

Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island

Minutes of Thirteenth Meeting

Date : 7 June 2013
Time : 2:30 p.m.
Venue : Conference Room (Room G46) at Upper Ground Floor,
Hong Kong Heritage Discovery Centre, Kowloon Park,
Tsim Sha Tsui

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 Tam Po-yiu	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Dr Peter Cookson Smith	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Ir Peter Wong	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Shuki Leung	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Paul Zimmerman	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour (SPH)
Mr Vincent Ng	
Mr Chan Hok-fung	
Mr Eric Fok	
Mr Lam Cheuk-yum	
Ms Patricia Or	
Mrs Winnie Kang	Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), Development Bureau (DEVB)
Ms Stephanie Lai	Senior Manager (Tourism) 2, Tourism Commission (TC)
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)
Mr Richard Wong	Chief Leisure Manager (Hong Kong West), Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Ms Ginger Kiang (LCSD)
District Planning Officer/Hong Kong,
Planning Department (PlanD)
Mr Larry Chu Secretary

In Attendance

Mr Frederick Yu Assistant Secretary (Harbour) Special Duties,
DEVB
Mr Peter Mok Project Manager (Harbour), 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
Mr Benjamin Cha
Ms Lily Chow
Ms Joanne Chan
Mr David Chan

For Agenda Item 3

Mr Samson Lai Assistant Director (Waste Management
Policy), Environmental Protection
Department (EPD)
Mr Thomas Wan Senior Architect/25, Architectural Services
Department (ArchSD)

For Agenda Item 4

Ms Carol Yuen Deputy Secretary for Commerce & Economic
Development (Commerce & Industry)1,
Commerce and Economic Development
Bureau (CEDB)
Mrs Candy Yueng Principal Assistant Secretary for Commerce
& Economic Development (Commerce &
Industry)1, CEDB
Ms Elsa Cheuk Chief Town Planner/Special Duties, PlanD
Ms Polly Yip Senior Town Planner/Special Duties 2,
PlanD
Mr Kenneth Yeung Town Planner/Special Duties 3, PlanD

For Agenda Item 5

Miss Cheryl Chow District Officer (Central & Western), Home

Affairs Department

For Agenda Item 6

Ms Ginger Kiang
Mr Ng Kar-shu
Ir Jimmy Chan Kam-leung

District Planning Officer/Hong Kong, PlanD
Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong 5, PlanD
Engineer 6, Transport Planning Branch,
Transport Planning Division, TD

Action

Welcoming Message

The Chair welcomed all to the meeting. He informed Members that Ms Emily Mo had taken over from Mr Vincent Fung the post of Assistant Commissioner (2) of TC, and Ms Stephanie Lai, Senior Manager (Tourism) 2 of TC attended this meeting on her behalf. He thanked Mr Fung for his contribution to the work of the Task Force, and welcomed Ms Lai. He also told Members that Mr Richard Wong, Chief Leisure Manager (Hong Kong West) of LCSD attended this meeting on behalf of Miss Olivia Chan, Assistant Director (Leisure Services) 2 of LCSD.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 12th Meeting

1.1 **The Chair** said that the Secretariat circulated the draft minutes of the 12th meeting to Members on 21 May 2013. After incorporating the proposed amendments received, the revised draft minutes were circulated to Members on 31 May 2013. Ms Patricia Or proposed the following further amendment to the last sentence of paragraph 6.8 which was tabled at the meeting:-

“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”.

The revised draft minutes with Ms Or’s proposed amendment incorporated were confirmed.

Item 2 Matters Arising

Confirmation of Minutes of the 11th Meeting (paragraph 1.2 of the confirmed minutes of the 12th meeting)

Action

- 2.1 **The Chair** said that items 5 and 7 of the draft minutes of the 11th meeting were re-circulated to Members on 18 March 2013, and the revised minutes with comments incorporated were confirmed on 30 March 2013.

Central-Wan Chai Bypass and Island Eastern Corridor Link (CWB) – Appearance of CWB Noise Mitigation Measures at the Harbour-front of North Point (paragraph 2.2 of the confirmed minutes of the 12th meeting)

- 2.2 **The Chair** said the Highways Department's (HyD) review on the feasibility of public accessibility to the landscape deck with relevant departments was still ongoing, and the department would inform the Task Force of the outcome when available.

HyD

Topical Study on the Proposed Boardwalk underneath the Island Eastern Corridor ((IEC) (paragraph 2.3 of the confirmed minutes of the 12th meeting)

- 2.3 **The Chair** said that a briefing session was conducted by CEDD on 24 May 2013. As agreed by Members at the session, a site visit to the key areas along the proposed alignment of the boardwalk would be organised, and was tentatively scheduled for 24 June 2013. The Secretariat would issue invitation to Members as soon as the details were confirmed.

**the
Secretariat**

(Post meeting note: the site visit was organised on 24 June 2013.)

Proposed Comprehensive Development for Residential and Commercial Uses at Java Road and Tin Chiu Street, North Point, Hong Kong (paragraph 3.16 of the confirmed minutes of the 12th meeting)

- 2.4 **The Chair** said that TD's written response on traffic issues concerning the proposed comprehensive development at Java Road and Tin Chiu Street was issued to Members on 21 May 2013.

Cargo Handling at the Promenade fronting Central Piers (paragraph 7.3 of the confirmed minutes of the 12th meeting)

- 2.5 **The Chair** told Members that a site visit to Central Piers would be organised in Q3 to let Members have a better understanding on the current situation and site constraints.

**the
Secretariat**

Action

- 2.6 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that a photo showing obstruction caused by trolleys at the promenade fronting Central Piers was sent to the Secretariat just before the meeting and he questioned whether Members could see the situation during the site visit. He opined that the ground floor design of the piers should be improved to cater for storage of cargo and trolleys when proceeding with the project for construction of additional floors above Central Piers Nos. 4 to 6. **The Chair** responded that Members' comments could be passed to TD and other relevant parties for consideration.
- 2.7 In response to Mr Paul Zimmerman's enquiry about the Central military dock, **Mrs Winnie Kang** said that the Government's response on the matter was set out in a paper to Legislative Council (LegCo) Panel on Development. The Secretariat could circulate the paper to Members for reference. The Government had ongoing discussion with the Garrison on the management of the dock, and would brief the Task Force once the proposed arrangement was available.
- 2.8 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** enquired whether the dock site and the access road between the dock and Lung Wo Road would be declared as closed area for military use; how the undertaking for public access would be executed; and how the part of Central and Western District Promenade in front of the dock would be managed.
- 2.9 **The Chair** considered that some matters raised were not related to harbourfront enhancement, and the Commission should not be involved in the debate on whether and how the site should be rezoned which should be decided by the Town Planning Board (TPB). However, the Commission would continue to advise on issues related to accessibility, connectivity and public access, etc. He suggested the Government to give a written response on the issues raised by Mr Zimmerman for Members' information.
- 2.10 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** accepted the suggestion. He presented a letter from SPH to the Chair, and requested for a presentation to the Task Force at the next meeting. **The Chair** said that the request would be considered.

DEVB

the
Secretariat

(Post meeting note: The letter from SPH to the Chair of HC, the Chair of HC's reply and the paper submitted by DEVB to the LegCo's Panel

on Development were circulated to all HC Members on 19 September 2013.)

Item 3 Setting up Community Green Station (CGS) at Hong Kong East (Paper No. TFHK/05/2013)

- 3.1 **The Chair** welcomed the project team to the meeting. **Mr Samson Lai** of EPD and **Mr Thomas Wan** of ArchSD briefed Members on the paper, with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 3.2 Referring to stakeholder engagement, **the Chair** asked the team to elaborate on the Eastern District Council (EDC)'s position on the initiative, and the measures to address local residents' concerns over potential nuisances arising from the operation of the CGS.
- 3.3 Both **Mr Paul Zimmerman** and **Mr Lam Kin-lai** supported the initiative to enhance waste recycling and related public education at community level.
- 3.4 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** supported the objective of the proposal but questioned the need of having five CGSs. He opined that the proposed CGSs were too large for serving education purposes only which could be conducted in other institutions.
- 3.5 **Mr Vincent Ng** welcomed the proposal which would utilise the unused space under IEC, and attract residents to walk from the hinterland to the harbourfront through the CGS.
- 3.6 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** suggested widening the pavement or providing shades along the boundary of site.
- 3.7 **Mr Eric Fok** supported the objective of the proposal and enquired about the functions of the CGS. He suggested that if the pilot scheme was popular, the Government might consider building smaller CGSs in Hong Kong so the community could participate more conveniently.
- 3.8 **Mr Samson Lai** responded to Members' comments as follows:-
 - (a) one of key the objectives of the proposal was to encourage participation by more local residents. The design of the site had made reference to the Energising

Action

Kowloon East Office with a view to improving pedestrian connectivity within the community;

- (b) EDC Members generally supported the proposal which would promote environmental protection. The location of the CGS was easily accessible to the nearby residential areas. A competent non-governmental organisation (NGO) would be appointed by way of open tender to operate the facility, including to organise environmental education programmes (especially on waste recycling) and to provide logistics support to local recycling activities;
- (c) clean recycling was an important theme of the education activities so that more recyclable materials would be properly cleansed and separated from the waste stream before being collected by the operator; and
- (d) the operator would reach out to the community to set up collection arrangement and hire trucks to shuttle around the neighbourhood to collect recyclable materials from the community. Space was available in the CGS for temporary storage of recyclable materials pending long-haul transfer so as to increase the cost effectiveness of the collection operation. However, no food waste would be handled at the CGS and the recyclable materials to be handled would be clean and dry which would not cause nuisance to the neighbourhood. EPD would work closely with the operator to ensure that the CGS would be properly managed. EDC and the community would be engaged over time to gather their views and feedback for improving the initiative.

3.9 Mr Thomas Wan made the following responses:-

- (a) containers would be used as the basic building units for the CGS and transformed into a pavilion to allow cross ventilation without air conditioning;
- (b) long part of the site would be used as recycling collection facilities and the rectangular part would be used as public educational facility; and
- (c) pavement would be maintained as pedestrian walkway between the old and the new areas, and green wall

Action

would be used to shield the dust and noise which might be generated from recycling operations.

- 3.10 To avoid any health hazard to participants, **Mr Lam Kin-lai** suggested conducting assessment on the air quality of the CGS as it was under the IEC flyover and would be used as a public educational centre without air conditioning.
- 3.11 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested that the CGS should be operated as a transfer station for residents to drop their recyclable waste, and small scale recycling operators should be allowed to operate their businesses in the CGS.
- 3.12 In response to Dr Peter Cookson Smith's enquiry on the arrangement of collecting recyclable waste from the community, **Mr Samson Lai** replied that operators would reach out to property managements, schools and different institutions in the community with a view to setting up regular collection arrangements, and organise educational activities for the community to enhance their awareness. On logistics, operators would use trucks to collect recyclable materials from the neighbourhood on a regular basis. Residents might also bring their recyclable materials to the CGS.
- 3.13 In concluding the discussion, **the Chair** said that Members were supportive of the initiative, and advised the project team to take on board Members' comments raised.

Item 4 Amendments to the Approved Wan Chai North Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H25/2 (Paper No. TFHK/06/2013)

- 4.1 **The Chair** welcomed the presentation team to the meeting. **Ms Polly Yip** of PlanD and **Ms Carol Yuen** of CEDB presented the paper, with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 4.2 **The Chair** commented that the paper should be prepared with more references to the Harbour Planning Principles (HPPs).
- 4.3 **Ir Peter Wong** asked whether the location would be crucial for Hong Kong's competitiveness in convention business; and if not, whether the Exhibition Station site could be used for other purposes to make the harbourfront vibrant.
- 4.4 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** asked the team to provide more

PlanD

Action

information on the accessibility and other facilities for pedestrians at elevated, ground and subway levels. He enquired whether the development could be accessed by subway; and whether the convention facilities should be proposed at the Express Rail Link (ERL) terminus in West Kowloon. He opined that convention facilities would aggravate the traffic congestion at the area as the expert panel report of the "Harbour-front Enhancement Review - Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Areas" (HER) study conducted by the former Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC) had expressed concern that the traffic situation at Fleming Road and the nearby road junctions after the Wan Chai Development Phase II (WDII) project.

4.5 **Mr Frankie Yu** said that convention activities would generate traffic mainly in a short period of time before the commencement of conventions and enquired whether this was a consideration for proposing conventions and meetings instead of exhibition activities at the site.

4.6 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** requested to have more information about the proposed development in relation to the design of the planned waterfront open space. He said that although he was not trying to do the design of the building right now, it would however be important to know the comprehensive design concepts, including which were the main directions of pedestrian flows, and given so many destinations and major developments in the vicinity, they should be well integrated in a comprehensive development. He asked whether the location of the footbridge at the prominent central location was most desirable. He also said that even as a notional architectural scheme, the harbourfront location demanded a more creative design such as using split levels, might be worth consideration, despite the limitations of existing building regulations. He also suggested that some "Government, Institution or Community" (G/IC) facilities such as toilets and electric sub-stations, etc., should be integrated into the proposed comprehensive development area (CDA) to help reduce the visual and landscape impacts of these facilities.

4.7 In response, **Ms Carol Yuen** said that:-

- (a) the proposed rezoning was a forward planning initiative to preserve the flexibility for future topside development. Hong Kong had a competitive edge as a service hub in

Action

the region, and there was a general consensus among industry players that Hong Kong could target conventions for high-end service sectors. As the potential participants of these high-end conventions would generally prefer down-town locations, the proposed site would be a suitable location given its good accessibility and public transportation network. The site would not be used for exhibitions as the traffic generated would be more significant than conventions; and

- (b) the TPB had approved the Master Layout Plan (MLP) of the ERL terminus site at West Kowloon in 2010 primarily for office, commercial and retail development, and the construction of the terminus had commenced.

4.8 Miss Elsa Cheuk made the following responses:-

- (a) the proposal had fully taken into account the potential traffic impact to the area. The architectural feasibility study commissioned by PlanD in 2012 had ascertained the feasibility of a topside development not exceeding 50mPD mainly for convention and meeting facilities at the site, as conventions and meetings would generate less vehicular traffic when compared with exhibitions. Construction of topside development at the site would only start after the completion of Shatin to Central Link (SCL) in 2020 when the traffic situation at that area would be improved significantly with the completion of CWB and the planned road improvement works at the junctions under WDII by 2017;
- (b) the site was well-served by the public transport including the proposed public transport interchange at the ground level of the site and the nearby public transport facilities. With the completion of the Exhibition Station which would provide a direct and convenient access to the Wan Chai North, it was expected that some of the convention participants would take the MTR. In addition, the topside development would provide pedestrian links at podium level to the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre (HKCEC) to the west, the waterfront promenade to the north via the proposed landscaped deck, and the existing commercial buildings to the south. All these would help divert pedestrians in the area;

Action

- (c) if the proposed rezoning was approved, a planning brief would be prepared and the development requirements such as pedestrian connections, urban design and landscape principles could be imposed therein to guide the applicant in preparing the MLP for consideration by the TPB. The proposed rezoning would provide a good opportunity for the applicant to integrate the design of the site with the surrounding areas as well as the proposed landscape deck leading to the waterfront promenade to the north. The applicant would also be required to provide technical assessments on visual impact, air ventilation and traffic impact etc. as part of the MLP for consideration by the TPB; and
- (d) while there was no plan for subway connection from the site to the waterfront at this stage according to MTRCL, Members' views would be reflected to MTRCL.

4.9 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** remarked that a convention centre might not be congruent with the waterfront setting of the area as a holistic urban design planning for the new Wan Chai reclamation area had yet to start. While traffic at most road junctions would be greatly improved in 2017, the expert panel under the HER Study had pointed out that the expected traffic volume at one junction would still exceed its capacity even with CWB and suggested that TD revisit this point. He agreed that conventions and meetings would generate less traffic impact than exhibitions, but queried whether some of the existing convention facilities in HKCEC would be vacated for exhibition in HKCEC and then generate additional traffic. On pedestrian flow, he commented that the footbridges linking to Wan Chai MTR station, the Immigration Tower and HKCEC were already very congested. While the SCL might help divert some passengers of Island Line, MTRCL should assess whether the footbridges would become even more congested with the proposed convention facilities.

4.10 **Mr Shuki Leung** supported the CDA proposal to allow more land uses and make harbourfront more vibrant. The close proximity of the MTR would bring convenience to the area; and the proposed development could integrate with the waterfront open space for public enjoyment, both indoor and outdoor.

4.11 On pedestrian connections, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested connecting the site to the waterfront by subways; and putting in

Action

place at-grade pedestrian crossing from Renaissance Harbour View Hotel to the waterfront. He remarked that the convention activities at HKCEC might be shifted to the proposed CDA site, resulting in more exhibitions at HKCEC and aggravated traffic congestion. Therefore, Members needed more information to support the envisaged improvement in traffic situation in the area by 2017.

- 4.12 **Ir Peter Wong** said that if more exhibitions would be held at HKCEC, the traffic problem arising from loading and unloading activities should be sorted out.
- 4.13 **Mr Franklin Yu** said that the traffic issues should be resolved before Members could fully support the rezoning proposal. In drafting the planning brief for the site, requirements should be included for the applicant to carefully design connections with the adjacent commercial buildings and the reprovisioned sports and recreational facilities.
- 4.14 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** said that at-grade pedestrian circulation at Wan Chai North was not sufficient. Requirements should be put in the planning brief for the applicant to adopt interesting design and good interface with the surrounding buildings.
- 4.15 **Mr Shuki Leung** said that PlanD would revert to the Task Force when drafting the planning brief and the applicant would also need to present the draft MLP to the Task Force. Members would have other opportunities to review the technical details and consider whether the proposed topside development could be supported.
- 4.16 **Miss Elsa Cheuk** responded that TD confirmed that the traffic situation in the area, particularly in Wan Chai North, would improve significantly in future as the ongoing road works, including CWB and the planned road work improvements would be completed by 2017. As confirmed by TD, the preliminary assessment had ascertained that the proposed convention and meeting facilities would not pose a significant traffic impact on the nearby area. The proposed rezoning would allow flexibility to optimize the use of the site. Members' concerns, on traffic, pedestrian connection, landscape and urban design requirements would be incorporated into the draft planning brief, and the applicant would be asked to seek Members' views on the MLP.

Action

- 4.17 In response to Members' comments on the traffic impact, **the Chair** said that PlanD should provide information and outcome of the initial study to support that the proposed development would not generate significant traffic impact to the area after completion of the CWB and the planned road improvement works under WDII. **Mrs Winnie Kang** suggested PlanD to prepare the said information on its preliminary assessment to facilitate Members' further discussion on the planning parameters and requirements for drafting the planning brief for the site. **Miss Elsa Cheuk** agreed to follow-up.
- 4.18 **Mr Chan Chung-yuen** remarked that the traffic situation at Wan Chai North would improve upon the completion of WDII roads and junctions improvement works and CWB; and in terms of land use, convention facilities would generate the least amount of traffic.
- 4.19 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that PlanD and TD should make reference to the expert panel report and the information provided by TD at that time when assessing the traffic impact of the proposed rezoning.
- 4.20 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** said that the current traffic at Wan Chai North was already very congested. CWB would not solve all the traffic issues and Members would need more information before supporting another development at the location.
- 4.21 Regarding the rezoning of a narrow strip of land to "G/IC(1)" according to the gazetted alignment of Tonnochy Road, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that a pedestrian crossing to the future waterfront should be planned at Tonnochy Road. To provide wider space and view corridor for pedestrians, he suggested widening Tonnochy Road.
- 4.22 In response to Dr Peter Cookson Smith's enquiry on the need to rezone Harbour View International House (HVIH) to "G/IC(5)", **Ms Ginger Kiang** explained that due to previous amendments to the Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans, some residential nature developments such as flat, hostel, house, residential institution, staff quarter, etc., were deleted from column 2 uses of G/IC sites. HVIH proposed amendments to the Notes of the OZP in order to allow hotel development at the site. After hearing the application, TPB agreed to rezone it to "G/IC(5)" to allow building improvement

PlanD

Action

works for HVIH, which was an existing development.

- 4.23 In closing the discussion on this item, **the Chair** requested PlanD to take into account the HPPs and Members' comments on accessibility, pedestrian connectivity, public enjoyment of the harbourfront and traffic issues, etc; and consult the Task Force early when preparing draft planning brief for topside development at Exhibition Station. Additional information to support the envisaged improvement of traffic situation in the area by 2017 should be provided to Members for reference. Members' comments and observations on the proposed amendments to the OZP in this meeting would be passed to TPB.

PlanD

**the
Secretariat**

(Post meeting note: the summary of discussion of the item was conveyed to the TPB on 17 July 2013.)

Item 5 Signature Project Scheme (SPS) in Central and Western District: Harbourfront Enhancement and Revitalisation (HEAR) at the Western Wholesale Food Market (WWFM) (Paper No. TFHK/07/2013)

- 5.1 **The Chair** welcomed Miss Cheryl Chow, District Officer (Central and Western) to the meeting. **Miss Cheryl Chow** briefed Members on the project, with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 5.2 **The Chair** remarked that Members welcomed and appreciated the Central and Western District Council (C&WDC)'s initiative to enhance and revitalize the harbourfront at WWFM.
- 5.3 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** supported the project and enquired whether the works could be completed before 2017. Given the value to the community in enhancing the connectivity along the harbourfront between WWFM and Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park, he suggested opening up the promenade as quickly as possible by building a footpath with district minor works fund, and allowing people to walk with their dogs on-the-leash. He also asked whether the public could access WWFM from the seaside through the unused piers. Separately, he supported having additional uses such as food and beverages premises at the site.
- 5.4 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** supported the project which would open up the harbourfront for public enjoyment. He commented that it was worthwhile to reinforce the unused piers for

Action

construction of structures with diversified uses. He suggested providing additional funding for this innovative project.

- 5.5 **Ms Patricia Or** fully supported the project. She suggested keeping the scope of the project basic so as to open up the promenade as soon as possible for public enjoyment; and extending the project to the pier still in operation given limited hours the pier was being used.
- 5.6 **Mr Shuki Leung** said that the project would provide unique walking experience to pedestrians. He suggested bringing in diversified uses, including “Dai Pai Dong” style restaurants; allowing the current market operators to open their own stalls to achieve a win-win situation; advancing the project completion; and continuing to organise carnivals in the interim to maintain vibrancy.
- 5.7 In response to Members’ suggestion on expediting the project, **Mrs Winnie Kang** explained that it would normally take about five years to complete a promenade development project under the public works programme and hence a number of quick-win projects had been pursued to open up more promenades for early public enjoyment in the past few years. These projects were mainly minor works project(s?) under \$30 million per project and no recurrent funding would be provided. DEVB, which had been providing recurrent funding for these advance promenades at the moment, had constraint to take up more projects. The HEAR project, which had designated funding from the SPS, had already been advanced by more than one year, but other procedures including seeking LegCo’s funding approval and necessary tender procedures could not be shortened.
- 5.8 **Miss Cheryl Chow** thanked Members’ unanimous support for the project. She said that efforts had been made to expedite the project as far as possible and the major hurdle of segregating the promenade from WWFM was being sorted out. Detailed uses of the site would be dealt with at the detailed design stage. While Members supported for food and beverage premises at the site, basic facilities would be included first so that the project could be completed for early enjoyment by the public as early as possible. Other uses would be added to the site over time. The characteristics of a wholesale food market and the marine feature could possibly be one of the themes in the project design. According to the initial assessment by the

Action

Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department, about a hundred market operators would be affected if the WWFM harbourfront driveway was turned into promenade, thus the affected operators would need to be engaged.

- 5.9 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** suggested that an indented alignment might be explored to provide space for parking mobile food carts along the promenade.
- 5.10 **Mr Chan Hok-fung**, as the Vice-Chairman of C&WDC, thanked Members' support for the project and said that he would bring Members' comments back to C&WDC. He informed Members that C&WDC had negotiated with the market operators for a long time but only three metres of the driveway was agreed to be released for developing the promenade at the moment. The operators would be further engaged with a view to releasing six metres for HEAR project.
- 5.11 In concluding the discussion, **the Chair** said that Members unanimously supported the project. The Task Force would work in partnership with C&WDC in taking this project forward. He reiterated Members' wish to accelerate this project, allow early public enjoyment at the waterfront, widen the promenade as far as possible, and bring in diversified uses at the site. He suggested that C&WDO consult the Task Force again when a detailed design was available.

C&WDO

Item 6 Preliminary Land Use Proposal for the Western Part of Kennedy Town (Paper No. TFHK/08/2013)

- 6.1 **The Chair** welcomed the presentation team to the meeting. **Ms Ginger Kiang** and **Mr Ng Kar-shu** of PlanD presented the paper, with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 6.2 In response to the Chair's enquiry, **Ms Ginger Kiang** said that the two finger piers in front of the ex-Kennedy Town Abattoir site were proposed for commercial, leisure and recreation uses, intended for uses such as kiosks and alfresco dining facilities to enhance vibrancy of the waterfront. There was no concrete development proposal for changing the existing use of the China Merchants Wharf (CMW) site, which was under private ownership. The site was proposed for commercial, leisure and tourism-related uses and hopefully could serve as redevelopment incentive.

Action

- 6.3 **Mr Chan Hok-fung** said that the proposal was presented to C&WDC but was rejected by C&WDC members as it would entail a significant increase in population by more than 10,000. The shortage of about 8.3 hectares open space in the district would be worsened as there was not sufficient provision of open space in the current proposal apart from the promenade. C&WDC members also expressed concerns on building height and traffic impact and local residents should be consulted on the proposal.
- 6.4 **Mr Lam Kin-lai** did not agree to turn the temporary active open space at Sai Ning Street into passive open space, as young residents had high demand for these recreational facilities.
- 6.5 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the proposed widening of Victoria Road would segregate the waterfront from the hinterland, and more pedestrian crossing facilities should be included. He welcomed the idea of making good use of the finger piers for food and beverage uses to enhance vibrancy. Separately, marine access to the promenade should be considered. He asked about the need for the proposed primary school, and expressed concern on the proposed increase in development density.
- 6.6 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** supported more diversified uses at the finger piers. He queried whether the ex-Mount Davis Cottage site should be allocated for public rental housing (PRH) use with a plot ratio of six. He further commented that the bus terminus relocated from Sai Ning Street to the site currently occupied by the Cadogan Street Temporary Garden (i.e. Site 3a) should be well integrated with the future topside residential development.
- 6.7 **Ms Patricia Or** suggested retaining the arch and foundation stone of the ex-Ting Wah Small Pox Hospital at its current location.
- 6.8 In response, **Ms Ginger Kiang** said that Hong Kong Island was a highly developed area with limited land resources. The current proposal attempted to strike a balance among competing land uses, including housing, open space and transport, etc. Efforts had been made to satisfy the community's need for open space by increasing the provision from 1.53 to 3.09 hectares in the area, albeit it could not make up all the

Action

shortage in local open space within Kennedy Town Area. Because of the high demand for housing land, particularly for PRH, the ex-Mount Davis Cottage Area site was proposed for PRH use, with a total proposed plot ratio of six as compared to the permissible plot ratio of eight to ten on Hong Kong Island. The temporary recreation ground at Sai Ning Street was proposed as "Open Space". The actual uses to be provided would be subject to LCSD's detailed design in implementation stage.

- 6.9 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** commented that PRH was a suitable use for the ex-Mount Davis Cottage Area site, which was on a slope where development would not cause much visual and air ventilation impact. Also, there was not enough space to build carpark uphill for private residential development. However, **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** said that the proposed PRH would generate too much traffic.
- 6.10 **Mr Shuki Leung** opined that Members should not be over worried about higher development density as sustainable density helped to support range of uses and waterfront vibrancy.
- 6.11 On the proposed relocation of incompatible uses, **Mr Chan Hok-fung** said that C&WDC members had suggested relocating the Victoria Public Mortuary (VPM) to the redeveloped Queen Mary Hospital (QMH), instead of Victoria Road under the current proposal due to objection from local residents. **Mr Paul Zimmerman** agreed that VPM could be relocated to the redeveloped QMH. **Mr Franklin Yu** opined that it was not optimal land use if VPM was relocated to the proposed site at Victoria Road.
- 6.12 In response to the Chair's enquiry, **Mr Ng Kar-shu** said that the salt water pumping station to be relocated was used to pump sea water to nearby residential area for flushing, and therefore had to be located at the waterfront.
- 6.13 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** suggested shortening the proposed new access road in the north of site 3a in order to provide a direct access to the waterfront as far as possible. By widening Victoria Road and Cadogan Street, vehicles could turn back via Victoria Road, instead of going all the way through the new access road.
- 6.14 In response to the enquiries of the Chair and Mr Shuki Leung

Action

about the proposed site for a new primary school, **Ms Ginger Kiang** clarified that the Education Bureau was looking for local school sites in different areas, and this was one of its planned schools. The site was about 6,200 m² in size, which was the standard requirement for a primary school.

- 6.15 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** commented that the proposed public transport interchange should be located at the proposed primary school site so that it would be closer to the existing and proposed residential developments. He added that the proposal should better enhance the pedestrian connectivity to the waterfront.
- 6.16 On air ventilation, **Mr Chan Hok-fung** said some residents had expressed concern on the proposed private residential developments of about 100 mPD along Victoria Road.
- 6.17 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** suggested extending the tramway to serve the proposed residential developments if the proposed access road was wide enough.
- 6.18 In response, **Ms Ginger Kiang** said that:-
- (a) the Department of Health (DH) advised that there was not sufficient space in the redevelopment plan of QMH to accommodate VPM. PlanD had explored relocating VMP to an ex-magazine or cavern site. However, the cavern site alone would not meet the expanding and up-to-date functional requirements of the mortuary. Expansion of the cavern had been explored. It would be very difficult to put all the facilities underground unless a very extensive ventilation system was built in the green area for the sake of infection control. There was also grave concern on the cost-effectiveness of this expansion option. Due to the need to take care of the feeling of families of the deceased, DH also considered that it would not be appropriate to put the mortuary underground;
 - (b) the new developments along Victoria Road would not cause air ventilation impact to the buildings at the back since the prevailing wind would come from the northeast instead of from the north. Building gaps had been proposed to facilitate air ventilation;

Action

- (c) the proposed site swapping of the primary school and public transport interchange as well as the tramway extension would be further explored together with TD;
- (d) the current land use option indicated the broad-brush planning proposal. Detailed information on pedestrian crossings had not been incorporated and could be provided to Members later; and
- (e) TD considered the new access road necessary for coping with traffic flow in the area. Having regard to Members' views on the pedestrian connectivity, PlanD would discuss further with TD to explore feasible alternatives in this regard.

6.19 Quoting the example of a section of Lung Wo Road outside Tamar, **Mr Leung Kong-yui** suggested adopting an underground design for the proposed access road so that pedestrians could access the waterfront from site 3a at grade.

6.20 In concluding the discussion, **the Chair** asked PlanD to take account of Members' comments and enhance the proposal for further discussion by C&WDC and the Task Force.

PlanD

Item 7 Any Other Business

Updated Action Areas Table

7.1 **The Chair** said that an updated action areas table had been circulated to Members before the meeting.

7.2 In response to Mr Paul Zimmerman's enquiry, **Mrs Winnie Kang** updated Members on the temporary uses of the Central harbourfront sites. Area A would be used for a ferris wheel and the short term tenancy (STT) had been awarded to a tenant in early June 2013. Areas D and E would be used for hosting events, and the enhancement work to upgrade the ground condition to equip it with basic infrastructure for future event uses was expected to complete in July 2013. The tender for the STT was being prepared. Areas F & G would be used as a passive open space and pet garden respectively, and the proposed designs had been agreed by Members in October 2012. The construction was in progress and expected to complete by end of 2013. Areas B, C and H would continue to

Action

be work sites.

- 7.3 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested that Areas D and E should not have perimeter fencing, and such requirement should be specified in the STT tender.
- 7.4 **Mrs Winnie Kang** responded that the original chain-link fence had been replaced by demountable metal fence to provide flexibility for the future event organiser to open or close the sites in a convenient way. Members' views in respect of permeability and accessibility, etc. expressed in the past would be taken into account when drafting the tender documents.
- 7.5 In response to Dr Peter Cookson Smith's enquiry, **Mrs Winnie Kang** said that there would be two pet circles in the pet garden as Members were briefed in October 2012.

Open Space Outside the City Hall

- 7.6 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** remarked that enhancement proposals should be considered for the open space outside the City Hall, which was currently a vacant space. He suggested reassembling the Queen's Pier at site, and providing shades at the lay-by on Lung Wu Road. **Mrs Winnie Kang** said that the Task Force would be briefed on this issue in due course.

**the
Secretariat**

Programming for Planning of the New Wan Chai Harbourfront and Removal of Billboards at Wan Chai Basin

- 7.7 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** enquired about the programme for the planning study for the new Wan Chai harbourfront. He suggested removing the billboards which were now blocking the view of Wan Chai Basin. **Mrs Winnie Kang** replied that, according to the latest information provided by HyD, part of the new Wan Chai harbourfront would be used as work site for the SCL project until end of 2020. PlanD would consult the Commission on the scope of the study later this year, and to commence the study in 2014 to tie in with the staged availability of the waterfront site from 2017 to 2020 so as to avoid making pre-mature or abortive recommendations. On the billboards, she added that she would gather more information on the matter.

Odour and Fencing at Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter

Action

- 7.8 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested pumping fresh sea water from the middle of the harbour to flush out the stagnant water in the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter to alleviate the odour problem. He also suggested fixing the dilapidated railing, fencing and planters along the road outside the shelter as a quick-win project.

**HyD
& MD**

Cross Boundary Coaches

- 7.9 Referring to TD's written response on the traffic issues concerning the CDA development at Java Road and Tin Chiu Street, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** opined that instead of allowing the drop-off and pick-up facilities for cross boundary coaches to remain on Java Road, a PTI should be built to take the coaches off the road. With the increase in the number of tourists, TD should review specifications for cross boundary PTI for PlanD's inclusion into the planning briefs of new developments.
- 7.10 In response, **Mr Chan Chung-yuen** said that it was the trade's preference to keep pick-up and drop-off facilities for cross boundary coaches on the road. There was an existing PTI facility for cross boundary coaches in Shaukeiwan but the usage was low. **The Chair** said that the issue might be addressed on a territorial basis.

Vote of Thanks

- 7.11 **The Chair** thanked all Members for their invaluable contributions to the work of the Task Force in the past three years.
- 7.12 There being no other business, the meeting ended at 6:15 p.m.

Secretariat

**Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island
October 2013**