

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

**Minutes of Twentieth Meeting**

Date : 21 September 2015  
Time : 3:00 p.m.  
Venue : Conference Room (Room G46) at Upper Ground Floor,  
Hong Kong Heritage Discovery Centre, Kowloon Park,  
Tsim Sha Tsui

**Present**

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Mr Nicholas BROOKE     | Chair  |
| Mr LEUNG Kong-yui      | Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong                 |
| Dr NG Cho-nam          | Representing Conservancy Association   |
| Mrs Karen BARRETTO     | Representing Friends of the Earth  |
| Mr Franklin YU         | Representing Hong Kong Institute of 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 Raymond CHAN        | Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers  |
| Mr Shuki LEUNG         | Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong                             |
| Mr CHAN Hok-fung       |  |
| Mr Walter CHAN         |  |
| Mr Eric FOK            |  |
| Mr Hans Joachim ISLER  |  |
| Mr Vincent NG          |  |
| Miss Christine AU      | Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), 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 Larry CHU           | Secretary  |

**In Attendance**

|                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| Mr Frederick YU     | Assistant Secretary (Harbour) Special Duties, DEVB |
| Miss Ingrid TJENDRO | Assistant Secretary (Harbour) 2, DEVB              |

**Absent with Apologies**

|                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| Mrs Margaret BROOKE | Representing Business Environment Council                |
| Mr Evans IU         | Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects |
| Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN   | Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour       |
| Ms Lily CHOW        |  |
| Ms Vivian LEE       |  |

**For Agenda Item 5**

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| Ms April KUN      | Chief Town Planner/Studies and Research, PlanD                      |
| Mr Patrick FUNG   | Senior Town Planner/Studies & Research 5, PlanD                     |
| Mr Hugo ERRAZURIZ | Director of Urban Design, AECOM                                     |
| Mr Kenny CHAN     | Associate, Planning, AECOM  |
| Dr Winnie LAW     | Assistant Director, Kadoorie Institute, The University of Hong Kong |

**For Agenda Item 6**

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| Miss Christine AU | Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB |
|-------------------|---|

**For Agenda Item 7**

|                |  |
|----------------|--|
| Ms Fiona AU    | Assistant District Officer (Eastern), Home Affairs Department (HAD)  |
| Mr KUK Wai-kei | District Traffic Team (Eastern District), Hong Kong Police Force     |
| Ms Money HO    | Senior Estate Surveyor/Hong Kong East (3), Lands Department (LandsD) |
| Mr Lawrence LI | Estate Surveyor/Shaukeiwan, LandsD                                   |

**Action**

**Welcoming Message**

**Mr Nicholas BROOKE**, Chair of the Harbourfront Commission, welcomed all to the meeting.

**Item 1 Election of Task Force Chair**

- 1.1 **Mr Franklin YU** nominated and **Members** supported Mr Nicholas BROOKE to be the Chair of the Task Force. **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** accepted the nomination and officially took over the chairmanship of the meeting.
- 1.2 **The Chair**<sup>1</sup> informed the meeting that Mr Edward LEUNG, Senior Manager (Tourism) 2 of TC was attending on behalf of Ms Emily MO.

**Item 2 Confirmation of Terms of Reference of the Task Force**

- 2.1 **The Chair** said that the terms of reference (ToR) of the Hong Kong Task Force of the last term was tabled for Members' reference. He added that at the 20<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Commission's Task Force on Harbourfront Developments in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing on 1 September 2015, he proposed and the meeting agreed to include specific reference to the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines (HPPs & HPGs) in the ToR. It was suggested that the same amendment would apply to all four Task Forces of the Commission, and the Secretariat would circulate the revised set of ToRs for Commission Members' consideration.
- 2.2 **The Chair** invited Members to propose other amendments to the ToR. There being none, the ToR of the Task Force was confirmed pending circulation of the revised version.

*(Post-meeting note: The revised ToRs of the Commission's four Task Forces, incorporating specific reference to HPPs & HPGs, were circulated to Commission Members on 25 September 2015, and were confirmed at the 21<sup>st</sup> Commission meeting held on 29 September 2015.)*

**Item 3 Acknowledgement of Minutes of the 19<sup>th</sup> Meeting**

- 3.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the draft minutes of the 19<sup>th</sup> meeting were circulated to Members of the last term on 11 August 2015. The revised draft minutes with Members' comments incorporated were circulated to Members again on 15 September 2015. Due to changes in membership, Members of

---

<sup>1</sup> "The Chair" thereafter is referred to Mr Nicholas BROOKE as the Task Force Chair.

the current term were invited to acknowledge the minutes.

**Item 4 Matters Arising**

A. Greening at the Central and Western District Promenade (Central Section) (paragraph 2.6 of the minutes of the 19<sup>th</sup> meeting)

4.1 **Mr Richard WONG** briefed Members on greening at the Central and Western District Promenade (Central Section) with the aid of a PowerPoint.

4.2 **The Chair** suggested that if there were insurmountable difficulties in planting trees, apart from the proposed arbours, LCSD should consider enhancing the greening through other possible means such as using potted plants. **Ir Raymond CHAN** echoed the Chair's view and suggested that the proposed arbours should blend in with the surrounding environment.

4.3 **Mr Richard WONG** agreed to look into possible means to enhance the greening in the area though he was concerned that potted plants with large size might collapse under windy condition and therefore might not be suitable. **The Chair** asked LCSD to prepare a landscape enhancement proposal for circulation to Members before the next meeting.

LCSD

*(Post-meeting note: The landscape enhancement proposal prepared by LCSD was circulated to Members on 11.11.2015.)*

B. Proposed University of Chicago Center in Hong Kong at the ex-Victoria Road Detention Centre, Victoria Road, Mount Davis (paragraph 2.7 of the minutes of the 19<sup>th</sup> meeting)

4.4 In response to a Member's enquiry concerning the site boundary of the ex-Victoria Road Detention Centre (VRDC), **Miss Christine AU** reported that the Education Bureau, the Commissioner for Heritage's Office, PlanD, the Government Property Agency and the Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO) of LCSD were consulted. According to their replies, the boundary of the site for the proposed University of Chicago Center was the same as the site boundary of VRDC. In the case of both VRDC and the proposed Center, the site only contained one abandoned gun emplacement within its western portion. The two respective sites did not include the other two

**Action**

abandoned gun emplacements to its west and its south. The two gun emplacements outside the site boundary were neither graded nor proposed graded historic buildings. Their heritage value had yet to be studied and assessed. The AMO was involved at the later stage in drawing up the conservation guidelines to facilitate the adaptive reuse of the graded buildings within the boundary. According to the approved planning application, the proponent would set back the existing boundary fencing of the ex-VRDC site to allow for public access to the abandoned gun emplacement within its western portion at all times. A proposed trail would also connect the ex-VRDC site to the other two disused gun emplacements for possible public access. **The Chair** suggested that the reply be circulated to Members for information.

*(Post-meeting note: The reply was circulated to Members on 2 October 2015.)*

C. 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 2.9 of the minutes of the 19<sup>th</sup> meeting)

4.5 **The Chair** said that as advised by the project proponent, the detailed design of the western part of the development was not ready yet and they aimed to consult the Task Force in Q4 2015.

**the project proponent**

D. Urban Design Study for the Wan Chai North and North Point Harbourfront Areas – Progress Update (paragraph 3.3 of the minutes of the 19<sup>th</sup> meeting)

4.6 **The Chair** said that the site constraint map was presented to the Working Group on the Urban Design Study for the Wan Chai North and North Point Harbourfront Areas (WGUDS) at its 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting on 27 May 2015. He suggested that Members could further discuss the Study under agenda item 5 of this meeting.

E. Land Use Review on the Western Part of Kennedy Town (paragraph 4.26 of the minutes of the 19<sup>th</sup> meeting)

4.7 **The Chair** reported that a working session was arranged on 24 August for Members to provide further inputs on the Review. PlanD would consult the Task Force on the conceptual design of the waterfront areas in due course.

**PlanD**

**Action**

F. Signature Project Scheme in Eastern District: Eastern District Cultural Square (paragraph 5.14 of the minutes of the 19<sup>th</sup> meeting)

4.8 **The Chair** said that the Eastern District Office (EDO) would provide the detailed design of the project for Members' information when ready.

**Item 5 Urban Design Study for the Wan Chai North and North Point Harbourfront Areas: Study Progress - Stage 1 Public Engagement (Paper No. TFHK/09/2015)**

5.1 **The Chair** welcomed the study team to the meeting. **Ms April KUN, Dr Winnie LAW and Mr Kenny CHAN** presented the study progress with the aid of a PowerPoint.

5.2 **The Chair** asked about the timetable of the Study including Stage 2 Public Engagement (PE), and whether any innovative solution could be identified for accessing the breakwater. He suggested the team to look into the issue on water quality which would be a determining factor for promoting water-related activities within the study area.

5.3 **Mr Kenny CHAN** responded that Stage 2 PE was expected to be launched in early 2016. The team recognised water quality as one of the major factors in determining the appropriate water activities, and they were gathering more information to look into the issue. On accessing the breakwater, the team was looking into other means, such as using sampans, small boats or water taxis. He however pointed out that there was only limited space on the breakwater.

5.4 **Mr Hans Joachim ISLER** declared that he was the former commodore of the Royal Hong Kong Yacht Club which was located within the study area. He opined that it was important to improve water quality. Some measures could have implications to the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance. On accessing the breakwater, he opined that sampans might be the only viable solution.

5.5 **Mr Walter CHAN** enquired whether underground or elevated connections between the waterfront and the hinterland would be more preferable while both had been advocated by the public. He further suggested the team to liaise with MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) to assess whether the proposed

**Action**

underground connections were feasible.

- 5.6 **Mr Kenny CHAN** responded that the team was looking into some possible locations for underground connections to be extended to. The team was open to both elevated and underground options which could serve different user groups including railway users and other visitors travelling across elevated connections and landscaped deck. **Ms April KUN** supplemented that during the Stage 1 PE, the team received comments from the local community that existing pedestrian facilities should be taken into account when designing new pedestrian linkages. The team would propose a comprehensive pedestrian network taking into account all the comments received and various considerations.
- 5.7 **The Chair** suggested the team to engage MTRCL as it would be sensible to have underground connections from the railway stations to the waterfront. He also suggested the team to explore constructing a pedestrian footbridge linking Excelsior Hotel to the waterfront with a view to improving connectivity to the "Noon Day Gun" area.
- 5.8 **Mr Franklin YU** said that it was difficult to gain access to the area from the Cross Harbour Tunnel entrance in Causeway Bay to Island Eastern Corridor in North Point. He asked if the team could propose solutions to address the issue. He also opined that pets should be allowed along the waterfront as far as possible despite some likely objections from members of the public.
- 5.9 **Mr Kenny CHAN** responded that the study team was aware of bottleneck locations and would further discuss with Members when preliminary proposals were ready. On pets, the team would try to strike a balance between different public views. **The Chair** opined that the Wan Chai North and North Point harbourfront could serve as a pilot for other areas to follow in terms of pet accessibility.

**Item 6 Temporary Uses at the New Central Harbourfront (Paper No. TFHK/10/2015)**

- 6.1 **Miss Christine AU** presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.

**Action**

- 6.2 **The Chair** remarked that the proposal was to seek Members' views on continuing with the two current temporary land uses, but not the tenancies. He opined that it was imminent for the Commission to start considering the long-term development for the new Central harbourfront and enquired about the reason for the observation wheel site to be proposed for a one-year extension.
- 6.3 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** also enquired about the difference in the proposed terms for the two extensions. He opined that it would take some time for overseas visitors to learn the observation wheel. While it was gradually turning into a tourism attraction, a slightly longer extension might be advisable.
- 6.4 **Mr Franklin YU** enquired about the patronage and types of free public events held at the event site. He opined that free public events should also be held on weekends for the enjoyment of more members of the public. For the observation wheel site, he commented that if the use was only extended for one year, given the time required for installation and dismantling, it might not be practicable to conduct a new open tendering exercise.
- 6.5 **Ir Raymond CHAN** remarked that he had no objection to extending the two current uses. He enquired if DEVB had considered any other alternative land uses for the sites concerned.
- 6.6 **Mr Ivan HO** said that the selection process for the operator should be open and transparent. He suggested incorporating suitable conditions in future tenancies so that local residents could enjoy the harbourfront. Some examples included integrating local features in the events or organising signature events with the local community.
- 6.7 **Miss Christine AU** responded that:-
- (a) When some sites in the new Central harbourfront became available in 2012, the Commission and the community expressed mutual aspirations to make use of them for public enjoyment as soon as practicable, before the commencement of permanent development. The two temporary uses proposed by the private sector were deliberated by the Commission, as well as the District Council, before being put forward as pilot projects. The Government invited open tenders for both projects in



**Action**

ensuring transparency and fair play;

- (b) there were other alternative temporary uses of the new Central harbourfront. For example, the Task Force was briefed on the proposal for a ferry plaza. While other ideas from the community were always welcomed, the current proposal of extending the two temporary uses was made based on the understanding that the community (including the Commission) favored the continuation of the two current uses. They were believed to be able to help fulfil the Commission's vision and benefit the public. DEVB looked forward to listening to Members' views and feedback on the two current uses;
- (c) the proposed terms for extension were different due to individual circumstances of the two sites. DEVB would note Members' views on terms and conditions, which would be suitably incorporated in the new tenancy agreements;
- (d) on free public uses at the event site, conditions had been included in the tenancy agreement to strike a proper balance between commercial viability and public enjoyment. In gist, the operator had to comply with a mandatory 120-day free public use requirement by organising events for the public to participate free of charge or opening the site for free public access. The operator had fulfilled this requirement so far and the Government would continue to monitor and ensure that such requirement would be complied with in the remaining time of the current term;
- (e) both operators of the observation wheel site and the event site had conducted outreaching activities to underprivileged groups. The Secretariat noted a report summarizing its charity events submitted by the observation wheel operator was circulated to Members for information earlier. DEVB would encourage the two tenants to continue engaging different social groups in the remaining times of the current term; and
- (f) as the Chair pointed out, Members' views were being sought on the land uses instead of the tenancies. If Members considered that the proposal for extending the two land uses should be supported, DEVB would follow

**Action**

up with LandsD on the subsequent land administrative procedures. Members' view on the practicality of issuing another open tender for a one-year term was noted.

- 6.8 **Mr Eric FOK** said that Members had a thorough discussion on the business viability for developing Sites 4 and 7 under public-private partnership in 2012 but no conclusion was drawn. He asked whether the popularity of the temporary uses would affect drawing up a master plan for future development in new Central harbourfront. While the current temporary uses could be extended, Members should continue the discussion on the future development in the meantime.
- 6.9 **Miss Christine AU** responded that the Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (UDS) completed by PlanD in 2011 had provided a master layout plan for the long term development of the eight key sites. Having regard to individual circumstances, permanent development of each site would be implemented at different time. Taking into account the completion timetable of relevant infrastructure works, it was expected that the permanent development of Sites 4, 6 and 7 would not take place before 2020. The proposal of extending the current temporary uses would not affect the permanent development of the sites concerned. Meanwhile, Members might be aware that the new Central harbourfront sites were recommended to be vested to the proposed Harbourfront Authority (HFA). A financial consultancy study was being conducted by the Secretariat on the resources required for establishing the HFA, including the financial position of developing sites proposed for vesting. The finding of the previous business viability study on Sites 4 and 7 would be made reference to in the ongoing consultancy study.
- 6.10 **Mr Vincent NG** had no objection to the proposed extension of current temporary uses. He enquired about the timetable for the long term development of Site 8, which was reassembling of the Queen's Pier (QP) between Central Piers Nos. 9 and 10 as recommended in the UDS.
- 6.11 **Miss Christine AU** responded that DEVB had been working with CEDD on reassembling QP and reviving its pier function at Site 8. **Mr MAK Chi-biu** supplemented that CEDD had commenced a consultancy to prepare a detailed design in mid-2014. CEDD planned to consult the public in early 2016. If the proposed design was supported, CEDD would take forward

subsequent town planning and funding approval procedures with a view to commencing reconstruction works in 2017.

- 6.12 In closing the discussion, **the Chair** concluded that Members supported the proposal of continuing the current temporary uses at the wheel and event sites for one and three years respectively.

**Item 7 Proposed Coach and Private Car Parking Places at Hoi Yu Street (Paper No. TFHK/11/2015) (Paper No. TFHK/12/2015) (Paper No. TFHK/13/2015)**

- 7.1 **The Chair** welcomed the representatives of relevant Government departments to the meeting.

*Temporary on-street meter parking for coaches at Hoi Yu Street, Quarry Bay, Hong Kong*

- 7.2 **Ms Fiona AU** briefed Members on Paper No. TFHK/11/2015, which was circulated to Members on 3 August 2015. She supplemented that some local organisations in the Eastern District had written to the Chair requesting for early implementation of the proposed temporary coach parking area.

*(Note: The letters of 17 September 2015 from the Co-ordination and Promotion of Eastern District, the North Point Kai-Fong Welfare Advancement Association and the North Point Residents' Association were tabled at the meeting for Members' reference.)*

- 7.3 In response to the Chair's enquiry, **Mr KUK Wai-kei** and **Ms Fiona AU** said that according to TD's assessment, the site could accommodate about 30 metered coach parking spaces. Each coach driver could use the space for 15 minutes up to one hour. While there would not be a separate management office, police officers and traffic wardens would patrol the proposed coach parking area. They expected that most coaches would stay for 30 minutes to one hour before leaving the site to pick up passengers.

- 7.4 **Mr Franklin YU** enquired about the justification for proposing this 6-month temporary measure; what measures were being planned after the 6-month period; and whether the proposal had taken into account the public coach parking spaces to be provided at a nearby private development at Java Road.

**Action**

- 7.5 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** opined that coaches waiting at Java Road had caused unacceptable traffic congestion. He supported implementing this proposal as a trial for six months and evaluating its effectiveness thereafter. He enquired the way forward after the 6-month period, and suggested that the departments should closely monitor the utilisation of the proposed coach parking area and carry out strict enforcement actions to prevent illegal parking activities along Java Road.
- 7.6 **Ir Raymond CHAN** agreed that a solution should be identified to resolve traffic congestion at Java Road. However, he doubted whether the temporary measure would be effective as it would be difficult to attract coach drivers to use the temporary parking spaces and then return to Java Road. He enquired if overnight parking would be permitted and whether there would any measure to ensure that the temporary parking spaces would be used exclusively by coaches.
- 7.7 **Mr Hans Joachim ISLER** shared the concerns raised by the Society for Protection of the Harbour (SPH) in Paper No. TFHK/13/2015. He opined that allowing parking at the waterfront was in contradiction to the Commission's objective in enhancing the harbourfront. He was also concerned that the temporary measure would become a long-term solution.
- 7.8 **Mr Shuki LEUNG** commented that it was a dilemma between successful harbourfront tourism and needs of the local community. He opined that as the problem was brought to light because of harbourfront tourism, the Commission should work with the local community and the District Council to find a feasible solution so that both visitors and residents could enjoy the harbourfront. The proposal should be given a try and the proponent department should brief Members on its effectiveness after the trial period.
- 7.9 **Mr Eric FOK** said that while the Commission had to protect the harbourfront, he noted that the District Council had a thorough discussion and supported the proposal. He would support giving the proposal a try but opined that the site should only be used by coaches. The proponent department should submit a progress report in 6-months' time.
- 7.10 **Mrs Karen BARRETTO** agreed with SPH's views as set out in Paper No. TFHK/13/2015 and did not support the proposal.

**Action**

She opined that the problem was complicated and required a solution other than just a temporary coach parking area.

7.11 **Ms Fiona AU** responded that EDO and departments concerned would monitor the utilization of the coach parking spaces after the proposal was implemented. EDC would be consulted on the way forward after the 6-month period. If there would be an alternative site or other long-term measures were available, the proposed coach parking spaces could be phased out. She added that TD was considering long term measures but the current proposal was the only viable measure at the moment. The Police would patrol and take enforcement action against illegal parking. **Mr KUK Wai-kei** supplemented that the Police had arranged officers to patrol Java Road and guide coaches to leave immediately after loading and unloading. The Police would ask coaches to leave Java Road and use the temporary coach parking area which was five minutes away. While it might take longer for coaches to return via Tsat Tsz Mui Road, the Police would monitor the traffic situation closely. For the provision of public coach parking spaces at a nearby private development, **Ms Money HO** said that the completion date for the nearby development was not available yet.

7.12 **Mr Shuki LEUNG** opined that relevant departments should look for a long term solution. He hoped that both short term and long term measures could be identified for the tourism area under the Urban Design Study for the Wan Chai North and North Point Harbourfront Areas. **The Chair** responded that TD was asked to report back to the Commission on long term solution for coaches and goods vehicles in Q1 2016.

**TD**

7.13 **Mr Franklin YU** opined that given the present situation, Members might support this temporary solution. He requested the proponent department to report back in 3-months' time after implementation of the measure and propose measures for implementation after the 6-month trial period.

7.14 **The Chair** concluded that the majority of Members supported the proposal as a short-term solution, and EDO should come back in six months to report on the effectiveness of the measure and suggest the way forward. Relevant departments should ensure that the site would be used by coaches only. If the proposed temporary coach parking should be further extended, EDO should consider installing fencing to screen coaches from the harbourfront in an attractive way. A long term solution

**EDO**

**Action**

should be identified as soon as practicable as allowing the coach parking area to occupy such a prominent waterfront site would not be acceptable.

*Proposed Short Term Tenancy for Temporary Public Fee-paying Carpark, Government Land at Hoi Yu Street, Hong Kong*

- 7.15 **Mr Lawrence LI** briefed Members on Paper No. TFHK/12/2015, which was circulated to Members on 10 August 2015.
- 7.16 In response to the Chair's enquiry, **Mr Lawrence LI** said that EDO supported the proposal as there was a local need for the car park. The retendering could be invited in end 2015 or early 2016 if the proposal was supported.
- 7.17 **Mr Franklin YU** said that the car park should serve users of Quarry Bay Promenade as there was no convenient north-south pedestrian connection. When pedestrian connections were available, the site should be resumed for other beneficial public uses.
- 7.18 **The Chair** concluded that the Task Force supported the proposed retendering.

**Item 8 Any Other Business**

A. *Action Areas Table*

- 8.1 **The Chair** said that the updated action areas table was tabled for Members' information. Members could pass their comments, if any, to the Secretariat.
- 8.2 There being no other business, the meeting ended at 5:00 p.m.

**Secretariat**

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