

Harbourfront Commission
Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island

Minutes of Twenty-second Meeting

Date : 29 February 2016
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
Mr LEUNG Kong-yui	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Mrs Karen BARRETTO	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Freddie HAI	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
Sr Emily LI	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr Ivan HO	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Ir Prof CHOY Kin-kuen	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	
Miss Lily CHOW	
Mr Eric FOK	
Ms Vivian LEE	
Mr Vincent NG	
Mr Henry CHAN	
Ms Rosanna CHOI	
Mr Alvin YIP	

Official Members

Mr Thomas CHAN	Deputy Secretary for Development (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)
Mr David Stanley CHAIONG	Chief Leisure Manager (Hong Kong West), LCSD
Ms Ginger KIANG	District Planning Officer/Hong Kong, Planning Department (PlanD)
Miss Ingrid TJENDRO	Secretary

In Attendance

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

Absent with Apologies

Mrs Margaret BROOKE	Representing Business Environment Council
Dr NG Cho-nam	Representing the Conservancy Association
Mr Hans Joachim ISLER	
Mr David PONG	

For Agenda Item 2

Ms TENG Yu-yan Anne	District Officer (Eastern), Home Affairs Department (HAD)
Mr LAI Ho-chun Samuel	Assistant District Officer (Eastern)2, HAD
Mr CHAN Chung-yuen	Chief Traffic Engineer / Hong Kong, TD
Mr KUK Wai-kei	District Traffic Team (Eastern District), Hong Kong Police Force (HKPF)
Mr Edward LEUNG	Senior Manager (Tourism) 2, TC
Ms HO Mun-yee Money	Sr Estate Surveyor/HKE(3) (District Lands Office, Hong Kong East), Lands Department (LandsD)

For Agenda Item 3

Ms April KUN	Chief Town Planner/ Studies and Research, PlanD
Mr Patrick FUNG	Senior Town Planner /Studies and Research 5(Atg.), PlanD
Ms Wendy LEE	Town Planner, Studies and Research 3, PlanD
Dr Eunice MAK	Director of Urban Planning, AECOM
Mr Kenny CHAN	Associate, Planning, AECOM
Ms Carol LEE	Project Officer, Kadoorie Institute, HKU

For Agenda Item 4

Mr MAK Chi-biu	Chief Engineer /Hong Kong 1, CEDD
Mr Eddie LAM	Senior Engineer 7, CEDD

Mr Albert LEUNG	Project Director, Jacobs China Ltd.
Mr Raymond CHAN	Project Manager, Jacobs China Ltd.
Prof Bernard V LIM	Principal, Architecture Design and Research Group Ltd.
Mr David STANDFORD	Principal Director, Leigh & Orange Ltd
Mr Henry LO	Associate Director, Centre for Architectural Heritage Research, School of Architecture, CUHK

For Agenda Item 5

Mr MAK Chi-biu	Chief Engineer /Hong Kong 1, CEDD
Mr LAM Chun-tak	Senior Engineer 2, CEDD
Mr Charles LUK	Project Director, AECOM
Mr Peter CHEEK	Executive Director, AECOM
Mr Simon WONG	Project Manager, AECOM
Ms Betty HO	Director, PlanArch
Professor John BACON-SHONE	Director, Social Sciences Research Centre, HKU

For Agenda Item 6

Ms Emily MO	Assistant Commissioner for Tourism
Mr Samir S THAPA	Director, Formula Electric Racing (Hong Kong) Limited
Ms Michelle LEE	Director of Operations, Formula Electric Racing (Hong Kong) Limited
Ms Vivian LEE	Managing Director, ActionHouse International Limited
Ms Bernice TSANG	Account Executive, ActionHouse International Limited

For Agenda Item 7

Mr MOK Hei-tat Paul	Chief Engineer, Special Duties (Works) Division, CEDD
Mr LEUNG Tak-kuen Anka	Senior Engineer, Special Duties (Works) Division, CEDD
Mr KWOK Hiu-fung Derek	Engineer /5, Special Duties (Works) Division, CEDD
Mr CHING Ming-kam Eric	Divisional Director, Mott Macdonald Hong Kong Limited
Mr CHAN Pak-kin	Senior Environmental Consultant, Mott Macdonald Hong Kong Limited

For Agenda Item 8

Mr Alexander BOSWORTH	Team Member, Worcester Polytechnic Institute Team
Mr Brandon BOZEAT	
Mr Xander ING	
Miss Emily YU	

Welcoming Message

The Chair welcomed all to the meeting. He welcomed and thanked Mr Alvin YIP Cheung-on, Director of Jockey Club Design Institute for Social Innovation, Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Mr Henry CHAN Chi-chiu, Chief Executive of Honoh Limited and Ms Rosanna CHOI Yi-tak, Partner of CWCC for joining the Task Force as co-opted Members. He also thanked Mr David PONG Chun-ye, Director of Shiu Wing Steel Limited, who was in absentia, for joining the Task Force as a co-opted Member. **The Chair** 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 21st Meeting

1.1 **The Chair** said that the Secretariat circulated the draft minutes of the last meeting to Members on 17 February 2016 and received no comments from Members. There being no proposed amendment, the draft minutes were confirmed at the meeting.

Item 2 Matters Arising

A. Temporary on-street metered parking for coaches at Hoi Yu Street, Quarry Bay, Hong Kong (Paragraph 2.6 of the minutes of the 21st meeting)(Paper No. TFHK/01/2016)

2.1 **The Chair** said that in response to Members' request, the Secretariat had invited the Eastern District Office (EDO) to update the Task Force on the effectiveness of the temporary coach parking area at Hoi Yu Street, Quarry Bay at the meeting. He welcomed representatives of EDO, TD, HKPF, TC and LandsD to the meeting. **Ms Anne TENG** presented Paper No. TFHK/01/2016 to Members and tabled a letter from the Travel Industry Council of Hong Kong.

2.2 **Mr Ivan HO** thanked EDO and the relevant departments for their coordination work with various stakeholders in order to

resolve the problem and their efforts in updating Members on the matter regularly.

2.3 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired if the Government had maintained a list of vehicle registrations of coaches picking up visitors at Java Road and their stopover time record.

2.4 **Mr Walter CHAN** supported the extension of the tenure as a temporary measure for coach parking and requested EDO to update the Task Force in around six months' time. He also enquired if the proposed permanent parking area with 30 coach parking spaces expected for operation in late 2017 could fully meet local needs.

2.5 **Ms Anne TENG** made the following responses -

- (a) the 30 coach parking spaces had to be provided in a private development pursuant to the relevant land lease;
- (b) as regards the existing 31 spaces at the Hoi Yu Street temporary on-street metered parking, they were set up as an interim measure to address the traffic flow problem along Java Road by providing a laagering point for visitor coaches. Based on a Government survey, around one third to half of the temporary on-street meters were occupied during evening peak hours from 5:30 pm to 8 pm. At the same time, HKPF advised that some visitor coaches would park elsewhere. So far, the Hoi Yu Street parking area was considered sufficient for meeting local needs. The Government would continue to monitor the situation for formulating a long term solution;
- (c) internal meetings were conducted with relevant departments to review the effectiveness of the temporary solution and address the spin-off issues arising from it. The Government was committed to strengthening enforcement against illegal parking along Java Road; and
- (d) the tourism sector fully supported the retention of

the on-street metered parking spaces and the Government would make continuous effort in ensuring smooth traffic around the Java Road area.

2.6 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** stressed that Members should be provided with the vehicle registrations of coaches picking up visitors at Java Road and a record of their stopover time. It would not be possible to ascertain, at the current moment, whether the proposed 30 parking spaces in North Point housing estate would be sufficient. He commented that the Task Force should make a statement requesting for the closure of temporary coach parking at Hoi Yu Street after the redevelopment of the North Point estate so that the harbourfront could be released for development and for public enjoyment.

2.7 **The Chair** requested EDO to report to the Task Force in around six months with survey findings to support their statement on the usage of the temporary coach parking and to project future needs.

2.8 **Ms Anne TENG** responded that the Government would take on board Members' comments in its next review and report to the Task Force when ready.

EDO

B. *Proposed University of Chicago Center in Hong Kong at the ex-Victoria Road Detention Centre, Victoria Road, Mount Davis (Paragraph 2.8 of the minutes of the 21st meeting)*

2.9 **The Chair** informed that written responses from the Government and the project proponent were circulated to Members on 17 February 2016.

2.10 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** commented that the project of the University of Chicago should include not only the ex-Victoria Road Detention Centre site but also the entire Jubilee Battery site. He opined that the Government should take into account the heritage value of the whole site in the development to ensure its holistic integrity and comprehensive preservation. He requested for the development programme of the site concerned.

2.11 **Miss Christine AU** responded that the Government would take forward harbourfront enhancement projects gradually having regard to availability of resources. The site concerned

would be kept in the radar for consideration of possible enhancement when opportunity arose.

C. *Design of the Western Part of Proposed Comprehensive Development at Inland Lot No. 9027 and Adjoining Government Land at I/O Java Road and Tin Chiu Street, North Point, Hong Kong (Paragraph 3.13 of the minutes of the 21st meeting)*

2.12 **The Chair** said a written response from the proponent was circulated to Members on 17 February 2016. He enquired if the actual proponent would present their proposal to the Task Force subsequent to the presentation made by the consultant of the project at the last Task Force meeting.

2.13 **Miss Christine AU** informed that the proponent had provided written information for Members' comment and the Secretariat would convey further views from Members to the proponent for follow up as appropriate.

D. *The Urban Design Study for the Wan Chai North and North Point Harbourfront Areas: Study Progress - Preliminary Harbourfront Enhancement Proposals (Paragraphs 4.6 and 4.9 of the minutes of the 21st meeting)*

2.14 **The Chair** informed Members that PlanD would report on their progress of the study under agenda item 3 of the meeting.

E. *Ground Decontamination Works at the Site of the Ex-Kennedy Town Incineration Plant/Abattoir and Adjoining Area (Paragraph 5.16 of the minutes of the 21st meeting)*

2.15 **The Chair** said the item would be discussed under agenda item 7 of the meeting.

F. *Land Uses in the New Central Harbourfront (Paragraphs 6.4 and 6.6 of the minutes of the 21st meeting)*

2.16 **The Chair** informed that written responses from the Highways Department (HyD) were circulated to Members on 17 February 2016.

2.17 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** commented that greenery and

planters should be provided along Lung Wo Road during the ongoing road works for the Formula E race.

2.18 **Miss Christine AU** responded that as stated in HyD's response circulated to Members, the concrete barriers had to be retained for the time being due to safety reasons. The Government would examine the road works of the Formula E race and bear in mind the issue in the overall implementation of harbourfront enhancement projects.

2.19 **The Chair** remarked that the matter would be discussed in more details under agenda item 6 of the meeting.

G. *Eastern Street Temporary Car Park (Paragraph 6.17 of the minutes of the 21st meeting)*

2.20 **The Chair** informed that written responses from LandsD were circulated to Members on 17 February 2016.

H. *Temporary Bus Terminus in Wan Chai (Paragraph 6.18 of the minutes of the 21st meeting)*

2.21 **The Chair** informed that written responses from CEDD were circulated to Members on 17 February 2016.

Item 3 Urban Design Study for the Wan Chai North and North Point Harbourfront Areas - Study Progress and Proposed Stage 2 Public Engagement Work Plan (Paper No. TFHK/02/2016)

3.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives of PlanD and the study team to the meeting. **Ms April KUN** and **Mr Kenny CHAN** presented the study progress and the proposed work plan for stage 2 public engagement (PE) of the Urban Design Study for the Wan Chai North and North Point Harbourfront Areas (UDS) with the aid of a PowerPoint.

3.2 **The Chair** commented that it would be important for the study team to engage a larger pool of the community, in particular those from Wan Chai south, in stage 2 PE.

3.3 **Mr Freddie HAI** appreciated the myriad of ideas

suggested in the proposal, but he would suggest consolidating and condensing them into a few viable options with clearer planning merits for a more effective and fruitful public consultation exercise.

3.4 Referencing the recent experience of the Avenue of the Stars, **Mr Ivan HO** stressed the importance of involving the whole community in any public consultation exercise.

3.5 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** commented that according to a survey conducted by the student team from the Worcester Polytechnic Institute (discussed under agenda item 8 of the meeting), 75% of the interviewees in North Point were not aware of the proposal on the Island Eastern Corridor Boardwalk. With such as an example, he opined that PE exercise should be carried out in a more proactive way and employing a public relation agency would be a practicable method. Besides, he commented that if water-based activities were to be organised in the ex-Wan Chai cargo basin, a safety report on typhoon protection and wave resistance should be provided.

3.6 **Mr Henry CHAN** was also concerned about the safety of having water sports activities in the area. He enquired if the UDS would cover this aspect.

3.7 **Mr Alvin YIP** appreciated the conduct of the design ideas competition and enquired whether winners and other participants would be engaged in developing the design in the future.

3.8 **Dr Eunice MAK** made the following responses-

- (a) the community in Wan Chai south had been consulted in stage 1 PE and would continue to be involved in stage 2 PE. A comprehensive public consultation would be conducted as far as practicable and consideration would be taken to involve a larger portion of the community in stage 2 PE;
- (b) many ideas collected from the design ideas competition were creative and could be suitably incorporated into the development proposal. The result of the competition would be announced

soon. Apart from soliciting good ideas from the entries, the winners would also be invited to participate in the workshops and focus group meetings so as to involve them in further developing the design;

- (c) Members would be consulted on the detailed proposals before stage 2 PE; and
- (d) the Hong Kong Water Sports Council had proposed a number of water sports activities at the waterfront area and there were international water sports competitions being organised regularly in the Victoria Harbour. The study team would examine the council's suggestions carefully with particular attention to the safety aspect.

3.9 **The Chair** enquired if the study team had been working with the Marine Department (MD) in relation to water-land interface matters.

3.10 **Dr Eunice MAK** responded that the study team had consulted MD in drawing up the harbourfront enhancement proposals.

3.11 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** made the following comments-

- (a) more information on wave attenuation, marine traffic and necessary exclusion areas for shipping should be provided ;
- (b) the site boundary for the Police Officers' Club should be set back for releasing more space in the promenade;
- (c) the list of consultees on the potential yachting and boating uses should also include associations of the marine industry beyond those under the Water Sports Council. He could provide appropriate contacts if needed; and
- (d) a phased development approach for the project should be considered.

3.12 **Mr Kenny CHAN** responded that-

- (a) the study team had paid attention to wave attenuation and marine traffic in formulating the proposals in particular for the Water Sports and Recreation Precinct and would provide more detailed information on these aspects to Members in the next stage;
- (b) the study team would work closely with members from the yachting and boating groups and engage them in the public engagement process;
- (c) when meeting with representatives from the Police last year, the study team was informed of the Police's proposal of setting back part of the promenade on the right edge of the typhoon shelter to allow a wider footpath. The study team would keep communicating with the Police to see if further enhancement would be possible; and
- (d) regarding phasing of development, the study team would consider the implementation of some deliverables as "quick-win" under a shorter timeframe with some over a longer span of time.

3.13 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired if the Harbour Unit would liaise with the Police on further setting back the boundary of the Police Officers' Club to allow a wider footpath for public use.

3.14 **The Chair** agreed. He also enquired about the date of the next Working Group meeting.

Harbour Unit

3.15 **Ms April KUN** responded that stage 2 PE was scheduled to commence in end May/early June 2016 and before so, Members would be consulted again on the details of the harbourfront enhancement proposals and be provided with other supplementary information as requested.

**PlanD
the study team**

(Post-meeting notes: The 4th meeting of Working Group on Urban

Design Study for the Wan Chai North and North Point Harbourfront Areas was conducted on 6 May 2016. On setting back the boundary of the Police Officers' Club, the study team further liaised with relevant parties and confirmed that the commitment as presented to the Task Force on 24 October 2013 would be adhered to and the pedestrian passage between the Club and the Causeway Bay Typhoon would be widened to a uniform width of 4.4m. It would be difficult to further set back the boundary as the emergency vehicular access (EVA) immediately next to the pedestrian passage had been reduced to the minimum width of 6m. There would also be a significant level difference (around 1m) between the EVA and the pedestrian passage which would render co-use to be difficult. That said, relevant parties committed to replace the existing chain link fence with boundary fences decorated by vertical greening to improve the overall ambience.)

3.16 **The Chair** thanked PlanD and the study team for reporting progress of the UDS.

Item 4 Reassembly of Queen's Pier (Paper No. TFHK/03/2016)

4.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives of DEVB, CEDD and the project team to the meeting. **Miss Christine AU, Mr Henry LO, Mr David STANDFORD** and **Mr Albert LEUNG** presented the reassembly of Queen's Pier (QP) with the aid of a PowerPoint.

4.2 After the Powerpoint presentation, **the Chair** invited Members to take a look at a model of the proposed reassembly of QP.

[The project team briefed Members on the model.]

4.3 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** made the following comments-

- (a) regarding the interfacing issues between the reassembled QP and Central Piers No. 9 and 10, the proposed design originally proposed by the consultant (i.e. Option B) should be respected;
- (b) there could be another interpretation of the side landing steps rather than the proposed reassembly under glass cover. Also, he considered the landing steps should not be a necessary feature of

the reassembled QP;

- (c) additional seats should be provided at the reassembled QP for the convenience of the staff of local tour and marine users of Central Piers 9 and 10; and
- (d) shaded structure of the reassembled QP would be welcomed by the community as it would be hot to stay under the glass roofs of Piers 9 and 10.

He enquired according to the international heritage principles, whether it would be a better arrangement if QP was reassembled at its original location in front of the City Hall.

4.4 **The Chair** invited Members' views on the three design options. He would also like to know if Members would like to present only the recommended option or all three options in the community engagement exercise to gauge public views. He said that the location for reassembly should not be re-opened as it was decided back in 2011 that it would be between Central Piers 9 and 10 after two phases of public engagement under the Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront ("UDS").

4.5 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said in response to the Chair's remark that in his view the community may be more concerned about the expenses required to reassemble QP between Central Piers No. 9 and 10 and the merits of reassemble the QP there rather than the interfacing issue of it with Central Piers 9 and 10.

4.6 **Mr Peter Cookson SMITH** said that he would prefer to present one recommended option to the public. He also considered that it might be better to place the plaque that set out the history of QP at the reassembled site instead of at its original site as it might confuse people.

4.7 **Ir Prof KK CHOY** enquired if any new structure would be required to replace the old for meeting the prevailing statutory safety requirement.

4.8 **Mr Ivan HO** appreciated the efforts of the Government and the project team. He had the following comments-

- (a) as the location of the reassembled QP had gone through PE process in the context of the UDS completed in 2011, he would not further comment on it;
- (b) the reassembly proposal should also be presented in conjunction with the detailed proposal on the Ferry Plaza that include landscape designs, furniture, gathering points as well as water -land interface issues;
- (c) did not prefer Option B as the gable wall option would obstruct visual connection between the land and the sea;
- (d) did not prefer a full-fledged modification of Central Piers 9 and 10 as proposed under Option B given the cost involved and suggested maintaining the design of Central Piers 9 and 10 intact;
- (e) did not prefer the proposed idea of displaying the side landing steps covered by glass;
- (f) as regards the landing steps, if using landing steps A, B, C as proposed, the area might be congested with people waiting for boats;
- (g) the landing steps of the reassembled QP and the current landing steps of Central Piers No. 9 and 10 should be arranged in a more user-friendly manner; and
- (h) the reassembly works should be expedited.

4.9 **Mr Freddie HAI** also appreciated efforts of the Government and the project team. He had the following comments -

- (a) the existing roof design of Piers 9 and 10 should be kept. He find it difficult to justify it financially to replace the existing well-functioning roofs;
- (b) for Option B, the gable wall interfacing structures

should be refined as they would delineate QP and Piers 9 and 10 abruptly at the interface and exposing a sharp distinction between the new and old building styles. Except this minor point, this option was in principle agreeable;

- (c) putting a glass cover on top of the side landing steps would not make the landing steps more attractive. He objected to this idea and invited the design team to consider alternative options; and
- (d) there should be adequate amenities such as lavatories near the reassembled QP. He stressed that this was not to request the provision of such within QP structure but to remind the project initiators to make sure there would be provision in the nearby precinct.

4.10 **Mr Alvin YIP** commented that the option to be adopted should not obstruct the harbour view. He opined that the three options could be further developed to provide more elaborate design possibilities for public comments. From a layman's point of view, the three options looked similar. That said, he would prefer an option without the covered walkway.

4.11 **Mr Henry CHAN** expressed that QP would be a great venue for art and cultural activities especially for street performances. He suggested incorporating this element into the design.

4.12 **Miss Christine AU** responded that-

- (a) the location for reassembling QP had been extensively deliberated under the UDS, in which two phases of public engagement were conducted. It was decided that QP would be located between Central Piers No. 9 and 10;
- (b) regarding the arrangement for the original site, the Government had proposed to construct a piazza and the proposal has received support from both HC and Central and Western District Council in 2014;

- (c) the QP project formed part of the holistic development of the future new Central harbourfront. When working on the project, the team would ensure that the design element would not compromise the future potential for Site 7;
- (d) benches of the old QP would be refurbished and reused. Public seating would be provided in the QP and its neighbouring sites for people waiting for the ferries and gathering for other activities in the new Central harbourfront;
- (e) there was a public toilet managed by LCSD outside the event space on the advance promenade, which was close to the future reassembled QP. Public toilets would also be provided in the future Site 3; and
- (f) the Government would consider the best way to demonstrate to the public the historical significance of the QP in accordance with the UDS.

4.13 **Mr CB MAK** responded that the structural elements of the old QP would be used in the reassembled QP and a few structural elements that were too flimsy under the current standard would be reinforced. Concerning the implementation programme, if funding approval could be attained by early 2017, substantial completion could be achieved by Q2 of 2019.

4.14 **Mr David STANDFORD** responded that Members' views on the gable wall design would be taken into consideration.

4.15 **Miss Christine AU** supplemented that-

- (a) the Government and the project team would examine more options for displaying the unused landing steps with the glass treatment as one of the possible options as it could maintain the original state and location of the landing steps in question; and
- (b) after taking into consideration Members' comments and consulting the Central and Western District

Council, the Government would finalize the public engagement strategy. It is intended to launch the public engagement for two months tentatively from March to May 2016 by setting up a website detailing the proposal, organising exhibition of display boards and conducting an opinion survey.

4.16 **The Chair** suggested modifying the QP model, say by filling up the vacant land with ideas as proposed in the UDS.

4.17 **Miss Christine AU** thanked Members for their advice and informed that the QP model would be suitably modified when presenting to the public.

4.18 **Mr Freddie HAI** remarked that the Government should incorporate public lavatories into the holistic development plan. It would be very undesirable if only standalone public lavatories were provided near QP, especially if no proper drainage system was provided and it had to rely on regular septic tank clearance services, as was indeed rather common in many similar situations in Hong Kong.

4.19 **Mr Ivan HO** further made the following comments-

- (a) the three options had been uploaded to HC's website and reported by the press, so it was not for Members to choose only one option for public engagement;
- (b) when refining the proposal, consideration should be taken on the view of QP from the seaside; and
- (c) the location issue of QP should not be opened again at this juncture.

4.20 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** opined that the public would reflect whether the location for reassembly should be reopened. He supported to present the three options prepared by the consultant for engaging the community instead of altering them or proposing other options.

4.21 **The Chair** said the Task Force would not reopen the location issue.

4.22 **Mr Henry LO** responded that to meet heritage preservation standard, it would be best for the unused landing steps to be kept with the entire structure at its original place. As for the location matter, following the international charter, it would be best if every heritage building could be retained at its original location as far as practicable.

4.23 **Mr Peter Cookson SMITH** enquired if the design of the Ferry Plaza within future Site 7 had been drawn up.

4.24 **Miss Christine AU** responded that the design of the “Ferry Plaza”, alike “Festival Lawn” and “Themed Garden”, would make reference to the UDS.

4.25 **The Chair** remarked that the context of the design of the Ferry Plaza should be provided when presenting to the public. He thanked the Government and the project team for the efforts made for the QP project and asked them to take on board Members’ comments and keep Members informed of the refined options and outcome of the PE programme.

**DEVB
CEDD**

Item 5 Proposed Boardwalk underneath the Island Eastern Corridor (Paper No. TFHK/04/2016)

5.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives of CEDD and the project team to the meeting. **Mr CB MAK, Mr CT LAM and Mr Peter CHEEK** presented the proposed boardwalk underneath the Island Eastern Corridor (IEC) with the aid of a PowerPoint.

5.2 **The Chair** enquired about the public comments received so far.

5.3 **Mr Ivan HO** supported the project and requested the process be expedited. Besides, he enquired if the width of the boardwalk could be varied in different sections as a 3.5 metre wide walkway would be too narrow and it would be unsatisfactory to adopt this width for the entire boardwalk. He opined that Hong Kong people should have the right to decide on the shape of their waterfront and the Government should not be over-cautious with the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance.

5.4 **Mr Peter Cookson SMITH** objected to the proposed cycle track as it would narrow the pedestrian walkway by half. He also considered that the questionnaire was too complicated and it should be designed in a way such that convincing responses would be collected for establishing an overriding need as required. In this connection, he enquired about the number of positive public responses needed to establish the overriding need.

5.5 **Mr Freddie HAI** supported the project. He commented that additional greenery should be provided along the boardwalk as greenery could act as a softener to its outlook which is beneath the bleak IEC. Besides, he enquired if there were other alternative design options such that the walkway would not need to be ascending to the flyover level and bypassing the ferry piers. He appreciated the Project Team for their courage to take on the issue of “definition of reclamation” under the current Protection of the Harbour Ordinance in pursuit of a more sensible design for the greater benefit of the general public.

5.6 **Mr Alvin YIP** commented that the proposal should be presented in a more precise and exciting manner. The team might consider collaborating with local universities which had many innovative student projects on developing the site concerned.

5.7 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** made the following comments, which were included in previous submission made to the Government -

- (a) as the proposed boardwalk could enhance accessibility to the harbour and add value to it, subject to Government’s provision of adequate justification to the issue of dolphin structures, the Society for Protection of the Harbour would unlikely object to it;
- (b) a wider walkway cum cycle track would maximise the benefits of the boardwalk;
- (c) more access points should be provided; and
- (d) the boardwalk should have minimal changes in levels to facilitate people with children or

disabilities.

5.8 **The Chair** enquired about the public responses received so far.

5.9 **Mr CB MAK** made the following responses-

- (a) around five hundred public replies had been received so far. Among them, only a minority objected to the project and there was general support for the cycle track;
- (b) the team would review the width of the boardwalk taking into account comments received. The team would also explore the possibilities of providing a boardwalk with varying width at some sections;
- (c) while the team would try to maximize the provision of greenery on the boardwalk, he cautioned that there were geographical and technical constraints to do so as the boardwalk was built under the IEC and above water; and
- (d) the team would explore the possibility of providing additional access points but noted the presence of private lots along the boardwalk.

5.10 In response to the design of the questionnaire, **Prof John BACON-SHONE** explained that the public usually complained about insufficient information when responding to a questionnaire and hence the present draft has aimed to be informative. The questionnaire asked open-ended questions and invited the public to write in comments. People could leave this part blank if they were already satisfied with the other parts of the questionnaire.

5.11 **The Chair** commented that it would be helpful if HC could show its passion and support for the project to the community.

5.12 **Miss Christine AU** responded that a boat trip within the Community Engagement process would be arranged for Members to show their support for the project and help publicize it.

(Post-meeting notes: A boat trip for Members was organised on 30 March 201 and a press release was subsequently issued.)

5.13 **Mr Henry CHAN** opined that artists might be interested to show their artwork on the boardwalk which could be a great attraction to people. He was also concerned about the safety of the cycle track.

5.14 **The Chair** invited CEDD and the project team to report to the Task Force on the latest progress before Stage 2 Community Engagement. **Mr CB MAK** responded that the Government would get back to the Task Force again after Stage 1 Community Engagement.

CEDD

(Post-meeting notes: CEDD plans to report back to the Task Force on the latest progress in Q3 2016.)

Item 6 Proposed Short Term Tenancies for Government Land at Central Harbourfront for Staging of the Fédération Internationale de l'Automobile Formula E Championship - Hong Kong ePrix (Paper No. TFHK/05/2016)

6.1 **The Chair** informed that the Formula E race would be held for the first time at the new Central harbourfront in October 2016. He welcomed representatives from TC and the organiser to the meeting to brief Members on the details of the race including the harbourfront sites proposed to be used for the event.

6.2 **Ms Vivian LEE** declared interest as the Managing Director of ActionHouse International Limited, which was the project management team of the race. **The Chair** advised that Ms LEE could attend as one of the representatives from the project team but should refrain from commenting on the matter.

6.3 **Ms Emily MO** presented the Government's support for the event, and **Mr Samir S THAPA** presented the event proposal and the proposed short term tenancies with the aid of a PowerPoint.

6.4 **The Chair** expressed his concern on the accessibility to

and around the waterfront by the public during occupation of the site for the event. As fences and concrete barriers would need to be erected along the racing track, he also enquired if pedestrian flow along the waterfront would be obstructed.

6.5 **Mr Freddie HAI** supported the idea in principle but queried that the current circuit was located next to a large stretch of construction site which would not be pleasant to look at from the perspective of promoting Hong Kong's image. He suggested extending the race circuit a bit westward so that the media could capture a more attractive beautiful backdrop of the cityscape and living streets in Hong Kong for pictures and publicity.

6.6 **Mr Alvin YIP** enquired if there was any long-term plan of making the race an annual event in Hong Kong.

6.7 **Mr Eric FOK** opined that while there was clear benefits from the tourism perspective in bringing the Formula E race to the city, HC should assess the event more broadly from community and harbourfront enhancement perspectives. He raised the following questions -

- (a) what was the long-term plan for the event after the investment made at the Hong Kong stop;
- (b) how would the public participate and get involved in the event;
- (c) what was the ticket price;
- (d) whether a big screen would be set up for live broadcast of the event to the public similar to the arrangement for the World Cup so that the race would not be perceived as an exclusive high-end sports event for the privileged; and
- (e) whether there could be spectators allowed for watching the race from the sea side on boats or yachts.

6.8 **Mr Ivan HO** enquired whether the footbridge along Man Yiu Street would be closed like the practice that was adopted during the Macau Grand-prix.

6.9 **Mr Henry CHAN** asked if complimentary tickets would be distributed to the underprivileged similar to the arrangement in some large-scale sports events. He also asked about the sound level during the Formula E race in comparison to that of Formula One.

6.10 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** raised the following questions

-

- (a) the pricing of the tickets and the level of participation by the general public;
- (b) the length of the occupation period of the land;
- (c) whether any nearby footbridges and pedestrian connections would have to be closed;
- (d) the amount of investment by the public in the event;
- (e) whether HC could be consulted at an earlier stage; and
- (f) whether greenery would be provided along Lung Wo Road to make it a more pleasant boulevard and whether compensation would be provided for the greening and planters removed.

6.11 **Ms Emily MO** responded that -

- (a) parts of the existing roads including Lung Wo Road, Yiu Sing Street and Man Kwong Street would be used for the race. To comply with the international safety standard required for the race, minor road modification works along certain road sections at the new Central harbourfront were being carried out by HyD at a total cost of around \$20 million. The works commenced in mid-October 2015 for substantial completion in end August 2016;
- (b) relevant departments would provide compensation

for the greening and planters removed during the minor road modification works. Detailed plans were being finalized; and

- (c) regarding the beautification of Lung Wo Road, relevant departments had taken note of Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN's comments for the provision of more greenery in the long-term development of relevant roads at the new Central harbourfront.

6.12 **Mr Samir S THAPA** supplemented the following points -

- (a) access to the sites occupied for the event would be restricted during the two-day event for ticket holders. However, accessibility to the harbourfront by members of the public via the existing passageway and roads in the vicinity would be maintained during both the set-up/preparation period and the event dates. Installation of fences along the racetrack would be designed to minimize blockage of harbour view;
- (b) with regards to Members' suggestion of moving the circuit westward, it would not be possible to alter the location of the race course for the event this year due to terms and conditions already agreed by the Fédération Internationale de l'Automobile (FIA). An alternative layout of the circuit could be considered for future events as appropriate;
- (c) in terms of future prospect, the organiser would hope to host the event on an annual basis in Hong Kong in Q4 of a year as the opening for the Formula E season. The Formula E Holdings Limited regarded Hong Kong as an iconic venue and was supportive to organising the race in Hong Kong every year;
- (d) pricing of the admission tickets would not be at too high a level in order to enable more members of the community to enjoy the race. The idea of broadcasting the event live with large screens in public areas was also being considered;

- (e) people were welcome to watch the race from the sea side on a boat or yacht, as well as from their offices and buildings near the circuit;
- (f) some of the passageway might be blocked for crowd management and safety reasons as requested by the Police; and
- (g) the sound level produced by an electric vehicle would be lower than that of Formula One and equivalent to that of a double decker bus.

6.13 **The Chair** enquired about the area to be fenced off by concrete barriers and the occupation period.

6.14 In response, **Mr Samir S THAPA** informed that as a safety requirement to protect the car racers and spectators, concrete barriers and a spectator fence would be erected alongside the whole racetrack. The concrete barriers and spectator fences would be set up about eight to ten days before the event and such works would be carried out during night time to minimize disruption to the traffic and public. He reiterated that suitable design would be adopted to minimize blockage of the harbour view.

6.15 In relation to consultation with HC, **Miss Christine AU** remarked that the proposed land use allocation had yet to be approved by LandsD. HC, as one of the important stakeholders, was engaged at an earlier informal briefing held in September 2015 and subsequently at this meeting again.

6.16 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** was concerned about public navigation around the area notably with the proposed view blockage along the footbridge.

6.17 **Ms Michelle LEE** responded that both sides of the footbridge would be covered for crowd management and safety reasons as suggested by the Police. The height of such coverage would be around 1.8m to 2m to allow light penetration.

6.18 **The Chair** enquired about the length of period for covering the footbridge.

6.19 **Ms Michelle LEE** informed that the organiser would liaise with the relevant government departments on the arrangement and update Members afterwards.

6.20 **The Chair** thanked the project team for their presentation and invited the organiser to report back with their layout plans and design of the race circuit as well as other supplementary information of the event to the Task Force when ready.

the Organiser

Item 7 Ground Decontamination Works at the Site of the Ex-Kennedy Town Incineration Plant/Abattoir and Adjoining Area (Paper No. TFHK/06/2016) (Paper No. TFHK/07/2016)

7.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives from CEDD and the consultant team to the meeting. **Mr Paul MOK** and **Mr Eric CHING** presented the background of the project with the aid of a PowerPoint.

7.2 **The Chair** asked for an indication of the degree of contamination at Cadogan Street Temporary Garden (the Garden). He also questioned about the source of the contamination, understanding that the Garden was previously a vegetable market.

7.3 **Mr Evans IU** enquired whether the soil of the root balls could be decontaminated by air spray.

7.4 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** questioned whether decontamination would be required if no development was proposed to take place at the site of the Garden. He commented that for instance, no decontamination was needed for the ex-Kwai Chung Incineration Plant in the absence of land use development programme. He also enquired about the source of contamination. Besides, he commented that the Government should consider alternative land use plans for the site without having to remove trees as a trade-off.

7.5 **Ir Prof KK CHOY** enquired whether it was the air, soil or any other aspects which had been polluted. According to the Environmental Protection Department (EPD)'s report, he believed

that water in the harbour would not be much affected. If it was the soil alone being contaminated, he enquired if the method of topping and covering the affected soil with a concrete layer could be a better remedy.

7.6 **Mr Paul MOK** made the following responses-

- (a) a summary of the extent and level of contamination was presented in Paper No. TFHK/07/2016 circulated to Members before the meeting. The underground soil of the garden was contaminated by heavy metals (such as lead, arsenic and mercury) and hydrocarbons. Since the concentration of the contaminants were found to exceed the relevant standard of Risk-Based Remediation Goals issued by EPD, ground decontamination works were required;
- (b) the main sources of contamination were the ex-incineration plant and the ex-abattoir. The pollutants were probably resulted from oil leakage from machinery of abattoir and/or incineration plant; and
- (c) various local and overseas decontamination methods were reviewed in the EIA report. The adopted methods (cement solidification for heavy metal contaminated soil and biopiles for hydrocarbon contaminated soil), were well established technologically and these methods had been adopted previously in Hong Kong. The methods were considered to be effective and appropriate.

7.7 In response to the use of air spray for cleaning the root balls, **Mr CHAN Pak-kin** responded that despite the less damaging effect of air on root balls, the polluted soil particles containing heavy metal and hydrocarbons might spread to other areas during the operation. Hence, this method was not favoured.

7.8 **Mr Paul MOK** supplemented that the site concerned was about 3.2 hectares in size at a precious waterfront location. Any

future redevelopment of the site would require decontamination as stipulated in the conditions of the Environmental Permit. According to the Land Use Review for the Western Part of Kennedy Town (the land use review), a waterfront promenade, residential development, a primary school and other Government and community uses were planned for the site concerned to serve both the local residents and the general public.

7.9 **The Chair** reminded the project team to respond to Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN's question of whether decontamination was required in the Garden if the site was not to be redeveloped.

7.10 **Mr Paul MOK** responded that-

- (a) despite there being no immediate threat to people, there still existed health risks as shown by the high concentration of some contaminants in the soil. Decontamination works should be carried out as soon as possible;
- (b) decontamination works had been carried out on the site of the ex-Kwai Chung Incineration Plant;
- (c) regardless of the sources of the contamination, decontamination works had to be carried out as long as the concentration of contaminant exceeded the required standard;
- (d) according to the site investigations carried out in 2000 and 2003, the ground water within the site was not contaminated; and
- (e) covering the contaminated soil with a concrete layer was not favoured as the risk would not be effectively eradicated.

7.11 **The Chair** expressed that the debate on the need for decontamination was originated from the land use review. In this connection, he invited PlanD to supplement further.

7.12 **Ms Ginger KIANG** responded that as contaminants were found in the Garden, decontamination works were necessary. On this basis and to enhance land use of the western part of

Kennedy Town, it was planned to provide a waterfront promenade and leisure and recreational uses in the harbourfront open space, while residential and G/IC uses were proposed at the hinterland.

7.13 **The Chair** enquired if the site of the Garden would continue to be used as an open space/park, whether decontamination would be required.

7.14 **Miss Christine AU** supplemented that PlanD consulted the Task Force at its meetings in May and November 2015 and also at a working session in August 2015, during which Members had commented on the land use review. The land use proposal was also discussed thoroughly in the community. As reaffirmed by the engineering team in the Government, leaving the site intact without carrying out the necessary decontamination works would be like leaving a “time bomb” behind. Decontamination works were to serve not only for the site of the Garden, but the larger extent of area comprising the future waterfront promenade, primary school, public transport interchange, piers and other community uses for the enhancement of the harbourfront and the benefits of the community.

7.15 **The Chair** requested CEDD and their consultant to provide a written response on whether decontamination was required in the Garden and the site if they were to be maintained in their current uses. He said that the Task Force would need to assess the danger brought by the site to the public more holistically.

CEDD

(Post-meeting notes: CEDD’s response on whether decontamination was required in the Garden and the site if they were to be maintained in their current uses was circulated to Members on 16 May 2016)

7.16 As a District Councillor of the district concerned, **Mr CHAN Hok-fung** shared the following views and comments -

- (a) the crux of the discussion had a more land use planning focus instead of it being a purely technical or engineering issue. He viewed that despite the low patronage to the Garden, the site occupied a substantial area and hence the nuisance caused by decontamination works and future development to

the local residents would potentially be great. There had been local discussions on the matter for a long time but no consensus was reached and some also preferred keeping the site concerned at its status quo as a temporary park.;

- (b) acknowledging the foregoing comments on redevelopment, the District Council explored and suggested a wider range of uses and options, including residential development with lower population density, a joint-user government/communal complex with a height less than 60m on the existing Garden site and an underground public carpark to address local needs. Decontamination works would hence be necessary to push forward all these developments and community uses; and
- (c) the site should be developed with a stepped building profile rising from the waterfront gradually to primary school, community complex and residential buildings in the hinterland.

7.17 **The Chair** remarked that PlanD might consider going through the proposed land use plan with the Task Force again to refresh and update Members.

7.18 **Ms Ginger KIANG** responded that the proposed OZP amendments, which were formulated based on the findings of the land use review, had been agreed by the Town Planning Board and gazetted for public inspection. PlanD would collect comments from the Task Force, the Central and Western District Council as well as public members and convey to the Town Planning Board for consideration.

7.19 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** requested PlanD to provide an alternative land use proposal of retaining the Garden at its present state.

7.20 **The Chair** requested PlanD to incorporate Members' comments in the land use review and report the progress when ready.

PlanD

Item 8 Any Other Business

A. Study Conducted by the Worcester Polytechnic Institute

8.1 **The Chair** welcomed team members from the Worcester Polytechnic Institute (WPI) to brief Members on the findings of the Study and invited Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN to give a brief background of the presentation for Members' information.

8.2 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** shared that every year, Harbour Business Forum and Designing Hong Kong would sponsor a group of students from WPI to conduct harbourfront-related studies in Hong Kong. This year, the theme of the study was on pedestrian connectivity along the harbourfront (the Study).

8.3 **Mr Brandon BOZEAT, Mr Xander ING, Miss Emily YU** and **Mr Alexander BOSWORTH** presented their findings with the aid of a PowerPoint.

8.4 **The Chair** enquired if there would be a full report on the recommendations of the Study.

8.5 **Mr Brandon BOZEAT** responded that the report would be uploaded to the university website when ready.

8.6 **Mr Paul ZIMMEMAN** opined that the Government should work out a concrete timetable for enhancing connectivity of waterfront promenades. He also if the Government had plans showing all the detour and routes along the promenades.

8.7 **Miss Christine AU** responded that the Harbour Unit would look into the recommendation with regards to the directions and routings of the detour and discuss with relevant departments on this front.

Harbour Unit

8.8 **Mr Vincent NG** enquired if Members could be provided with an update on the progress of enhancement initiatives in the 22 action areas.

8.9 **Miss Christine AU** responded that a summary report setting out the progress made on individual harbourfront enhancement proposals in the 22 action areas was circulated every

six months for Members' reference. Members would also recall that the Task Force on Water-land Interface had completed an update of the overall harbour plan which was presented to Members at the 20th HC meeting in June 2015. During the course of the review, it was understood that there was a growth of nearly 7 km of the waterfront promenades from 2003 to 2015. Supplementary information could be shared with Members for reference.

8.10 **The Chair** thanked the WPI team for their good work and presentation.

(Post-meeting notes: WPI's presentation was circulated to HC Members on 10 May 2016. The study findings had also been relayed to relevant departments for consideration.)

8.11 There being no other business, the meeting ended at 7:30 pm.

Secretariat

**Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island
May 2016**