

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

**Minutes of Eighteenth Meeting**

Date : 10 February 2015  
Time : 3:00 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
Mrs Karen BARRETTO	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr LAM Kin-lai	Representing Conservancy Association
Mr Franklin YU	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Evans IU	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Dr Peter Cookson SMITH	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Mr Ivan HO	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
Mr CHAN Hok-fung	
Mr Walter CHAN	
Ms Lily CHOW	
Mr Eric FOK	
Mr Raj Sital MOTWANI	
Mr Vincent NG	
Mr Alvin YIP	
Mr Thomas CHAN	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Edward LEUNG	Senior Manager (Tourism) 2, Tourism Commission (TC)
Mr Alan TAM	Acting 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	Assistant Director (Leisure Services) 2, Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Ms Ginger KIANG	District Planning Officer/Hong Kong, Planning

Mr Larry CHU  
Department (PlanD)  
Secretary

**In Attendance**

Miss Christine AU  
Mr Frederick YU  
Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB  
Assistant Secretary (Harbour) Special Duties,  
DEVB  
Miss Ingrid TJENDRO  
Mr Peter MOK  
Assistant Secretary (Harbour) 2, DEVB  
Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr LEUNG Kong-yui  
Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and  
Transport in Hong Kong  
Mr LAU Chun-kong  
Mr Brian David LI  
Mrs Ayesha Macpherson LAU  
Ms Jacqueline CHUNG  
Ms LI Chun-chau  
Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors

**For Agenda Item 3**

Ms April KUN  
Mr Patrick FUNG  
Chief Town Planner/Studies & Research, PlanD  
Senior Town Planner/Studies & Research 5,  
PlanD  
Mr Kelvin LAW  
Ms Pearl HUI  
Mr Hugo ERRAZURIZ  
Dr Winnie LAW  
Vice President, AECOM  
Director of Urban Planning, AECOM  
Director of Urban Design, AECOM  
Assistant Director, Kadoorie Institute, The  
University of Hong Kong

**For Agenda Item 4**

Mr Gavin TUN  
Mr Francis YAN  
Miss Kwan LAM  
Ms Cindy TSANG  
Mr Todd WAN  
Ms Sarah LEE  
Ms Sarah HO  
Director, Project Management, Capital Project  
Delivery, Facilities Services, University of  
Chicago  
Managing Director, Project Manager HK, Bing  
Thom Architects (BTA)  
Architect, Project Coordinator HK, BTA  
Director, Townland Consultants Limited (TCL)  
Town Planner, TCL  
General Manager & Director of Service, C. K.  
Lo & S. Lam Ltd  
Account Executive, C. K. Lo & S. Lam Ltd

**For Agenda Item 5**

Ms Bella FAN  
Mr Ivan LI  
Senior Associate, Ronald Lu & Partners (Hong  
Kong) Ltd  
Chief Architect, Ronald Lu & Partners (Hong

Miss Vivian WAN	Kong) Ltd Assistant Town Planner, In Yam Development Limited
Miss Camay LAM	Director, AXXA Group Limited
Mr Steeve CHAW	Senior Engineer, AECOM Asia Company Ltd

**Action**

**Welcoming Message**

**The Chair** welcomed all to the meeting, and informed Members that Mr Richard WONG had taken over the post of Assistant Director (Leisure Services) 2 of LCSD from Miss Olivia CHAN; Mr Edward LEUNG, Senior Manager (Tourism) 2 of TC was attending on behalf of Ms Emily MO; and Mr Alan TAM, Acting Chief Traffic Engineer/Hong Kong of TD was attending on behalf of Mr CHAN Chung-yuen.

**Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 17<sup>th</sup> Meeting**

- 1.1 **The Chair** said that the Secretariat circulated the draft minutes of the 17<sup>th</sup> meeting to Members on 5 November 2014, and received no comments from Members. There being no proposed amendment, the draft minutes were confirmed at the meeting.

**Item 2 Matters Arising**

*Shatin to Central Link – Exterior Design of the West Ventilation Building of the Exhibition Station (paragraph 6.18 of the minutes of the 17<sup>th</sup> meeting)*

- 2.1 **The Chair** said that two workshops were organised in October and December 2014 for Members to offer further comments on the revised design of the ventilation building. After the two workshops, Members would still like to see a further revised design and MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) was doing so and would revert.

**MTRCL**

*[Post-meeting note: MTRCL provided a final design of the ventilation building which the Secretariat circulated to Members on 25 March 2015. Further written comments from Members had been conveyed to the project proponent.]*

Action

2.2 As regards the section 12A planning application concerning Fenwick Pier, **Ms Ginger KIANG** said that the proponent had withdrawn the application and was considering submitting a new planning application to the TPB.

**PlanD**

2.3 **Mr MAK Chi-biu** said that CEDD would conclude the consultant selection exercise and commence the study for the proposed boardwalk underneath the Island Eastern Corridor shortly. The study would produce preliminary structural scheme which would be assessed for compliance with the requirements of the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (PHO).

2.4 In response to Dr Peter Cookson SMITH's enquiry, **Mr MAK Chi-biu** said that the implementation of the proposed boardwalk would be by a step-by-step approach. Members might recall that an earlier topical study conducted by CEDD had confirmed that the proposed boardwalk was technically feasible from an engineering point of view. However, it was also recognized that its implementation would involve reclamation under PHO. In this connection, CEDD saw the need to engage consultants to prepare cogent and convincing materials for satisfying the overriding public need test in compliance with PHO with reference to relevant technical circular. The consultant would also be tasked to carry out public consultation for the project. The study was expected to take more than one year to complete. If all the requirements of PHO could be satisfied, CEDD would then proceed with preparing a detailed design.

2.5 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** opined that CEDD should set up a website and publish all relevant previous and future documents, consultation papers and discussions relating to the boardwalk. He was of the view that the overriding public need for the proposal might have already been established as it had been discussed thoroughly by the community in the past. **Mr MAK Chi-biu** responded that the consultant would put up a website for uploading relevant information after commencement of the study.

**CEDD**

2.6 On installing a dry weather flow interceptor (DWFI) to improve the water quality within the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter (CBTS), **Mr MAK Chi-biu** said that relevant departments had conducted a preliminary study and the result indicated that a DWFI close to the seaside would not be effective. Relevant

Action

departments would study other possible measures to improve the water quality within CWBTS.

2.7 **Mr MAK Chi-biu** updated Members that the Transport and Housing Bureau was considering the way forward of the proposed construction of additional floors at Central Piers Nos. 4 to 6.

2.8 In response to the Chair's enquiries about greening at the Central and Western District Promenade (Central Section) and facilities at the Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park, **Mr Richard WONG** said that he would follow up Member's comments after the meeting. **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** suggested that trees which could provide shading should be planted along the promenade.

LCSD

2.9 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** suggested that Members should be provided with a progress report at every meeting to facilitate the Task Force to keep track of on-going harbourfront projects and issues. **Miss Christine AU** responded that the action area table was updated and circulated to Members on a regular basis.

*[Post-meeting note: Among others, the 19<sup>th</sup> Commission meeting on 23 March 2015 had a discussion about the action area table. The meeting concluded that the table should be updated every six months, aligning with the current arrangements. However, the next term of the Commission could revisit the topic and decide whether to have more frequent updates. The next update should be made before the first Task Force meeting in the new term (i.e. 2<sup>nd</sup> half of 2015).]*

**Item 3 Urban Design Study for the Wan Chai North and North Point Harbourfront Areas (Paper No. TFHK/01/2015) (Paper No. TFHK/02/2015)**

3.1 **The Chair** welcomed the presentation team to the meeting. **Ms April KUN** of PlanD, **Mr Kelvin LAW** and **Mr Hugo ERRAZURIZ** of AECOM presented Paper No. TFHK/01/2015 with the aid of a PowerPoint.

3.2 In response to the Chair's enquiry about the public engagement (PE) strategy, **Dr Winnie LAW** said that the public engagement plan would take reference to the experience of the Harbour-front Enhancement Review - Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Areas. She would work on a PE exercise that would be more user-oriented with the goal of creating a

waterfront which would be welcomed and used by the public. Key stakeholders, including the existing and potential users of the waterfront would be engaged. Apart from the traditional focus group meetings and public forums, on-site events within the study area would be organised for the general public, including in particular local residents, to participate. **The Chair** encouraged the team to maintain a brave and bold attitude when taking forward the study.

3.3 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** remarked that the consultancy brief should be released for Members' reference. He opined that the water basin adjacent to the Royal Hong Kong Yacht Club (RHKYC) was an ideal location for developing a maritime museum.

3.4 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** made the following comments:-

- (a) the study should recognise and reflect the unique role of Wan Chai, as compared to the rest of the Victoria Harbourfront;
- (b) in addition to using CWBTS, other existing and potential near-shore marine uses fronting the study area should also be examined;
- (c) the study should address the issue of constructing a DWFI and/or other facilities for improving the water quality within CWBTS;
- (d) the pedestrian accessibility along the Police Officers' Club and the RHKYC should be improved;
- (e) while footbridges might be provided, at-grade connections should be the priority option;
- (f) road and street furniture design enhancements should be included for example by using planters and granite stones instead of concrete barriers;
- (g) demand for coach parking and water-land interface facilities such as landing steps, pontoons, etc. should be examined;
- (h) the suggestion of relocating the Golden Bauhinia Square (GBS) to a better location away from the existing helipad

**Action**

should be considered;

- (i) the OZP should not become a limitation when assessing the commercial gross floor area required for bringing in vibrancy; and
- (j) AECOM should ensure that sufficient manpower and resources were provided for the study.

3.5 **Mr Hugo ERRAZURIZ** responded that the study team saw tremendous opportunities in this part of waterfront, and an innovative approach would be adopted when taking forward the study. As the study has just started, concrete proposals had not been formulated. It was the intention of the study team to understand and collect Members' views and comments at the early stage of the study so these views and comments could be incorporated in the study process.

3.6 **Mr Franklin YU** suggested studying the technical feasibility to construct a continuous accessible waterfront from the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre (HKCEC) to North Point for public enjoyment as some parts were currently inaccessible private sites. He hoped that the study could suggest suitable uses for both harbourfront land and near shore water.

3.7 **Mr Alvin YIP** suggested having an expert from the arts and culture field to help formulate a comprehensive design, identify suitable uses that could meet with operators' requirements, especially for Key Site 1 which would be an arts and culture precinct.

3.8 **Mr Ivan HO** said that he looked forward to an exciting and unique solution for this part of the waterfront, which was the last opportunity on Hong Kong Island to showcase Hong Kong's image as an international metropolitan city. The consultancy team should understand more about the context of the area including its history which would bring a broader vision for suggesting place-making opportunities.

3.9 In response, **Mr Kelvin LAW** said that the study team would be further strengthened and other professionals would be involved in the study process. The upcoming PE exercise would also engage local residents.

**Action**

- 3.10 **Ms April KUN** supplemented that after consulting the Task Force on the proposed study scope last year, Members' comments were taken into account when refining the study brief. These included adjusting the study area to include GBS; requiring the consultant to examine pedestrian connections at different levels; including an assessment on suitable water-related activities; expanding the PE exercise to cover a wider community, *etc.* As the study had only been commenced for three weeks, the presentation for this meeting might not be able to address all Members' aspirations. PlanD would work with the consultant to ensure that the study team would have sufficient resources. Members' comments would be taken into account while taking forward the study.
- 3.11 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** opined that the study area should include the roads segregating the hinterland from the waterfront such as Connaught Road as well as the waters fronting the study area. He also suggested that the professionals from marine related sectors should be involved to provide input on marine-related issues.
- 3.12 **Ms April KUN** responded that Members' comments on the study area were noted. When refining the study scope, the area of influence was introduced for the consultant to study beyond the three key sites. In addition, the consultant would explore various water-land interface issues.
- 3.13 **Mr LAM Kin-lai** remarked that the consultant could enhance pedestrian connectivity from Victoria Park to Key Site 3.
- 3.14 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** said that the study should not start with a list of constraints. The water basin would provide opportunities for different proposals. Making reference to the proposed boardwalk underneath the Island Eastern Corridor, he opined that some proposals might cover the water body and involve reclamation. The study should explore the technical feasibility of the proposals and assess whether strong public need could be established.
- 3.15 **Mr Kelvin LAW** said that the connection between Key Site 3 and the Victoria Park had to overcome the relevant technical constraints, and the study team would explore possible solutions. The study team had an in-house marine specialist on board to provide inputs on marine issues.

**Action**

- 3.16 **The Chair** asked the team to take into account Members' comments when the study progressed further. The recommendations of the study should reflect the unique role of Wan Chai. Members looked forward to hearing progress reports from the study team on a regular basis.
- 3.17 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** reiterated that reclamation might be required for public needs such as constructing a DWFI at CWBTS to improve water quality. To facilitate the process, he opined that the entire study process should assume that proposals could be raised by the public which served a public need but might have PHO implication. Therefore the entire public engagement process should be properly guided by legal advice and all consultation and planning in the past and going forward should be well documented and be available on-line for the public to avoid wasting time and money.
- 3.18 **Miss Christine AU** briefed Members on the proposal to set up a working group under the Task Force for Members to work with the study team on a continuous basis.
- 3.19 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** had reservation on setting up a new working group but not relying on the Task Force to provide further input on the study. **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that he was pleased to work with the study team but opined that formulating proposals and reporting the progress of the study should be the study team's responsibility instead of the working group. **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** supported the idea of having a working group to advise the consultant on a regular basis. **The Chair** concluded that the working group could provide a platform for Members to work alongside with the study team throughout the study process. He did not see any potential problem of having this working group as long as the responsibility of formulating proposals and reporting progress remained with the study team.

*[Post-meeting note: the Working Group was formed and its first meeting was held on 31 March 2015.]*

**Item 4 Proposed University of Chicago Center in Hong Kong at the ex-Victoria Road Detention Centre, Victoria Road, Mount Davis (Paper No. TFHK/03/2015)**

- 4.1 Before discussion, **the Chair** and **Mrs Margaret BROOKE**

**Action**

declared that they were involved in the project, and would not participate in the discussion of this item. Mr Vincent NG was invited to preside the discussion.

*[Note: As Mr Vincent NG presided the discussion of this item, "the Chair" to which the remaining paragraphs referred in this item should be understood as Mr Vincent NG, rather than Mr Nicholas BROOKE.]*

- 4.2 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that the Government should explain why the Task Force had not been consulted before the site was allocated to the proponent. **Mr LAM Kin-lai** questioned whether there was any condition restricting the proponent to use and demolish the existing historic buildings within the site. **The Chair** responded that these comments could be addressed after hearing the proponent's presentation.

**EDB**

*[Post-meeting note: The Education Bureau (EDB) had provided a written response which was circulated for Members' information on 22 April 2015.]*

- 4.3 **The Chair** welcomed the representatives of the project team to the meeting. **Mr Gavin TUN** of University of Chicago, **Mr Francis YAN** of Bing Thom Architects and **Ms Cindy TSANG** of Townland Consultants Limited presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 4.4 **Mr Ivan HO** said that the proposal was bold and brave. As the site was an important part of the harbourfront close to the western end of harbour limit, he suggested that the proponent should consider enhancing the accessibility by widening adjacent pedestrian pavement, and improving the transparency of the building so that the public could still enjoy the harbour view when passing by the site.
- 4.5 **Mr Walter CHAN** said that as the site would become the campus of an educational institute and be open to the public for enjoyment, pick-up and drop-off area should be available for coaches, in particular for those carrying secondary school students to learn the history of the ex-detention centre.
- 4.6 **Mr Franklin YU** appreciated the proponent's efforts made in revitalising the historic buildings. He enquired whether removed vegetation from the proposed development would be compensated. He also enquired whether the steel supporting

**Action**

structures could be shielded by an architectural feature or natural vegetation in order to minimise visual impact. He asked about whether there would be any pedestrian linkage between the site and the existing public trails and whether there would be sufficient car parking spaces provided within the site.

4.7 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** commented that the plans presented should show a wider area for Members to understand its impact on the surrounding environment and the interrelationship between old and new buildings. He opined that it would be important to preserve the natural shoreline, which was different from the core harbour.

4.8 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** commented that:-

- (a) the existing white perimeter wall should be removed or replaced by glass wall to enhance visual permeability of the buildings and the harbour;
- (b) the Jubilee Battery site as a whole should be revitalised and made available for public enjoyment. The heritage site should not be split up by fencing off and revitalising the ex-detention centre only. The Government could provide resources to revitalise the entire site, including those which were not included in this project;
- (c) Block C and the building adjacent to the old battery should not be demolished; and
- (d) only public transportation should be allowed to have access to the site.

4.9 **Mr Alvin YIP** supported the design approach which allowed part of the development to be accessible by the public. He enquired whether there would be supporting facilities such as restrooms and light refreshment facilities available for public use.

4.10 **Mr Eric FOK** said that traffic condition at Victoria Road should be taken into account and a traffic study might be needed to justify the current scale of development. There should be sufficient car parking spaces provided within the site or it would give rise to illegal parking problem.

4.11 **Mr LAM Kin-lai** said that the Conservancy Association

**Action**

strongly objected to the demolition of Block C which signified part of the history of the site.

**4.12 Mr Gavin TUN and Mr Francis YAN responded that:-**

- (a) the proposed scheme was a preliminary design. The project team was working on operational details and would consider incorporating Members' suggestions into the building design as appropriate;
- (b) no student or teaching staff needed to park their cars at the current temporary campus in Cyberport. After the permanent campus was constructed at the site, shuttle buses would be provided between the site and an appropriate transit point. Four car parking spaces including one for the handicapped would be provided within the site. There would also be a loading/unloading area for service and delivery vehicles;
- (c) Block D to the north of Victoria Road would also be refurbished while the university was still considering its use;
- (d) among the seven existing buildings within the site, only Block C would be demolished because of site constraints. They have considered using the building concerned for fire safety and emergency vehicular access (EVA) but found it impracticable. In accordance with the design guidelines for conservation promulgated by the Antiquities and Monuments Office, only the gate of Block C would be preserved. The gate would be displayed at the heritage interpretative centre where photographs and narratives on the history of the site would be displayed;

*[Post-meeting clarification by the project team: In addition to Block C, an ancillary structure behind the disused battery will also be demolished. This structure is a later addition to the VRDC used for a kitchen and servants' quarters. Demolition of this structure will restore the original military setting for better interpretation of the military nature of the Site.]*

- (e) a compensatory tree plan was prepared, and the project team was working with LCSD to further improve the plan;

**Action**

- (f) there would be access points connecting the site with the existing public trails. It was the project team's aspiration to open these accesses at all times;
- (g) new and old buildings would be connected by footbridges. To enhance accessibility to the existing buildings, the project team would incorporate elevator and stairs to provide sufficient connections;
- (h) the project team would further consider details of providing refreshment facilities. There would also be restroom available for the public; and
- (i) a traffic impact assessment (TIA) was conducted, which demonstrated that no adverse impact would be brought by the development. The pavement would be widened and pedestrian crossing would be added at Victoria Road.

4.13 **The Chair** concluded that Members had raised comments on various aspects related to harbourfront planning and enhancement, such as improving visual connectivity between Victoria Road and the waterfront; preserving the natural shoreline; allowing public enjoyment, *etc.* Members also expressed that an integrated planning for the area in the vicinity would be needed. Members raised other comments in respect of traffic impact, public transportation, provision of car parking spaces, and preservation of Block C as well as the building adjacent to the old battery, *etc.* These comments would be recorded in the minutes of the meeting. However, it was considered that these issues fell outside the purview of the Commission and should be considered and advised by the relevant advisory and statutory bodies and/or government departments.

*[Post-meeting note: The Secretariat summarized Members' comments and conveyed them to the Town Planning Board on 26 February 2015.]*

**Item 5 Design of the Public Transport Interchange at Inland Lot No. 9027 and Adjoining Government Land at J/O Java Road and Tin Chiu Street, North Point, Hong Kong (Paper No. TFHK/04/2015)**

5.1 **The Chair** welcomed the project team to the meeting. **Ms Bella**

**Action**

**FAN** and **Mr Ivan LI** of Ronald Lu & Partners (Hong Kong) Ltd and **Miss Camay LAM** of AXXA Group Limited presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.

- 5.2 In response to the Chair's enquiry, **Ms Bella FAN** said that around 250 car parking spaces would be provided at the second basement level to serve the development. 30 coach parking spaces would also be provided in accordance with the lease conditions and the planning brief. **Mr Steeve CHAW** of AECOM Asia Company Ltd said that after extensive studies, 30 coach parking spaces were determined to be necessary. **Mr Alan TAM** said that the 30 coach parking spaces were equivalent to more than three hundred metres of road side coach parking spaces and should be sufficient.
- 5.3 **Mr Franklin YU** said that the public open space within the site should provide connections to the proposed boardwalk to the north.
- 5.4 **Mr Evans IU** enquired if there would be any connection to the North Point Ferry Piers. He pointed out that some District Council members commented that there was not enough space along the pavement for planting trees. He enquired if the current development would provide adequate space for both trees and pedestrians.
- 5.5 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** made the following comments:-
- (a) it would be useful if Members were provided with their comments as expressed in previous meetings in February and October 2013;
  - (b) while the 30 coach parking spaces might be sufficient, the bus bays might be too narrow for long coaches;
  - (c) the project team was only asked to create an active interface between the development and adjacent streets, but not the promenade to the north. The current design would construct a blank wall facing the waterfront, which was not compatible with the Commission's vision to make the promenade vibrant. The Emergency Vehicular Access (EVA) to the west should be rerouted to accommodate alfresco dining at ground level; and
  - (d) there should be a better process to ensure that Members'

comments would be reflected in development plans.

- 5.6 In response, **Ms Ginger KIANG** said that the project team had consulted this Task Force and subsequently obtained approval from the TPB on this development. The site provided development opportunities, but was also constrained by the configuration and area required for the proposed public open space. She understood from the developer that there would be an EVA serving the development. The developer was working on details of providing retail and alfresco dining facilities at the ground level of the western portion of the proposed development.
- 5.7 **The Chair** echoed the view that it would be undesirable to have a blank wall facing the waterfront and no facilities at ground level of the western part of the site.
- 5.8 **Ms Bella FAN** responded that a podium for retail purposes would be provided within the western part of the site, and some alfresco dining facilities would be provided at ground level. On the eastern part, she said that the design of the public transport interchange (PTI) was constrained by bus as well as mini-bus bays which had to be provided at the middle of ground floor. The only ingress/egress point at Tin Chiu Street would be therefore close to the waterfront where vehicular ramps linking to the basement had to be constructed. In order to create a park-like atmosphere at the promenade, the wall facing the waterfront would be softened by landscaping.
- 5.9 **Mr Ivan HO** considered that the proposal was unacceptable as a blank wall would be constructed facing the waterfront promenade.
- 5.10 **Mr Franklin YU** asked about location of the alfresco dining facilities; and whether the façade of the Government, Institution or Community (G/IC) facilities could be improved to provide better visual permeability.
- 5.11 **Ms Bella FAN** said that the alfresco dining facilities would be located at the retail floor and glass wall would be installed at the side facing the promenade. The same treatment would be made for G/IC facilities to be built within the development. These facilities would also be connected to the adjacent public open space. The existing PTI would be moved to a new place at the eastern part of the site by the end of this year. There would be

Action

opportunities for the project team to further enhance the design of the western part of the site.

5.12 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** suggested the Government to review the process of monitoring development projects which were advised by the Commission. Quoting his comment as recorded in paragraph 3.6 (e) of the minutes of the Task Force meeting on 21 February 2013, he reiterated that “retail facilities should be provided along the PTI perimeter and the waterfront promenade”. He opined that his previous comments were not taken into account in the current design. He also commented that free parking for coaches should be provided and that the EVA at the western part of the site should be rerouted away from buildings to allow more space for outdoor seating.

**The  
Secretariat**

5.13 **Mr LAM Kin-lai** opined that ground level space should be open for natural ventilation and the PTI should avoid using mechanical fans for ventilation.

5.14 **Ms Bella FAN** responded that there would be sufficient ventilation fans and extensive louvre along the ingress/egress point which would facilitate air ventilation within the PTI.

5.15 For the PTI at the eastern part of the site, **the Chair** said that Members were not satisfied with the design of having a blank wall facing the waterfront. He had concern over air ventilation within the PTI and whether the 30 coach parking spaces would be sufficient. For the western part of the site, he invited the proponent to brief Members again on the detailed design. The technical feasibility to move the EVA towards the waterfront in order to provide more space for alfresco dining should be further explored.

5.16 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** asked the necessity for providing a pet garden at the harbourfront. On the landscape plan, he commented that the present scheme would only provide grass, footpaths and parkland that were not properly compartmentalised. While understanding that it was a conceptual plan, he opined that the landscape plan could be improved.

5.17 **Mr MAK Chi-biu** asked the proponent to clarify whether there would be provision for constructing a cycle track within the waterfront promenade which would form part of the proposed boardwalk underneath the Island Eastern Corridor.

Action

- 5.18 **Miss Camay LAM** responded that part of the waterfront promenade with a width of around 5 to 10 metres was reserved for constructing cycle track in future.
- 5.19 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** opined that the EVA could be provided with grass or open stones with grass, and that outdoor seating should be permitted on EVAs as long as the tables and chairs were loose and could be crushed by emergency vehicles. It was excessive to have three EVAs cutting through the site. He asked the Government to review the EVA requirement. He also suggested that the proponent to plant trees that could provide more shading within the site. Rain shelters between the residential development and different transport nodes should also be provided.
- 5.20 **Mr Ivan HO** opined that Members' comments should be confined to within the Commission's terms of reference, rather than the fine details of the architectural design. He pointed out that the Fire Services Department would not accept providing EVA on grass area.
- 5.21 In closing, **the Chair** asked the proponent to consult the Task Force again with a detailed layout of the western part of the site. He also invited the proponent to refine the scheme taking into account Members' comments in particular, on alfresco dining, landscape plan and the provision within the waterfront promenade for constructing cycle track. **Ms Bella FAN** appreciated Members' understanding on the technical constraints faced by the development in the eastern part of the site. She said that the project team would endeavour to improve the scheme, and come back with a more detailed design for the western part of the site.

**The project  
team**

**Item 6 Any Other Business**

- 6.1 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

**Secretariat**

**Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island  
May 2015**