD

Action

3.19 In closing the discussion on this item, **the Chair** asked the project team to take into account Members' comments, such as accessibility to the landscape deck, visual permeability, etc. For the public engagement exercise, he suggested that HyD should invite affected residents to consider whether the noise level would be acceptable if the proposed noise mitigation measures were not implemented. **Mr Albert Liu** said that HyD would provide written response on the issues to the Task Force after the meeting.

HyD

Item 4 S.16 Application for Office Development with Eating Place, Shops & Services at CDA(1) Zone, 14-30 King Wah Road, North Point (Paper No. TFHK/12/2012)

4.1 **The Chair** welcomed the project team to the meeting. **Mr Shuki Leung** of Glory United Development Limited and **Mr Phill Black** of Pro Plan Asia Ltd presented the paper, with the aid of a PowerPoint.

4.2 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** appreciated the design of the passageway at the western boundary of the development. He suggested allowing outdoor café area or retail facilities at ground level facing the future open space underneath IEC. He suggested that the visual permeability of ground level at the eastern boundary should be improved, and asked whether there would be fences impeding public access. He also enquired for more information about the emergency vehicular access (EVA) at the northern boundary.

4.3 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** asked if there would be a more coordinated landscape proposal with other projects in this area, including the proposed boardwalk underneath IEC.

4.4 In response to Members' comments, **Mr Phill Black** said that -

(a) the development had been set back from King Wah Road to provide a landscape area along the road and therefore there would not be sufficient space at ground level for outdoor dining facilities. There would be indoor restaurants on the first floor facing the future public open space underneath IEC;

(b) the driveway at the eastern boundary of the development

Action

would provide a visual corridor to the waterfront and there would be no fence along the site boundary; and

- (c) the project proponent had worked out a landscape concept for the ground linkage between the development and the future open space underneath IEC.

4.5 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested that the restaurant might be moved to the roof floor since the view of waterfront at the first floor would be affected by the proposed noise barrier of the CWB project.

4.6 **Mr Franklin Yu** appreciated that the project team had paid efforts to comply with HPPs. He asked how the project proponent could achieve a lower than permitted plot ratio in this development.

4.7 **Mr Phill Black** said that PlanD did not define the extent to lower the plot ratio. The present overall plot ratio of 8.78 was an arbitrary figure but had shown the project proponent's willingness to cooperate.

4.8 In concluding the discussion, **the Chair** said that Members were generally supportive of the proposal and agreed that it had responded to HPPs, given the constraints of the site. The project proponent was advised to take into account Members' comments when refining the proposal.

Item 5 Topical Study on the Proposed Boardwalk underneath the Island Eastern Corridor (Paper No. TFHK/13/2012)

5.1 **The Chair** welcomed the project team to the meeting. **Mr Mak Chi-biu** of CEDD and **Mr Charles Luk** of AECOM Asia Co Ltd briefed Members on the paper, with the aid of a PowerPoint.

5.2 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** said that the proposed boardwalk should be designed comprehensively to allow multiple uses, emphasise pedestrian continuity and maximise connectivity from the hinterland to the waterfront. He opined that the proposed incorporation of cycle track into the boardwalk could not be justified by transport or recreational needs, given the competition with pedestrian movement and the fragmented design. There was already an extensive recreational cycle track network in the New Territories.

Action

- 5.3 Echoing the view, **Mr Benjamin Cha** added that the design of the boardwalk could be improved by excluding the proposed cycle track.
- 5.4 **Mr Lam Kin-lai** concerned that the change in level along the boardwalk would affect its accessibility for the elderly and at the same time increase the construction cost.
- 5.5 **Mr Vincent Ng** queried whether there was a genuine need for the boardwalk to have convoluted alignment and changes in level. He asked whether reclamation or hanging structures would be needed to support the raised bridge between the pile caps of IEC, and whether a retractable bridge was possible for passage of fire boats.
- 5.6 **Mr Lam Cheuk-yum** asked if bridge structures, which might obstruct the view of the residents in the vicinity, were required to support the loading of the boardwalk.
- 5.7 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** made the following comments -
- (a) he appreciated the project team's efforts to maximize the width of the boardwalk;
 - (b) if reclamation was required, the project team should outline the process to establish the overriding public need under the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (PHO), and advise whether the test could be satisfied or not;
 - (c) he noticed that marine traffic arising from the piers nearby was infrequent and doubted whether the inconvenient changes in level was necessary. The project team should study alternative measures having regard to accessibility, connectivity and cost implications;
 - (d) the number of connections to the hinterland at street level would be limited if a raised bridge structure was adopted. Sufficient landing facilities should also be provided; and
 - (e) he asked if the design of the retractable bridge at the North Point fire services pier was shown to Members in previous presentations on the same issue.

5.8 **Mr Mak Chi-biu** responded that -

- (a) the topical study only focused on a number of issues that enable CEDD to understand the scope for a further technical feasibility study;
- (b) issues such as connectivity to the hinterland, walking environment, and landing facilities could be addressed in the future study;
- (c) the gradient of the proposed boardwalk was mild and relevant government guidelines enabling disabled persons to use the boardwalk would be observed. The project team would also be mindful of the gradient issue so as to facilitate the elderly;
- (d) as compared with the “low-level bridge” concept under the Hong Kong Island East Harbour-front Study, the present scheme could continue to allow marine uses underneath IEC;
- (e) the Fire Services Department (FSD) had emphasized the importance of effective discharge of rescue boats, personnel and equipment at the North Point fire services pier. FSD’s requirements had been taken into account in the conceptual layout; and
- (f) CEDD was open-minded and would take into account Members’ views in working out the way forward.

5.9 **Mr Franklin Yu** appreciated that the project team had put in place cantilevered structure outside the footprint of IEC, where there was insufficient headroom, in order to create a good relationship between the boardwalk and the waterfront. He suggested that more sections of the boardwalk could adopt this design if appropriate.

5.10 **The Chair** suggested that the study might examine two scenarios in parallel, with and without cycling track, to compare their cost and reclamation implications. He asked the project team to provide an update to the Task Force when the study result became available.

CEDD

Item 6 Action Areas: Central Action Area

Update on Temporary Uses of the New Central Harbourfront Sites

6.1 With the aid of a PowerPoint, **Mrs Winnie Kang** of Harbour Unit updated Members on the temporary uses of the new Central harbourfront sites as follows -

- (a) Area A would be used as a temporary entertainment site with an observation wheel and ancillary facilities. A short-term tenancy (STT) had been issued on 30 October 2012. To ensure that applications would not be only competing on monetary terms but also on technical proposal, a two-envelope approach had been adopted;
- (b) the Lands Department had been liaising with the Hong Kong Maritime Museum (HKMM) on the proposal to place an anchor at the site fronting Central Piers Nos. 9 and 10, which was next to Central Pier No. 8 where HKMM was located. Harbour Unit was actively liaising with all concerned parties to facilitate the arrangement;
- (c) Areas D and E would be a temporary event site to bring vibrancy and diversity of activities to the harbourfront. The Hong Kong Philharmonic Orchestra would hold a concert "Symphony Under the Stars" on 9 November 2012 at Area D, which would be the first signature event in the new Central harbourfront sites. After the event, CEDD would continue the enhancement works to equip the sites with basic infrastructure to facilitate future event uses. The enhancement works would be completed by the first quarter of 2013. A STT under two-envelope approach for organising events in these two sites was being prepared; and
- (d) Areas F and G would be used as a temporary passive open space and pet garden respectively to be managed by LCSD. Existing resources would be allocated for developing the sites so as to allow early public enjoyment. The design and facilities provided would be relatively basic. It was planned that the sites would be opened to the public by the end of 2013. She invited the project team to brief Members on the detailed design of the sites.

Proposed Design of Areas F and G

- 6.2 **Mr Lam Kwai-sang** of ArchSD and **Mr Rocco Yim** of Rocco Design Architects Limited presented the proposed design of Areas F and G, with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 6.3 **Mrs Winnie Kang** supplemented that there would be a waterfront café operated by a non-governmental organization (NGO) at the advance promenade in the new Central harbourfront near the sites. In response to the Chair's enquiry, she said that apart from the toilet in Area G, there would also be toilets in Area D and Tamar Park for public use. She added that the temporary uses would last for about three years to tie in with the long term development schedule of Site 7.
- 6.4 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** commented that the design should avoid level difference and use of kerb which might cause slip-and-fall accidents to visitors. Fences should also be avoided to ensure uninterrupted public access. He suggested that instead of concrete wall, a more permeable design should be explored for separating dogs of different sizes in the pet garden.
- 6.5 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** enquired on how the light in the Areas would be distributed in order to show a clear walk path during night time.
- 6.6 Quoting the example of Shanghai Expo, **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** suggested designating some area for café with outside seating to attract people to the area. He also queried the necessity for a pet garden in Central as pet owners might prefer bringing their pets to places near their homes. In response, **the Chair** said that there was very strong public demand for pet garden in Central and Wanchai area.
- 6.7 **Mr Lam Kin-lai** welcomed the pet garden which could replace the former one in Wan Chai. He expressed the need to have parking space or traffic lay-by near the sites.
- 6.8 **Mr Rocco Yim** responded that fences about 1.1 metres in height would be required for keeping dogs inside the circular area in the pet garden. Due to its temporary nature as well as cost and maintenance consideration, fair-faced concrete was suggested to be used as the material for the separation. There would be pole lights along the footpath to achieve the lux level required for the park. The project team would continue to explore the

Action

possibility of avoiding the kerb between the footpath and the lawn while noting LCSD's maintenance concerns. Temporary toilets were required in the pet garden because pets were not allowed in the advance promenade and Tamar Park.

- 6.9 **Miss Olivia Chan** said that the temporary pet garden in the former Wan Chai Waterfront was very popular and there was strong public demand and support from the Central and Western District Council for developing this pet garden. A toilet was proposed at the eastern end of Area G to achieve a fair distribution of toilets within the new Central harbourfront sites. The experience of the Tamar Park was that kerb was required to prevent the grass and soil from being washed away during heavy rainfall on site with sloping topography.
- 6.10 **Mrs Winnie Kang** responded that Harbour Unit was liaising with TD, HyD and CEDD to find suitable locations in the vicinity for arranging metered parking.
- 6.11 **Mr Eric Fok** said that the proposed fence in Area F might limit the size of activity area. In response, **Mr Rocco Yim** said that it was a continuous bench for people to seat around with a natural focal point for performances.
- 6.12 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** reiterated his concerns on the separation for dogs and the use of kerb. He suggested replacing fair-faced concrete with artificial timber for the separation wall.
- 6.13 In response, **Miss Olivia Chan** said that some dog owners did request to segregate dogs of different sizes, but LCSD had no strong view on whether to have such separation in the pet garden. LCSD was also open-minded on using kerb or other means as long as the soil drain problem could be resolved. LCSD would work with partners in refining the detailed design having regard to Members' comments.
- 6.14 In closing the discussion, **the Chair** asked ArchSD to work with LCSD to refine the design, taking into account Members' comments.

Management of areas fronting Central Piers

- 6.15 **Mr Ken Wong** of TD and **Mr Mak Chi-biu** of CEDD presented a note on the management of areas fronting Central Piers, which was tabled at the meeting.

- 6.16 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** opined that designated space should be provided within the piers at ground floor for storage purpose, noting that some unattended items were found placed at the promenade.
- 6.17 **Mr Ken Wong** responded that the project for the construction of additional floors on Central Piers No. 4 to 6 was at the detailed design stage. According to the preliminary design, there would be limited space available on ground floor after providing the necessary facilities including passengers' waiting rooms, barrier free lifts, fire services installations and two small convenient shops. Notwithstanding, CEDD and TD would examine the feasibility of the suggestion.

Item 7 Any Other Business

Design of Lung Wo Road (P2)

- 7.1 **The Chair** informed Members that a letter from the Designing Hong Kong Limited to the South China Morning Post and a note of response from CEDD and TD on the design of Lung Wo Road were tabled at the meeting.
- 7.2 In response to the Chair's enquiry, **Mr Mak Chi-biu** said that there was no plan to raise the speed limit along Lung Wo Road at the moment. The speed limit for the entire Lung Wo Road might be reviewed after the completion of the CWB project.
- 7.3 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the Government had promised that Lung Wo Road would be a dual two-lane boulevard with a speed limit of 50 kilometres per hour (km/h) instead of a highway with concrete central barriers. He asked the Government to revise the design by replacing the concrete central barriers with planters.
- 7.4 **Mr Chan Chung-yuen** of TD said that the speed limit of the road was set at 50 km/h as requested but a recent survey indicated that only 15% of vehicles were driving below the speed limit. Therefore, there was a need to provide sufficient protection to road users. **Mr Mak Chi-biu** said that CEDD

Action

7.5 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** commented that Lung Wo Road should be designed as a boulevard to provide a good walking environment with widened space and tree shades for pedestrians.

7.6 **The Chair** concluded that whilst in the short term P2 might be providing relief to the heavy traffic congestion in Central, any suggestion of an increased speed limit would be strongly resisted and indeed in the longer term Members expected that the original intention of a tree-lined boulevard to be met. He requested CEDD and TD to provide a written response on Members' comments.

**CEDD
TD**

Underground Pedestrian Network to Enhance Connectivity in Causeway Bay

7.7 With the aid of a PowerPoint, **Mr Chan Chung-yuen** of TD presented an information note about the proposed underground pedestrian network to enhance connectivity in Causeway Bay, which was tabled at the meeting.

7.8 Members noted that while the proposal did not include connection to the waterfront, provisions could be made for further extension of the subway system to the harbourfront in future.

The Queen's Pier

7.9 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** asked for a review of the location for reassembling of the Queen's Pier, including the possibility of reassembling it at the open space outside the City Hall.

7.10 **Mrs Winnie Kang** responded that under "the Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront", the Queen's Pier would be reassembled between Central Piers Nos. 9 and 10. She supplemented that enhancement initiatives were being contemplated at the open space outside the City Hall and further details would be reported to the Task Force in due course.

7.11 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested that the open space outside the City Hall should be considered as one of the possible options for reassembly of Queen's Pier.

7.12 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

**Secretariat
Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island
April 2013**