

Harbourfront Commission
Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island

Minutes of Nineteenth Meeting

Date : 5 May 2015
Time : 3:00 p.m.
Venue : Conference Room, 15/F, North Point Government Offices,
333 Java Road, North Point, 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 Conservancy Association
Mrs Karen BARRETTO	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Andy LEUNG	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 Paul ZIMMERMAN	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Mr CHAN Hok-fung	
Ms Lily CHOW	
Mr Eric FOK	
Ms LI Chun-chau	
Mr Thomas CHAN	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Edward LEUNG	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	Assistant Director (Leisure Services) 2, Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Ms Ginger KIANG	District Planning Officer/Hong Kong, Planning Department (PlanD)
Mr Kenneth WONG	Secretary

In Attendance

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

Absent with Apologies

Mr LAU Chun-kong	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr Shuki LEUNG	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong

Mr Walter CHAN
Mrs Ayesha Macpherson LAU
Mr Brian David LI
Mr Raj Sital MOTWANI
Mr Vincent NG
Ms Jacqueline CHUNG
Mr Alvin YIP

For Agenda Item 3

Mr Patrick FUNG	Senior Town Planner/Studies & Research 5, PlanD
-----------------	---

For Agenda Item 4

Ms Ginger KIANG	District Planning Officer/Hong Kong, PlanD
Mr Derek TSE	Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong 5, PlanD
Miss Stephanie CHAN	Assistant Town Planner/Hong Kong 10, PlanD
Miss Shirley LEUNG	Engineer/Central & Western 3, TD

For Agenda Item 5

Ms Anne TENG	District Officer (Eastern), Home Affairs Department (HAD)
Ms Rebecca MAK	Assistant District Officer (Eastern) (Atg.), HAD
Mr CHAN Chi-yip	Project Manager (Works), HAD
Mr LI Ho-kin	Senior Project Coordination Manager 1, Architectural Services Department (ArchSD)
Mr Chris LIU Chi-ho	Senior Project Manager 323, ArchSD
Ms Helen WONG	Architect/102, ArchSD
Mr Jason WONG	Landscape Architect/1, ArchSD
Ms Yvonne LEE	Deputy District Leisure Manager (Eastern) 2, LCSD
Ms Gladys CHAN	Deputy District Leisure Manager (District Support) Eastern, LCSD

For Agenda Item 6

Mr Johnny LEUNG	Manager Director, The Star Ferry Limited (SFL)
-----------------	--

Mr Samson LEUNG	Operations Manager, SFL
Ms Carol CHAN	Senior Business Officer, SFL
Mr Cyrus SHAM	Assistant Operations Executive, SFL
Mr Ian BROWNLEE	Director, Masterplan Limited
Mr Benson POON	Town Planner, Masterplan Limited
Mr Gary HUI Bing-cheong	Engineer, WEC Engineering Consultants (International) Ltd

Action

Welcoming Message

The Chair welcomed all to the meeting; and informed Members that Mr Edward LEUNG, Senior Manager (Tourism) 2 of TC was attending on behalf of Ms Emily MO.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 18th Meeting

- 1.1 **The Chair** said that the Secretariat circulated the draft minutes of the 18th meeting to Members on 22 April 2015. After incorporating the proposed amendments received, the revised draft minutes were circulated to Members on 30 April 2015.
- 1.2 **Mr Ivan HO** suggested deleting the post-meeting note appearing after paragraph 5.21 as it had no direct relevance to the content of the preceding paragraph.
- 1.3 **Mrs Karen BARRETTO** suggested amending the first sentence of paragraph 5.19 of the revised draft minutes as follows:-

“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.”
- 1.4 After incorporating the proposed amendments of Mr Ivan HO and Mrs Karen BARRETTO, the further revised draft minutes were confirmed at the meeting.

Item 2 Matters Arising

- A. Shatin to Central Link – Exterior Design of the West Ventilation Building of the Exhibition Station (paragraph 2.1 of the minutes of the

18th meeting)

- 2.1 **The Chair** said that MTRCL provided a further revised design of the ventilation building which the Secretariat circulated to Members on 25 March 2015. Further written comments from Members were conveyed to the project proponent. Members' comments would also be conveyed to the TPB.

[Post-meeting note: After taking into account Members' further comments, MTRCL provided a response and a finalised design which the Secretariat circulated to Members on 15 May 2015. No further comment was received from Members before the prescribed deadline.]

- B. Proposed Boardwalk underneath the Island Eastern Corridor (IEC) (paragraph 2.5 of the minutes of the 18th meeting)

- 2.2 **The Chair** said that the investigation study for the proposed boardwalk underneath the IEC had commenced in March 2015. In response to Members' suggestion, the Consultant targeted to launch the study website in Q3 2015.

- 2.3 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** did not see it necessary to take one year to carry out the study as the public was already consulted on the project in the course of the feasibility study conducted some years ago, and he opined that the PHO should essentially allow this sort of project for fulfilling a public purpose. **The Chair** responded that as explained at the last Task Force meeting, the process had to be transparent and comprehensive so that all parties concerned could be engaged and properly consulted and also to put up a case to justify fulfilment of the overriding public need test. **Mr MAK Chi-biu** supplemented that as the project fell within the scope of the PHO, it was important that there should be a robust process to address all the legal concerns under the Ordinance. Therefore, the process would require some time to get all the steps right.

- C. Greening at the Central and Western District Promenade (Central Section) and facilities at the Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park (paragraph 2.8 of the minutes of the 18th meeting)

- 2.4 **The Chair** relayed LCSD's advice that due to the temporary nature of the Central and Western District Promenade (Central Section), the current design was intended to provide basic facilities and greenery; and it would be more appropriate to enhance the greening when permanent development of the

Action

promenade has to be taken forward in the future. In response to the Chair's further enquiry about any short-term measures to improve the greening, especially the shading at the promenade, **Mr Richard WONG** said that there were constraints particularly those posed by underground drainage and utilities, and some arbours or shelters had been provided there. LCSD would have to further study if it was possible to plant more trees there.

2.5 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** commented that proposed enhancement of greening in parks had been constrained by underground facilities in other cases as well. In future, the layout of underground facilities should be taken into consideration right at the beginning of the design process so as to leave more room for proper tree planting and greening.

2.6 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired about the details of the underground facilities at the promenade and requested LCSD to provide a plan of these underground facilities to Members. At the Chair's suggestion, **Mr Richard WONG** agreed to further report on the constraints on tree planting at the promenade at the next Task Force meeting.

LCSD

D. *Proposed University of Chicago Center in Hong Kong at the ex-Victoria Road Detention Centre, Victoria Road, Mount Davis (paragraph 4.2 of the minutes of the 18th meeting)*

2.7 **The Chair** said that Members' views on the project expressed at the last meeting had been summarised and conveyed to the TPB on 26 February 2015. Concerning the Jubilee Battery Site, the Education Bureau had also provided a written response which was circulated for Members' information on 22 April 2015. Subsequently, further comments from a Member had also been referred to the relevant bureaux and departments for a response. The Secretariat would revert to Members when the response was available.

**the
Secretariat**

2.8 In response to Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN's enquiry, **Ms Ginger KIANG** said that the TPB had imposed a number of conditions when approving the planning application. The relevant information could be provided to Members after the meeting.

PlanD

[Post-meeting note: The approval letter, including the approval conditions, was circulated to Members on 11 August 2015.]

Action

E. Inland Lot No. 9027 and Adjoining Government Land at I/O Java Road and Tin Chiu Street, North Point, Hong Kong – Detailed Design of the Western Part of the Site (paragraph 5.21 of the minutes of the 18th meeting)

2.9 **The Chair** said that as advised by the project proponent, they were still working on the detailed design for the western part of the development. Tentatively, they targeted to brief the Task Force in Q3 2015 when a more mature design was available.

the project proponent

Item 3 Urban Design Study for the Wan Chai North and North Point Harbourfront Areas – Progress Update (Paper No. TFHK/05/2015)

3.1 **The Chair** welcomed Mr Patrick FUNG of PlanD to the meeting. **Mr Patrick FUNG** reported that since the commencement of the Study in January 2015, the study team had conducted a baseline review and prepared a draft urban design baseline considerations plan which mapped out all the constraints and key issues affecting the future waterfront planning and design within the study area. The team had also prepared a draft urban design framework plan which set out the proposed design themes for the key sites and highlighted the urban design enhancement opportunities. Both the plans had been discussed at the 1st meeting of the Working Group on the Urban Design Study for the Wan Chai North and North Point Harbourfront Areas (WGUDS) held on 31 March 2015. The team noted Members' concerns on pedestrian connectivity and use of the water space as well as Members' comments that the public engagement (PE) should allow for cross sectoral discussion and interflow of ideas. Members' comments together with all the public views to be collected in the upcoming Stage 1 PE would be taken into account in refining the plans. The team had also formulated the work plan for Stage 1 PE which was scheduled to be launched in June 2015. The PE activities would mainly include interviews with major stakeholders, focus group meetings, resident workshops and on-site public events, etc. Currently, the team was having pre-engagement interviews with major stakeholders, and was working on the logistical arrangements for the PE activities

3.2 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** questioned when a very detailed map showing all the constraints of both the public and private land within the study area would be made available to Members as

Action

raised at the last WGUDS meeting.

- 3.3 **Miss Christine AU** responded that the study team had prepared a constraint list which would be ready for presentation to Members at the next WGUDS meeting. **Mr Patrick FUNG** confirmed that the plans were now under refinement and the refined plans could be presented at the next WGUDS meeting. He would further discuss with the study team to work out the level of details as required by the WGUDS. **The Chair** said that the WGUDS would like to review the plans before they were released to the public.

PlanD

[Post-meeting note: The site constraint map was presented on the 2nd WGUDS meeting on 27 May 2015.]

Item 4 Land Use Review on the Western Part of Kennedy Town (Paper No. TFHK/06/2015)

- 4.1 **The Chair** welcomed the presentation team to the meeting. **Ms Ginger KIANG** and **Mr Derek TSE** of PlanD presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 4.2 **The Chair** questioned whether the proposed 8-storey primary school at Site 3b could actually provide a visual relief to the location as it would be higher than the adjoining buildings.
- 4.3 **Mr CHAN Hok-fung**, who was also the Vice-Chairman of the Central and Western District Council, said that there would be an increase of about 3,400 flats and 10,000 persons respectively under this proposal. He expressed concern on the traffic impact especially at Victoria Road and the pressure on the community facilities which would be generated by such a development scale. He opined that the review should have included Sai Wan Estate which was built over 50 years ago and might be redeveloped in future. He also suggested shifting the proposed residential development at Site 3a to other site(s) on Victoria Road to enhance air ventilation; and deferring the submission of this revised land use proposal to the TPB so that the residents could have more information and discussion with PlanD and the relevant departments.
- 4.4 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** echoed the concern on the traffic impact especially at Victoria Road which would be generated by the increased development density. He supported deferring the submission of the revised proposal to the TPB until the

Action

information on the traffic impact assessment (TIA) was made available to the Task Force. For the key waterfront sites at Sites 1a, 1b and 4b, he questioned about their development concepts; whether the proposed building height restriction was for the entire sites; what marine uses had been considered; and whether the input of the Transport and Housing Bureau had been sought.

- 4.5 **Mr Ivan HO** said that there was no proposal to improve accessibility of the proposed new waterfront open area to the inner part of the old Kennedy Town. Neither was there proposal to improve connections through elevated landscaped decks to public transport facilities like the MTR stations. While different uses like commercial, leisure and tourism had been designated for the key waterfront sites, they seemed segregated and not integrated into the waterfront area. There was also little information on how the promenade would be connected to the eastern side and to other parts of the waterfront. The proposal should also address the unique characteristic of this fantastic waterfront.
- 4.6 **Mr Andy LEUNG** said that this huge piece of waterfront land provided a unique opportunity for comprehensive urban re-planning and design. He opined that there should be particular themes to define the waterfront activities before deciding on their uses. Site 3b would be the future focal point making immediate connection to the waterfront, but the primary school with little interaction with the waterfront would become a barrier to accessibility. While Victoria Road was the main road straddling across the whole area, there was not enough measures to enhance the walkability to the waterfront from the south of Victoria Road especially from where the MTR stations were. There should be a more comprehensive pedestrian accessibility strategy by making use of footbridges or landscape decks, given the level difference of Victoria Road.
- 4.7 **Ms Ginger KIANG** responded that:-
- (a) when the Task Force was last consulted on the preliminary proposal, some of the points raised today were also raised (connectivity and vibrancy) and PlanD had taken them into consideration when formulating the revised proposal. The Western District and Kennedy Town were old developed areas and this was the only piece of land available for redevelopment to meet quite a

Action

lot of competing uses, including housing, school, Government, Institution or Community (GIC) use and promenade, *etc.* Within these constraints, PlanD had tried best to accommodate as far as practical to meet various planning objectives, including the construction of a continuous waterfront promenade. For key waterfront sites, planning intention had been indicated through the proposed zoning. For Sites 4a and 4b, which were currently under private ownership and partly occupied by two industrial buildings, flexibility was allowed for the future proponents to provide waterfront facilities and activities while planning incentive was provided for the proponents to redevelop the industrial buildings;

- (b) the local and the District Council's concern was mainly on the development scale but it was necessary to balance different development needs in the area. GIC and open space requirements arising from this revised proposal in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines were met. The 8-storey primary school was proposed. Together with the low-rise GIC cluster at the back, it could provide the breathing space and visual permeability throughout the area; and
- (c) PlanD, in consultation with TD, had tried to provide better connection between the hinterland and the waterfront through a number of measures including widening the pavement of Cadogan Street and providing two footbridges across Victoria Road, *etc.* Enhancing the connection with the MTR stations would be longer term strategy and development as there were many site constraints in the old town area.

4.8 Miss Shirley LEUNG and Mr CHAN Chung-yuen of TD supplemented that:-

- (a) at the beginning of this land use review, a full scale TIA was conducted, but as the proposal has been slightly modified over the years, TD carried out in-house review to ensure that findings and recommendations of the original TIA were still valid under the revised proposal. As the total population and the number of flats were adjusted downward under the revised proposals, it was confident that the original TIA should be adequate; and

Action

- (b) apart from widening Victoria Road to a maximum of 4 lanes, a number of traffic improvement measures were proposed, including constructing a new access road to connect Victoria Road with Cadogan Street for diversion of Central-bound traffic; converting the section of Victoria Road between Cadogan Street and Ka Wai Man Road into one-way with westbound traffic only; signalling the Victoria Road/ new access road junction, the Catchick Street/new access road/Cadogan Street junction and Victoria Road/ Sai Ning Street junction for more efficient traffic control; and modifying and improving the Victoria Road/Cadogan Street junction and Belcher's Street/ Sands Street junction.
- 4.9 **Mr CHAN Hok-fung** opined that TD should examine the actual traffic situation, instead of only assessing the number of vehicles. For example, he observed that the traffic was often blocked by trams turning from Catchick Street to Davis Street, Belcher's Street and then to Cadogan Street; and by school coaches turning from Ka Wai Man Road to Victoria Road.
- 4.10 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** echoed that trams were normally not included in the traffic flow when conducting TIA, but they would often block the car traffic especially when turning onto narrow roads. He understood that this was a planning study instead of a design study and so there might not be too much details about how to make use of the promenade area. On the other hand, he opined that Sites 3a and 3b were the last part of old Hong Kong that could have new development and it would be preferable if some themes could be drawn up to address the historical context.
- 4.11 **Mr LAM Kin-lai** opined that consideration should be given to extending the tramway to the new access road between the new primary school and the new development so as to relieve the traffic congestion and to facilitate accessibility to the waterfront.
- 4.12 **Mr Andy LEUNG** suggested incorporating the current turning circle of the tramway into the proposed public transport interchange (PTI) under the proposed residential development at Site 3a to avoid conflict with other vehicles and pedestrians.
- 4.13 **Mr Ivan HO** opined that in the absence of other proposed means of connection to the waterfront, it would not be acceptable in term of accessibility and connectivity if the

Action

proposed access road was to be used as a new trunk road as it would segregate the waterfront from the rest of the area. He also asked for elaboration on why there was no plan to extend the tramway as such extension could enhance connectivity and accessibility to the waterfront.

- 4.14 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** opined that emphasis should be placed on public transport rather than private vehicles. He commented that the proposed land uses were compartmentalised and not well connected; and the proposed zonings for key waterfront sites were vague without details on the implementation responsibility.
- 4.15 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** opined that the Government should provide the finance to fill any funding gap in re-aligning the tram route. He called for the road between the residential site and the waterfront park to be removed. The intended zonings and building height restriction for the pier sites were not clear as there was no study on the conceptual design and the marine related uses. He did not support submitting the revised proposal to the TPB.
- 4.16 **The Chair** said that as expressed by Members, this revised proposal was not ready for submission to the TPB. In particular, there should be more specific proposal on the concepts for the key waterfront and pier sites. The major challenge was connectivity and accessibility to the waterfront, including the tramway and the focus should be placed on public transport rather than private vehicles. There should also be attempt to address the historical context of this unique waterfront.
- 4.17 In response, **Mr Thomas CHAN** said that the whole ex-Kennedy Town Incinerator and Abattoir site was subject to decontamination programme and there was still some time before Sites 1a, 1b and 2 would be available for development. There was no firm proposal on their development yet. While Members' comments that these sites should be designed and developed in integrated manner having regard to historical context and connectivity to both the other development within this land use review and the older area were noted, many of the points raised could only be realised through a more coordinated implementation plan rather than the zoning. He suggested that a more detailed conceptual design could be worked out for Sites 1a, 1b, 2, 4a and 4b to devise the design and implementation approach for Members' discussions.

- 4.18 **Ms Ginger KIANG** supplemented that the OZP system aimed to provide flexibility and clear guidance for project proponents to develop their land. PlanD took note of the importance to promote the vibrancy of this waterfront with leisure and recreational opportunities for residents. In the form of a planning review, there was no detailed implementation proposal at the moment but Members could be assured that the proposed zoning was in line with the Commission's objectives. PlanD could follow the suggestion to prepare a conceptual design for Sites 1a, 1b, 2, 4a and 4b to illustrate how the sites could be developed and the Commission's objectives be achieved in the long run. PlanD has also tried best to widen the pavement of this area, but the scope for further widening the road connecting to the old areas would be relatively limited as there was already a lot of existing development there. PlanD would work with TD to consider how to further improve the connectivity between the waterfront and the hinterland.
- 4.19 **Mr CHAN Chung-yuen** supplemented that in the original TIA, there was no study on extension of the tramway. There would also be difficulty in combining the tram terminus with the proposed bus terminus.
- 4.20 **The Chair** believed that it would be helpful if PlanD could prepare a conceptual design, especially on how the pier sites could be integrated with the rest of the waterfront.
- 4.21 **Miss Christine AU** suggested that if the proposed zoning was agreed in principle, the Harbour Unit could further work with PlanD to prepare a separate conceptual design for the sites for Members' consideration.
- 4.22 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** reiterated that he did not support the zoning plan as the coverage and the proposed uses for the key waterfront and pier sites were not clear. Also, the new access road would be used as a main road which would interfere with the public enjoyment of the waterfront. He called for a study on how to remove this road.
- 4.23 **Ir Peter WONG** opined that the innovative idea of combining the tram terminus with the PTI should be looked into even if there was no such precedent. **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** said that the issues of connecting to public transport and general traffic should be addressed as the new MTR stations in the area

had been completed.

- 4.24 **The Chair** said that this revised proposal might be submitted to the TPB together with Members' concerns and comments expressed at this meeting. Alternatively, PlanD might prepare conceptual design to address Members' concerns, and revert to the Task Force before making a submission to the TPB.
- 4.25 **Ms Ginger KIANG** responded that PlanD's original plan was to submit the OZP amendments to the TPB within this quarter. PlanD would be prepared to work with the Task Force on the conceptual design of the key waterfront sites to address Members' concerns.
- 4.26 In closing the discussion, **the Chair** suggested convening a working session for the Task Force to provide further inputs for PlanD to work out a better plan to address Members' concerns. **Mr Thomas CHAN** responded that it was agreeable to convene a working session to thrash out the design and implementation issues for the key waterfront sites and ways to address Members' concerns on connectivity without making too substantial amendments to the proposed OZP, especially for the sites with development timetable some years away.

**PlanD & the
Secretariat**

[Post-meeting note: A working session was arranged on 24 August 2015 for Members to provide further inputs on the Review.]

Item 5 Signature Project Scheme in the Eastern District: Eastern District Cultural Square (Paper No. TFHK/07/2015)

- 5.1 **The Chair** welcomed the representatives of the project team to the meeting. **Ms Anne TENG**, District Officer (Eastern), and **Ms Helen WONG** and **Mr Jason WONG** of ArchSD presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 5.2 **The Chair** appreciated that the proposed scheme was a responsive and innovative solution, given the budgetary constraints.
- 5.3 While acknowledging the constraints, **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** opined that the outdoor cultural venue needed better definition and accentuation on diversity of uses as it might not be used for cultural performance and local parade most of the time; and that the concept of tensile roof to mirror traditional Chinese buildings was vague. He also opined that the planting

Action

plan could be more imaginative in attracting people to the venue; and that the activity area and sitting-out area might just look like pathways. He suggested designating the area on the western seaside for uses more associated with the waterfront, instead of a playground which might be shifted to the planting area.

- 5.4 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** appreciated that the proposed scheme had responded positively to Members' comments expressed at an earlier meeting, and was pleased to accept the plan. He suggested that the cultural square should allow people to use scooters, tricycles and rollerblades, *etc.* when there was no performance. It should allow dog access with provision of water points in the vicinity; and there should be shaded seating similar to the canopy tree at the Stanley Plaza. Also, the site to the east of the Square was actively used by trucks for loading and unloading purpose, and there should be proper drainage system to facilitate rinsing of the area.
- 5.5 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** appreciated that the design responded to Members' comments made at the last occasion, especially on opening up of the promenade. She opined that if there were nicely designed trees and shades, the Square could still attract people even when there was no performance; and that there could be some food and beverage (F&B) facilities or kiosks rather than just vending machine.
- 5.6 **Ms LI Chun-chau**, who was also a member of the Eastern District Council (EDC), said that this project had undergone extensive discussion and public consultation, and was supported by most EDC members. Eastern District did not have enough large venues for gathering and performance and this project could meet the demand of local residents who would like this landmark project to be implemented as soon as possible. She appreciated that the Square would link up with the Tam Kung Temple which had important celebration activities every year. To link up the Square with the reading habit, she suggested adding a small library or deploying a mobile library there. On the other hand, she reflected EDC's views that the venue might not be suitable for very active uses, like skateboards, *etc.* which might disturb people taking a rest there.
- 5.7 **Mr Eric FOK** supported the theme of the project which could create a breathing space and community within the district,

Action

incorporate the local culture, and draw people to the waterfront. He enquired whether there were supporting facilities for events like F&B facilities and storage space for equipment; and whether people had to make applications for using the performance areas.

- 5.8 **Mr Ivan HO** complimented the project team on their responsiveness to Members' comments made on the last occasion. Appreciating the simplicity design approach which would enable people to enjoy the venue in their own way, he hoped that the implementation of this project could be expedited. He suggested that there should be adequate provision of supporting facilities for events, like power supply, water and drainage, *etc.*; adopting an inclined floor surface design to enhance visual connectivity and surface drainage; and enhancing the connection of the proposed tensile structure with local culture, for example by using appropriate color.
- 5.9 **Mr Evans IU** suggested further enhancing the connectivity between the open space and the Tam Kung Temple which were currently separated by a road, and widening the connection with the promenade.
- 5.10 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** complimented the project team for taking on board some of Members' comments expressed on the last occasion. He opined that it was nice to have such a venue close to the waterfront, and if well managed, its usage should not be a problem as Hong Kong had a shortage of such performance venue.
- 5.11 Given the relatively small size of the site and the tight budget, **Mr Andy LEUNG** considered it a fairly good scheme which made a good balance between the soft and hard landscape. To make the venue more popular and usable, it was important to enhance its interface with the surrounding area and connection with the hinterland. This would become a convenient landing point for the future boardwalk and the connection with the promenade was important in drawing people from the western side, albeit there might be constraints on the eastern side. He also pointed out that there might be potential illegal parking problem at Tam Kung Temple Road, which would be difficult to manage especially during large scale events. He had no problem with the pavilion design which resembled those at the Museum of Coastal Defence.

5.12 **Mr LI Ho-kin** of ArchSD responded that:-

- (a) the project team would make sure that there would be appropriate supporting facilities for events like water points, power supply and drainages, *etc.*;
- (b) while the fundamental requirement of the Square was for performances, there might not be performance every day and therefore the project team would make the design as flexible as possible. Children might bring their toys in the open area, which could also be used for exhibitions, fairs and gathering events, *etc.* The project team would also make the Square as open as possible but there would be shading and covered structure on the western side of the venue;
- (c) the design will enhance the connectivity by introducing a 10 metre wide waterfront promenade which will be an extension of the existing Aldrich Bay Promenade on the north. The Government has also added a new pedestrian crossing on the south to enhance the connection with Shau Kei Wan Main Street East (SKWMSE); and
- (d) while a sloping floor design might enhance the visual connectivity of audiences with the performance stage, too steep a floor design might restrict some kind of uses. The project team would try to strike a balance.

5.13 **Ms Anne TENG** supplemented that:-

- (a) Members' concern on illegal parking was noted as some trucks might continue to use the area. A balance would be struck on the future uses and there was no plan to ban the use of any vehicles in the nearby area. The District Office would continue to work with TD, the Police and the relevant departments to monitor the situation and deter proliferation of illegal parking; ensure a good flow of vehicles and pedestrians when there was a major event; and work out the interface for vehicles loading and unloading in the nearby area;
- (b) the Square was close to SKWMSE where there were a number of good restaurants, and it was EDC's intention to bring more tourists to SKWMSE. The project team

Action

would study with LCSD on whether it would be sustainable to have a permanent kiosk or other possible options;

(c) while some Members might have apprehension on underutilization of the venue, Eastern District was actually quite short of performance space as it was the largest and most populated district on Hong Kong Island. Although there might not be performance on a daily basis, it was envisaged that the performance stage would be quite popular. As suggested by LCSD, the promenade would be open round the clock. The performance stage and platform would be open for booking by the public from 7:00 am to 11:00 pm. When the stage or platform were not booked for events during the above-mentioned opening hours from 7:00 am to 11:00 pm, they would be open for public use subject to the details of the management scheme, which would be worked out when the project progressed; and

(d) the project team would endeavor to inject more flexible and lively elements into this waterfront project.

5.14 **The Chair** concluded that the majority of Members were very supportive of the early implementation of the project. He asked the project team to take Members' comments into account when working out the detailed design. He also noted that the project team would consult Legislative Council later this year and seek funding from the Legislative Council afterwards. He asked the project team to share the detailed design with the Task Force when ready. **The Chair** remarked that the project was worth supporting. He also suggested that if need be, the Eastern District could use this minutes of meeting as support of their funding application.

EDO

Item 6 Proposed Design Concept for the Ferry Plaza at the Central Waterfront, with the Celestial Star Ferry Attraction and Public Amenity Space (Paper No. TFHK/08/2015)

6.1 **The Chair** welcomed the presentation team to the meeting. **Mr Benson POON** of Masterplan Limited presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.

Action

- 6.2 **The Chair** remarked that the proponent was seeking Members' views on whether the proposal had merits, and whether the Task Force would support them in taking forward the discussion with the Government. There were issues on funding and amendment to zoning, *etc.*, and Members should treat the proposal as conceptual. At this stage, it would be premature for the Task Force to give in-principle endorsement to the proposal.
- 6.3 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** welcomed the donation of the retired ferry as a feature at the Central waterfront and the exact location could be further explored. He opined that people would like to be able to touch the ferry and therefore it was not necessary to build the artificial water feature surrounding the ferry.
- 6.4 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** did not agree that there was a need to place a retired ferry on land as the Star Ferry experience was crossing the harbour itself. Alternatively, he suggested that the ferry might be anchored to the harbourfront as a restaurant.
- 6.5 **Mr Ivan HO** appreciated the SFL's initiative to donate the retired ferry, but did not support putting it on land, which might appear a bit strange and inauspicious to the Chinese. Instead, the retired ferry might be berthed to provide an iconic feature at the waterfront.
- 6.6 **Mr Andy LEUNG** opined that the best way to experience the Star Ferry as an important icon of Hong Kong was to use it to cross the harbour. While there was no F&B facility on board, the experience could be made more interesting and celebratory, and tourists would prefer to celebrate Star Ferry while it was in the water. If the retired ferry was permanently berthed at the waterfront, it would have more direct relation with the water. But if it was placed on land, it would just become another themed restaurant.
- 6.7 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** concurred that it might appear a bit ironic if ferry service was operated alongside a retired ferry put on an artificial dock. He opined that there could be better use of this valuable waterfront site. A better way to have F&B experience on board might be a harbour cruise on a working ferry. He opined that the Task Force was not in a position to comment further on how this proposal should proceed when it would take up such a vital part of the Central harbourfront.
- 6.8 **Mr CHAN Chung-yuen** said that the proposal would not have

Action

impact on the ferry operation. With regard to the operation mode of the proposed Ferry Plaza, the relevant bureaux and departments would further examine the feasibility from various policy angles when more details were available.

- 6.9 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** opined that a retired ferry could be kept as an iconic feature alongside with normal ferry operations. Although it might not be the right place and way to keep the retired ferry, it would be unfortunate if the donation was not accepted and the retired ferry was not put to some sensible uses at the waterfront.
- 6.10 **Mr Evans IU** appreciated the proposed donation of the retired ferry to the people of Hong Kong, but opined that it should stay in water. **Mrs Karen BARRETTO** agreed with reusing and recycling the ferry, but concurred that it should stay in water.
- 6.11 **Mr MAK Chi-biu** pointed out that the proponent should consider the technical challenge to lift the retired ferry above the Queen's Pier which would be reassembled in the vicinity.
- 6.12 **Mr Ian BROWNLEE** of Masterplan Limited responded that the proponent came up with this ferry plaza idea before the observation wheel was in place. The proponent was given the understanding that the proposal could only be considered after the removal of the observation wheel. Because of the licensing requirements of the Marine Department (MD) and the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD), and the wavy condition in the harbour, it would be uneconomical and unpractical to keep a retired ferry as a restaurant on water. No other location had been identified for the retired ferry as the original idea was to integrate the future ferry plaza with the current operation of the Star Ferry, probably within the terms of the franchise to generate non-fare box revenue to cross-subsidise the ferry service.
- 6.13 **Mr Johnny LEUNG** of the SFL supplemented that:-
- (a) it was costly and not easy to keep the retired ferry afloat at Ting Kau because of the need to comply with various statutory requirements and to resolve many administrative and maintenance issues. When there was a typhoon, the ferry had to be towed to a typhoon shelter and a special area had to be allocated for it;

Action

- (b) a retired fireboat was being placed ashore in Hong Kong, but it did not mean that fireboats would not be running in the harbour. The appearance of the retired ferry had been modified to an old generation of the fleet and was considered to be an iconic and collective memory;
- (c) the SFL intended to donate the retired ferry to the Government for placing on land, and did not insist on any concessionary operation of the restaurant but would prefer to have such consideration included; and
- (d) the SFL was under pressure to donate the retired ferry. If this conceptual idea was not accepted, the retired ferry might have to be scrapped within a year.

6.14 In summing up, **the Chair** said that Members appreciated the proponent's gesture and idea, but had mixed views on whether it was the right place and way to celebrate the Star Ferry. He asked the proponent to take Members' views and consider alternative options.

Item 7 Any Other Business

A. Update on the temporary uses of the new Central harbourfront sites

7.1 At the Chair's invitation, **Miss Christine AU** gave Members an update on the temporary uses of the new Central harbourfront sites, with the aid of a PowerPoint. She said that in the near future, Members would be given the opportunity to consider and discuss the future of some of the temporary uses, especially Sites A, D & E.

7.2 In response to the Chair's enquiry about the "Formula E" event to be held at the new Central harbourfront, **Miss Christine AU** said that no confirmation was received yet but Members would be consulted of the proposed alignment when available.

7.3 **Mr Edward LEUNG** responded that the Government welcomed large scale event to be held in Hong Kong. According to his understanding, the organiser was still working on the proposal and the relevant bureaux and departments would continue to liaise actively with the organiser on this event.

Action

- 7.4 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that a pedestrian crossing from Edinburgh Place to Yiu Sing Street over Lung Wo Road should be provided as soon as possible to facilitate access to the new Central harbourfront sites. He also expressed concern that concrete central dividers instead of planters had been used in Yiu Sing Street although it was not a high speed road.
- 7.5 **Miss Christine AU** responded that a pedestrian crossing from the area fronting the General Post Office and Star Ferry Car Park to the north of Lung Wo Road was scheduled to be implemented within this year. The road works to modify the alignment of Yiu Sing Street would be gazetted under the Central Reclamation Phase III Project. Along with Lung Wo Road, Yiu Sing Street would be required as an express alternative route to ease the existing road congestion of Connaught Road Central and Harcourt Road prior to the completion of the Central-Wan Chai Bypass (CWB) and for public safety purposes, some concrete barriers were used to separate the opposite lanes at the moment. Members had been informed in 2013 that upon completion of CWB, the traffic condition of Lung Wo Road and nearby roads would be reviewed and enhancement of design of the whole area would be considered. **Mr MAK Chi-biu** supplemented that Yiu Sing Street was a short road which formed part of the road system linking to Lung Wo Road and so the same design standard was adopted.

B. Action Areas Table

- 7.6 **The Chair** said that the updated action areas table was tabled for Members' information. If Members had any comments, they could pass them to the Secretariat.
- 7.7 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired about the licence renewal date for the billboards at Hung Hing Road near the ex-Wan Chai Public Cargo Working Area. He opined that the Government should be prepared not to renew the licence so that people could enjoy the sea view once the construction sites behind the billboards were cleared.

C. Vote of Thanks

- 7.8 **The Chair** said that this was the last meeting of the Task Force under the current term of the Commission. He thanked all Members for their invaluable contributions to the work of the

Action

Task Force in the past two years.

7.9 There being no other business, the meeting ended at 6:45 p.m.

Secretariat

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