

Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island

Minutes of Twelfth Meeting

Date : 21 February 2013
Time : 9:30 a.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 Leung Kong-yui	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Mr Lam Kin-lai	Representing the Conservancy Association
Mr Franklin Yu	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Leslie Chen	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 Paul Zimmerman	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Mr Chan Hok-fung	
Mr Eric Fok	
Mr Lam Cheuk-yum	
Ms Patricia Or	
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 Tsui Kwok-wah	Senior Engineer 11 (Hong Kong Island Division 1), Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Mr Richard Wong	Chief Leisure Manager (Hong Kong West), Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Ms Ginger Kiang	District Planning Officer/Hong Kong, Planning Department (PlanD)
Ms April Kun	Senior Town Planner/ Hong Kong 4, 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
Mr Michael Ng	Principal Transport Officer/ Management, TD

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 Louis Loong	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Benjamin Cha	
Ms Lily Chow	
Mr Vincent Ng	
Ms Joanne Chan	
Mr David Chan	

For Agenda Item 3

Mr Edmund Sin	Project Manager, Choice Win (H.K.) Limited
Mr Simon Wong	Senior Town Planner, In Yam Development Limited
Miss Joe Lam	Assistant Town Planner, In Yam Development Limited
Mr Kelvin Ip	Director, Ronald Lu & Partners (Hong Kong) Ltd.
Mr Lemuel Cheng	Associate Director, Ronald Lu & Partners (Hong Kong) Ltd.
Ms Bella Fan	Senior Associate, Ronald Lu & Partners (Hong Kong) Ltd.
Mr Alan Macdonald	Director, Urbis Limited
Miss Janice Lo	Planner, Urbis Limited
Ms Winnie Wu	Associate, LD Asia
Miss Michelle Chan	Assistant Town Planner, LD Asia

For Agenda Item 4

Miss Elsa Cheuk	Chief Town Planner/ Special Duties (Acting), PlanD
Mr Timothy Lui	Senior Town Planner/ Special Duties 1, PlanD

For Agenda Item 5

Mr Ian Brownlee	Director, Masterplan Limited
Ms Kira Brownlee	Town Planner, Masterplan Limited
Mr Benson Poon	Town Planner, Masterplan Limited
Mr Graeme Reading	Founder, Café Deco Group
Mr Johnny Leung	Managing Director, Star Ferry Company Limited
Mr Eric Or	Senior Manager, Star Ferry Company Limited

For Agenda Item 6

Mr Ian Brownlee	Director, Masterplan Limited
Ms Kira Brownlee	Town Planner, Masterplan Limited
Mr Benson Poon	Town Planner, Masterplan Limited
Mr Johnny Leung	Managing Director, Star Ferry Company Limited (SFCL)
Mr Eric Or	Senior Manager, SFCL

Action

Welcoming Message

The Chair welcomed all to the meeting.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 11th Meeting

1.1 **The Chair** said that the Secretariat circulated the draft minutes of the 11th meeting to Members on 8 January 2013; and no comments from Members had been received. On paragraph 7.6 of the draft minutes concerning the discussion on design of Lung Wo Road, he suggested adding that Members expected that a tree-lined boulevard to be met in the long run.

1.2 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** echoed the Chair's suggestion and opined that paragraph 5.10 and paragraph 7.6 of the draft minutes did not accurately reflect Members' discussion on the issues concerned. **The Chair** suggested and **Mr Paul**

**The
Secretariat**

Action

Zimmerman agreed to recirculate items 5 and 7 of the draft minutes for Members' comments.

- 1.3 As no other amendment was proposed, the draft minutes were confirmed subject to Members' further comments on items 5 and 7.

(Post meeting note: items 5 and 7 of the draft minutes were re-circulated to Members on 18 March 2013 and the revised minutes with Members' comments incorporated were confirmed by the Chair on 30 March 2013.)

Item 2 Matters Arising

Briefing on the Planning of Wan Chai Development Phase II (WDII) Project (paragraph 2.3 of the confirmed minutes of the 11th meeting)

- 2.1 **The Chair** said that on Mr Paul Zimmerman's suggestion to arrange a meeting between CEDD, the Royal Hong Kong Yacht Club (RHKYC) and other concerned parties to discuss possible changes to the current works contracts under the WDII project, CEDD was coordinating the meeting with relevant parties.

Central-Wan Chai Bypass and Island Eastern Corridor Link (CWB) – Appearance of CWB Noise Mitigation Measures at the Harbour-front of North Point (paragraphs 3.9(d), 3.18(d), 3.18(e) and 3.19 of the confirmed minutes of the 11th meeting)

- 2.2 **The Chair** informed Members that the Highways Department (HyD) had provided a written response to address Members' comments raised at the last meeting and it was issued to Members on 15 February 2013. He said that HyD had undertaken to brief Members on the issue of public access to the landscape deck when the result of its feasibility study was available.

HyD

Topical Study on the Proposed Boardwalk underneath the Island Eastern Corridor (paragraph 5.10 of the confirmed minutes of the 11th meeting)

- 2.3 **The Chair** said that according to Members' suggestion, CEDD and its consultant were studying the two scenarios, one with and one without cycle track, to compare their construction cost, and seeking legal advice on the implication related to the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (PHO). CEDD would try

CEDD

Action

to report back to the Task Force at the next meeting.

Design of Lung Wo Road (P2) (paragraphs 7.4 and 7.6 of the confirmed minutes of the 11th meeting)

- 2.4 **The Chair** said that CEDD and TD had provided a joint written response to address Members' comments and it was issued to Members on 15 February 2013. Separately, Harbour Unit reported at the Commission meeting on 7 January 2013 that the Police had stepped up enforcement action against speeding along Lung Wo Road.
- 2.5 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that he would not accept the response from CEDD and TD and insisted that the concrete barriers should be replaced by stone planters.
- 2.6 **Mr Chan Chung-yuen** responded that as it was no longer a traffic or transport issue, TD would leave it to CEDD to consider how to take forward Member's suggestion.
- 2.7 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** expressed the need to beautify the road as it was an important part of the Central waterfront. She opined that if stone planters could not be installed for technical reasons at the moment, the enhancement works should be implemented within a reasonable timeframe.
- 2.8 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** expressed that while he had no objection to install stone planters if it was technically feasible, he agreed with CEDD and TD that Lung Wo Road was currently serving as an important alternative route to ease traffic congestion in Central, any construction works that would affect the traffic should be carried out until the completion of Central-Wan Chai Bypass (CWB).
- 2.9 While agreeing that the traffic impact should be considered, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the road was currently underutilised and it should be acceptable to carry out some works to replace concrete barriers quickly. He also requested for a confirmation that concrete barriers would not be used in any future extension of the road.
- 2.10 **The Chair** concluded that Members supported the replacement of concrete barriers by stone planters at Lung Wo Road if feasible, and recognized that the enhancement works might be carried out after the completion of CWB.

Item 3 Proposed Comprehensive Development for Residential and Commercial Uses at Java Road and Tin Chiu Street, North Point, Hong Kong (Paper No. TFHK/01/2013)

- 3.1 Dr Peter Cookson Smith declared that he was a Director of Urbis Limited, which was one of the project proponent's consultants. The Chair decided that Dr Smith could remain in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion of this item.
- 3.2 **The Chair** welcomed the presentation team to the meeting. **Mr Alan Macdonald** of Urbis Limited and **Mr Kelvin Ip** of Ronald Lu & Partners (Hong Kong) Ltd briefed Members on the paper, with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 3.3 **The Chair** made the following enquiries –
- (a) whether the project proponent would take up the management and maintenance of the waterfront promenade after it was implemented;
 - (b) details of the Government, Institution or Community (G/IC) facilities to be included in the site; and
 - (c) details of the proposed pet garden including whether it would be accessible by the public.
- 3.4 **Mr Franklin Yu** asked the project team to supplement on the north-south pedestrian connectivity of the development, especially the access route to the waterfront. He enquired how the seaward view of the existing buildings in the hinterland could be preserved, apart from the visual corridors provided in the north-south direction.
- 3.5 **Mr Lam Kin-lai** said that the proposed development would provide nearly 300 car parking spaces and this would affected the already congested traffic condition at Java Road. He opined that opportunity might be taken to widen Java Road so as to improve the traffic situation. He also expressed that the buildings should have wider separations in order to avoid blocking the seaward view of the existing buildings in the hinterland.

3.6 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** made the following comments -

- (a) he said that Members had asked for an integrated design for the North Point Ferry Piers and the current site under one proponent but the present design did not include the piers;
- (b) the arrangement that the MTR station and piers were on the west of the site while the proposed public transport interchange (PTI) was on the east would not be convenient for the public to make the interchange;
- (c) a plan showing public open space and outdoor seating areas should be provided;
- (d) the area covered by emergency vehicular access (EVA) should be clearly indicated;
- (e) retail facilities should be provided along the PTI perimeter and the waterfront promenade;
- (f) the porosity of the buildings could be improved by providing wider separation;
- (g) a plan showing where dogs were allowed on-the-leash and off-the-leash should be provided; and
- (h) coach parking facilities should be provided in the development as there was a strong demand for such facility in the area.

3.7 **Mr Alan Macdonald** responded that -

- (a) under the land lease, the project proponent would hand over the waterfront promenade to LCSD for management, whereas the open space adjacent to the promenade would be managed and maintained by the project proponent;
- (b) according to the planning brief, the project proponent was required to provide a pet garden. It would be located adjacent to the PTI, surrounded by a peripheral wall and suitably landscaped;
- (c) efforts had been made on enhancing the north-south

Action

pedestrian connectivity through the development and the site would be connected to the MTR exit on the west via a tunnel across Java Road. The walking distance to the PTI was within normal range and the pedestrian connectivity with public transport facilities was considered adequate;

- (d) the project proponent was not required to widen Java road;
- (e) G/IC facilities to be provided within the site include public toilet, integrated family service centre, childcare centre, day care centre for the elderly, and community hall;
- (f) the project team would consider enhancing the interface with the piers but it would be subject to the progress of the topical study conducted by CEDD on the proposed boardwalk underneath the Island Eastern Corridor (IEC);
- (g) an EVA was planned along the waterfront;
- (h) a plan showing the areas of public and private open space and seating areas, and where dogs were allowed could be provided to Members;
- (i) the architectural design of the PTI would be further refined; and
- (j) parking facilities for up to 30 coaches, and pick-up and drop-off points for coaches would be provided within the development.

3.8 **Mr Kelvin Ip** supplemented that both the IEC and Java Road were major sources of noise. Having regard to the site constraints, the project team had already tried their best to balance all the factors and maximize the separations between buildings within the development and with the adjoining developments. The proposed building height within the development had taken into account the building heights of nearby developments.

3.9 In response to the Chair's enquiry on the building height restriction (BHR) of the site, **Mr Kelvin Ip** said that 80 mPD was the BHR set for the site. **The Chair** asked whether the noise

Action

mitigation measures along IEC would reduce noise impact to the development; and whether the horizontal spread of the buildings had been increased.

- 3.10 **Mr Alan Macdonald** said that the project team had tried to maintain a visually interesting height profile in the development, not simply by stepping down to the harbourfront but also stepping down to both sides. The team had not considered the noise barriers along IEC, but had set back the development to provide public open space at the waterfront in accordance with the Harbour Planning Principles. In addition, the buildings were arranged so that they would not face directly to the noise sources. He said that the current scheme was an improvement as compared to the baseline scheme in the planning brief.
- 3.11 **Mr Lam Kin-lai** reiterated that the project proponent should allow wider building separations instead of adopting a staggered building height profile, and he suggested that TD take the opportunity to widen Java Road.
- 3.12 **Mr Alan Macdonald** responded that the project proponent was required under the planning brief to have a 30-metre difference in building heights for the residential towers from the south to north. The separations between the buildings in the development had been positioned to avoid blocking the views of residents in the hinterland. Widening Java Road was outside the remit of the project proponent.
- 3.13 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** enquired about the design details on the ground level at the western boundary of the site, which would be a major entrance to the waterfront promenade in future.
- 3.14 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** enquired about the distribution of outdoor seating areas that would allow food and beverage and made the following comments -
- (a) shelters should be provided to pedestrians at ground level;
 - (b) pedestrian access should be clearly articulated and designed for pedestrians going between the piers and the MTR exits so that they would not be guided to the retail areas;

Action

- (c) as there were two EVAs within the development, the project team should explore the possibility of reducing one;
- (d) it should be clarified whether the coach parking facilities within the development could be used by the tourist coaches without restrictions;
- (e) the project team might make reference to the design of a PTI at Hung Hom, which had retail facilities and kiosks along its perimeter; and
- (f) as LCSD did not allow dogs on-the-leash in some public open space, a plan showing clearly the areas where people were allowed to walk with their dogs on-the-leash or off-the-leash should be provided.

3.15 In response, **Mr Alan Macdonald** said that -

- (a) public open space and major access to the development would be provided at the western edge of the site. Shaded seatings would also be provided;
- (b) extensive greening and shelters would be provided for pedestrians;
- (c) the integration of the MTR exit with the development and the provision of outdoor seating areas allowing food and beverage would be further reviewed;
- (d) given the requirements on EVA, the number of EVAs could not be reduced. The project proponent had already avoided the provision of a cycle track to provide more space for the promenade;
- (e) the project proponent would try to avoid restricting the use of coach parking facilities as in some developments in Tsim Sha Tsui and advice would be sought from TD in this regard;
- (f) the project proponent would provide retail facilities along the southern periphery of the site along Java Road. Given the footprint of the PTI, it would be difficult to provide retail facilities along the perimeter of the PTI; and

- (g) dogs would be allowed to enter into the pet garden from the eastern side of the site.

3.16 In closing the discussion, **the Chair** appreciated that the proposed design was a significant improvement as compared to the baseline scheme. He asked the project team to take into account Members' comments in working out the detailed design. On traffic matters such as coach parking and widening of Java Road, **the Chair** asked TD to provide a response.

TD

(Post-meeting note: After the meeting, Ms Patricia Or informed the Secretariat that her company Gammon Construction Ltd participated in an open tender exercise of the development. She declared that she was not aware of the company's involvement in the project at the time of the meeting. Noting that Ms Or had not made any remarks during the discussion on this item, the Chair agreed to record the declaration as a post-meeting note.)

Item 4 Amendments to the Draft Central District (Extension) Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H24/7 (Paper No. TFHK/02/2013)

- 4.1 **The Chair** welcomed colleagues of PlanD to the meeting. **Miss Elsa Cheuk** and **Mr Timothy Lui** of PlanD presented the proposed amendments to the Draft Central District (Extension) Outline Zoning Plan ("OZP") No. S/H24/7 with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 4.2 **The Chair** commented that the Garrison's undertaking that the military dock site would be opened to the public for enjoyment when it was not in military use should be reflected in the OZP. He also enquired about the east-west permeability when the dock was in military use.
- 4.3 **Mr Peter Cookson Smith** asked about the facilities that would be provided in the four ancillary buildings in the military dock site. He was of the view that the design of the decorative arch was not satisfactory and requested to remove it.
- 4.4 **Mr Franklin Yu** enquired whether the area of the military dock site was minimal for operational need and how the Garrison's undertaking would be implemented as it was not included in the Notes and the Explanatory Statement ("ES") of the OZP. Separately, he asked about the north-south connectivity from

Action

the Central Barracks to the military dock, as well as the management of the military dock.

- 4.5 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** considered that the landing steps in the military dock should be opened for public use when it was not in military use. She commented that the design of the decorative arch was not satisfactory and it was undesirable to have the four ancillary buildings in the site. She also would like to have more details on the management of the dock.
- 4.6 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** echoed the view of removing the decorative arch. Separately, he enquired the rationale for imposing the 10mPD building height restriction (“BHR”), and requested for a Gross Floor Area (“GFA”) restriction to be imposed in the OZP so that no additional buildings could be constructed within the military dock. He was of the view that the Garrison’s undertaking should be reflected in the OZP. He further enquired about the management of the dock site.
- 4.7 **Mr Tam Po-kiu** considered that comments on the design of the decorative arch were subjective and it should be assessed in the context of the adjacent waterfront site (i.e. Site 7 under the Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (“UDS”). He had an open mind on the design of the military dock and considered that the four ancillary buildings within the dock site were not substantial.
- 4.8 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** was of the view that the Garrison’s undertaking should somehow be reflected in the Notes or ES. He enquired whether the Town Planning Board (TPB) had any authority over military sites, including the imposition of plot ratio and BHR, etc. He was not worried that there would be new buildings in the site as he anticipated that the paved ground area of the military dock would be required for vessel landing and ceremonial use by the Garrison.
- 4.9 **Mr Chan Hok-fung** expressed support for the proposed OZP amendments as they were technical in nature and aimed to reflect the final delineation of the military dock and the land use zoning. As regards the design of the decorative arch, he pointed out that the Task Force and the Central and Western District Council (“DC”) had previously been consulted on the design of the military dock and did not have any strong views on it. He felt it peculiar that comments on the design were raised at this late stage. Separately, he asked PlanD to explain

Action

the reason for imposing the 10mPD BHR and how public enjoyment of the promenade could be safeguarded.

- 4.10 **Lam Kin-lai** pointed out that the site concerned was a military site and he reminded that Members should carefully consider whether HC had any authority to comment on the detailed design and the use of a military site. On BHR, he considered that 10mPD would be more appropriate to allow some flexibility for the Garrison to use the area. **Mr Chan Hok-fung** supported his view.
- 4.11 In response to Members' enquiries, **Miss Elsa Cheuk** explained that –
- (a) the 10mPD BHR was imposed to ensure that the height of future development at the Site would be compatible with the surrounding waterfront setting and would not create any visual intrusion to the development behind. It was in line with the proposed BHR of 10mPD as recommended for Site 7 under UDS completed in 2011;
 - (b) the main purpose of the Notes and ES was to demonstrate the planning intention and objectives of specific land use zoning. It was not a common practice to set out operational details in the Notes and ES such as the detailed arrangement of opening the military dock to the public when it was not in military use. That said, the relevant undertaking was set out in the paper submitted to the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) of the TPB which was accessible by the public; and
 - (c) the Government was working with the Garrison on the detailed arrangement for the management of the military dock.
- 4.12 **The Chair** concluded that Members emphasised the importance of public access to the military dock as part of the waterfront promenade. PlanD should further consider how the Garrison's undertaking that the military dock would be opened to the public when it was not in military use could be duly reflected and conveyed to the public in an official way to safeguard public enjoyment of the waterfront. On BHR, he invited PlanD to consider how the OZP could constrain any further building structures to be erected in the dock site. He said that while Members generally accepted the structures already built, any

Action

further construction at the dock site should be subject to review by the TPB and consultation with the HC. Separately, he asked the Harbour Unit to report further on the management of the military dock site and the north-south access at the next Task Force Meeting.

Harbour Unit

- 4.13 In response, **Mr Thomas Chan** said that the Garrison had confirmed that it would open the military dock to the public as part of the waterfront promenade for enjoyment when it was not in military use, and such undertaking had been made known to the public through various means, including the MPC Paper and this Task Force paper. He clarified that the military facilities within the military dock including the landing steps were not for public use. Members of the public could use the public landing facilities at Central Piers Numbers 9 and 10. **Mrs Winnie Kang** supplemented that the 10mPD BHR was the same as the BHR that was applicable to the Site 7 under the UDS.

Item 5 Submission of a Conceptual Proposal for Rationalization and Expansion of Public Viewing Areas at the Central Star Ferry Terminal (Paper No. TFHK/03/2013)

- 5.1 **The Chair** welcomed the project team to the meeting. He said that the proponent's briefing aimed to seek the Commission's views on the conceptual idea before engaging the relevant government departments, and there was no need for Members to endorse the proposal at this stage.
- 5.2 **Mr Ian Brownlee** and **Mr Benson Poon** of Masterplan Limited, and **Mr Graeme Reading** of Café Deco Group briefed Members on the idea, with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 5.3 **The Chair** asked if the proposed public viewing deck at the roof level of the Central Terminal Building (CTB) was an "all-weather" facility as it was currently a bare site.
- 5.4 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** welcomed the idea but he queried the necessity to have the proposed elevator which would be obtrusive. He suggested that the project proponent donate part of the additional rental income generated from the enlarged restaurant area to benefit the public.
- 5.5 **Mr Eric Fok** supported further exploring the idea and sought

Action

clarification as to whether it was possible to serve food and beverages at the new public viewing deck at the CTB; and whether the project proponent would bear the cost of the upgrading works.

- 5.6 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** expressed that the current public space outside the restaurant had been undesirably designated and should be reassigned as dining space of the restaurant, and that the Commission should not be too demanding on the reprovisioning of public viewing deck at the CTB.
- 5.7 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** expressed concern about the visual impact of the proposed elevator when viewed from the east, and whether the additional revenue generated from the expansion of restaurant area would be ploughed back to subsidise the ferry operation.
- 5.8 **Mr Franklin Yu** commented that the current configuration of public viewing deck was not satisfactory. He welcomed the idea of converting it into dining area of the restaurant and channeling the additional revenue generated to harbourfront enhancement.
- 5.9 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** suggested that the public viewing deck outside the restaurant might be converted to dining area of the restaurant for a few days each week while it might remain as public viewing deck for other days. He was of the view that the roof level of the CTB might still be opened to the public and simple refreshment could be served there. Such arrangement might be operated on a trial basis to test the public's response.
- 5.10 **Mr Leslie Chen** supported the idea in general but raised concerns whether the "public dining area" mentioned by the project proponent would only be restricted to the customers of the restaurant. While Mr Tam's idea could be supported, but the roof level of the CTB should be made accessible to the public most of the time. He supported having the elevator at the CTB since the lift shaft could be placed inside the building which would cause less visual impact.
- 5.11 **Mr Ian Brownlee** made the following responses -
- (a) additional revenue generated by the expansion of floor area of the restaurant would be used to subsidise the ferry operation;

Action

- (b) the proposal could provide a new and ideal public viewing deck at the roof level of the CTB and at the same time achieve an effective utilisation of space by the restaurant; and
- (c) the project proponent would take forward the proposal by refining its details further, including incorporating the elevator to allow access by the handicapped as far as practicable. Depending on the actual cost for implementation, the Café Deco Group would look at the possibility of absorbing the cost.

5.12 **Mr Michael Ng** said that TD welcomed the project proponent's idea which could generate more non-fare box revenue to cross-subsidise the ferry operation. However, as this proposal was only preliminary and conceptual, TD needed more detailed information from the proponent, including pedestrian circulation, financial viability and technical feasibility etc., before taking a final view on the proposal.

5.13 **Mr Graeme Reading** said that the idea would create a good-service restaurant at the harbourfront. The restaurant had tried the time-sharing approach for the public viewing deck outside the restaurant but found it not workable. He also pointed out that the two piers were designed to cater for a much greater volume of pedestrian flow. As there was plenty of underutilised space currently, the proposal would not cause adverse impact on the pedestrian flow.

5.14 **The Chair** thanked the project team's presentation. He said that Members generally welcomed the idea presented and asked the project proponents to take into account Members' views in refining the design details; start engaging the relevant government departments; and consult the Task Force again when a detailed proposal was available.

Item 6 Proposed Cooked Food Market, Ground Floor, Central Terminal Building, Central (Paper No. TFHK/04/2013)

6.1 **Ms Kira Brownlee** of Masterplan Limited briefed Members on the paper, with the aid of a PowerPoint.

6.2 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** expressed support for the idea which he

Action

considered would attract tourists and bring activities to the harbourfront. The project proponent should consult the relevant government departments, including the Food and Environment Hygiene Department (“FEHD”).

- 6.3 While concurring that the proposal could enhance vibrancy of the area, **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** opined that the market should be more carefully designed and well organized.
- 6.4 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** suggested that the area could be developed into a market with a diversity of stalls like Temple Street to include not just food stalls, in order to turn it into a tourist attraction. He added that the proposed market should be properly managed and promoted, and that the revenue generated from the market should be ploughed back for harbourfront enhancement or the ferry operation.
- 6.5 **Mr Franklin Yu** appreciated the proponent in presenting the idea. As the area might not be spacious enough to accommodate various types of activities, he suggested the project team to conduct market research to assess commercial viability of the proposed cooked food market.
- 6.6 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** expressed support for the idea which she considered that an integrated design and management model should be adopted.
- 6.7 **Mr Eric Fok** supported further exploring the idea, provided that there were standardisation of stalls and well planned pedestrian and traffic flow.
- 6.8 **Ms Patricia Or** welcomed the idea as it could bring vibrancy to the harbourfront. She suggested converting the area on the first floor of Central Pier No. 7 into cooking area for the proposed market on the ground floor, to make use of the existing utility set up on the first floor.
- 6.9 While quoting the examples of on-street evening food stalls in Beijing and Japan, **Mr Lam Kin-lai** supported the idea and opined that the food stalls should be properly managed.
- 6.10 **Mr Ian Brownlee** responded that –
- (a) Members’ views would be taken into account in refining the details. Legal advice had been sought which

Action

indicated that it was possible to satisfy FEHD's licensing requirements to operate a food market;

- (b) only 15 stalls could be accommodated in the area and would be managed by the project proponent;
- (c) as the Maritime Museum would be relocated to Central Pier No. 8, it was opportune to revitalise the whole area. Different themes could be adopted for different floors; and
- (d) the proposed food market was short-term lasting for 5 years, which did not require any planning approval.

6.11 **Mrs Winnie Kang** said that commercial operations were involved in the proposal and it was questionable whether the land could be granted or leased to the operator without an open tender exercise. She suggested that the proponent should approach the Lands Department to sort out the land status first.

6.12 In closing the discussion, **the Chair** said that Members welcomed the idea that could add vibrancy to the harbourfront. He asked the project team to take Members' comments into account, conduct market research, formulate a good management model, and engage the relevant government departments.

Item 7 Any Other Business

Cargo Handling at the promenade fronting Central Piers

7.1 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** expressed concern on the occupation of the waterfront promenade front the Central Piers by cargo handling. He urged TD to provide space within the piers for storage of cargo handling equipments temporarily; and to take the matter into account when designing new piers.

7.2 **Mr Michael Ng** responded that TD recognised the need for handling of cargo from Central to outlying islands, and was working to address Members' comments in the project of constructing additional floors at Central Piers Numbers 4 to 6. However, as explained in the earlier meeting, the space on the ground floor of the piers was very limited.

Action

- 7.3 **The Chair** asked TD to report to the Task Force again when a solution was available. **TD**
- 7.4 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:50 p.m.

Secretariat

Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island

June 2013