

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

**Minutes of Twenty-third Meeting**

Date : 25 May 2016 (Wednesday)  
Time : 2:30 p.m.  
Venue : Conference Room, 15/F, North Point Government Offices,  
333 Java Road, North Point

Present

Mr Nicholas BROOKE	Chairman
Mrs Margaret BROOKE	Representing Business Environment Council
Dr NG Cho-nam	Representing Conservancy Association
Mrs Karen BARRETTO	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Franklin YU	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Paul CHAN Yuen-king	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
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Mr Eric FOK	
Mr Henry CHAN	
Ms Rosanna CHOI	
Ms Jacqueline CHUNG	
Mr Stanley HO	
Mr David PONG	
Mr Alvin YIP	

Official Members

Mr Thomas CHAN	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands) <sup>1</sup> , Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Edward LEUNG	Senior Manager (Tourism) <sup>2</sup> , Tourism Commission (TC)
Mr Anthony LI	Senior Engineer/Housing & Planning, Transport Department (TD)
Mr Eddie LAM	Senior Engineer 7(HK Island Div 1), Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Mr Richard WONG	Assistant Director(Leisure Services) <sup>2</sup> , Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Ms Ginger KIANG	District Planning Officer/Hong Kong, Planning Department (PlanD)
Mr Larry CHU	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
Miss Emily SOM	Assistant Secretary (Harbour)2 (des), DEVB
Mr Peter MOK	Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB

Absent with Apologies

Mr LEUNG Kong-yui	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
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	
Miss Lily CHOW	
Mr Hans Joachim ISLER	
Ms Vivian LEE	
Mr Vincent NG	

For Agenda Item 2

Miss Christine AU	Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Eddie LAM	Senior Engineer 7 (HK Island Div 1), CEDD
Mr Raymond CHAN	Project Manager, Jacobs China Ltd
Mr Sean WONG	Deputy Project Manager, Jacobs China Ltd
Mr Kin LAU	Associate, Leigh & Orange Ltd
Mr Henry LO	Associate Director, School of Architecture, CUHK

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

For Agenda Item 4

Mr CHIU Yat On, Michael	Chief Executive Officer (Planning)1, LCSD
Ms LOK Mee Mee, Mimi	District Leisure Manager (Eastern), LCSD
Mr LEUNG Kin Tak, Allen	Chief Project Manager 302, Architectural Services Department (ArchSD)
Mr YOW Kin Fai, Anthony	Senior Project Manager 328, ArchSD
Mr LAU Man Kuen, Ephes	Project Manager 350, ArchSD
Mr CW NG, Elton	Architect 132, Housing Department (HD)

Miss KW FUNG, Edith

Planning Officer 33,HD

For Agenda Item 5

Mr Timothy J. Peirson-Smith

Spokesperson of the Hong Kong Observation Wheel,  
Managing Director of Executive Counsel Limited

Ms Stef LO

PR Manager of Executive Counsel Limited

Ms Mavis CHAN

PR Consultant of Executive Counsel Limited

Mr Chris WONG

PE Consultant of Executive Counsel Limited

Mr Rogier SNEP

Project Manager of the Swiss AEX Holding Limited

Mr Cedric TAM

Senior Construction Manager of the Swiss AEX  
Holding Limited

For Agenda Item 6

Miss Christine AU

Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB

Miss Ida TSE

Project Coordinator (Harbour), DEVB

**Action**

**Welcoming Message**

**The Chair** welcomed all to attend the meeting. He introduced two co-opted Members, Ms Jacqueline CHUNG nominated by the Wan Chai District Council and Mr Stanley HO nominated by the Eastern District Council (EDC) for joining the Task Force.

He also informed Members that Mr Edward LEUNG, Senior Manager (Tourism)<sup>2</sup> of TC attended on behalf of Ms Emily MO; Mr Anthony LI, Senior Engineer/Housing & Planning of TD attended on behalf of Mr CHAN Chung-yun; and Mr Eddie LAM, Senior Engineer 7 (HK Island Division 1) of CEDD attended on behalf of Mr CB MAK.

**Item 1 Confirmation of the Minutes of the Last Meeting**

1.1 **The Chair** said the draft minutes of the last meeting were circulated to Members for comments on 16 May 2016. The revised draft minutes with Members' comments incorporated were circulated again on 23 May 2016. There being no proposed amendment, the 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 2.8 of the minutes of the 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting)

2.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the Eastern District Office (EDO) would report to the Task Force at the next Task Force meeting when their review was completed.

2.2 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** requested EDO to provide Members with relevant information of coaches that park at the site, such as vehicle registration numbers and records/log sheets of stopover time.

EDO

B. The Urban Design Study for the Wan Chai North and North Point Harbourfront Areas: Study Progress – Study Progress and Proposed Stage 2 Public Engagement Work Plan (Paragraphs 3.14 and 3.15 of the minutes of the 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting)

2.3 **The Chair** informed Members that the issue would be discussed under item 3 of the meeting.

C. Reassembly of Queen's Pier (Paragraph 4.25 of the minutes of the 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting)

2.4 **The Chair** welcomed representatives of the project team to the meeting. He asked and **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** declared that his views to be offered on the reassembly of Queen's Pier (QP) represented the Society for Protection of the Harbour. **Miss Christine AU** and **Mr Eddie LAM** presented the preliminary findings of the Community Engagement (CE) exercise of the reassembly of QP with the aid of a PowerPoint.

2.5 **The Chair** said that the Victoria Harbourfront Concern Group (Concern Group) set out their views on the reassembly of QP via the letter that was tabled for Members' information. He enquired if CEDD had received comments from the Concern Group during the CE exercise and whether their comments had been incorporated in the initial finding.

2.6 In response, **Mr Eddie LAM** said that the views of the Concern Group would be put alongside all other views received in the exercise to be considered by the Government.

2.7 On the proposed design of the landing steps at the two sides of QP, **Dr NG Cho-nam** asked whether option III (reassembly with at-grade display and seating) would be able to fulfil relevant requirements of restoring a Grade 1 historical building.

2.8 **Mr Henry LO** responded that option III was a new option

prepared after consulting the Hong Kong Institute of Architectural Conservationists (HKICON). HKICON advised that instead of reconstructing some landing steps, a better arrangement could be to reassemble the landing steps with at-grade display and seating.

2.9 **Dr NG Cho-nam** opined that even though option III could offer better functionality for public enjoyment, its compliance with heritage restoration principle could be subject to challenges.

2.10 **Mr Henry LO** said that the project team received different views on the arrangement for the two side landing steps during the CE exercise. Further comments from Members are welcomed.

2.11 **The Chair** enquired if option III was included in the CE exercise. **Miss Christine AU** responded that option III was among the three options proposed in relation to arrangement for side landing steps in the CE exercise. It was indeed the option that received most support.

2.12 **Dr NG Cho-nam** enquired if the Government consulted the Antiquities Advisory Board (AAB) on the proposed arrangement. He remarked that the Government should take note of the heritage status of the old QP and should not sacrifice preservation for the sake of functionality.

2.13 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** enquired about the cost estimates for the three options proposed. He opined that the option to be adopted should be cost effective. Besides, reassembling QP along the harbourfront to revive its pier function was more sensible than putting it at its original location. With the change in area and architectural design of Edinburgh Place, putting QP in-situ would no longer form a heritage cluster with the City Hall and Edinburgh Place as the Concern Group aimed for. He also doubted whether the considerable number of emails requesting to reassemble QP at its original location were really representative as it would be easy for any group to generate support by an email template.

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

- (a) a comparison of the cost estimates between the three options for reassembling QP at the waterfront and in-situ reassembly at Edinburgh Place would be useful in determining which option would be more cost effective;
- (b) several experts in marine traffic suggested that provision of additional landing steps in QP adjacent to Central Piers

Nos. 9 and 10 (Piers 9 and 10) would cause the manoeuvring space of vessels to overlap and result in conflicts in marine traffic. Closing the two landing steps of Piers 9 and 10 while reviving the three landing steps of QP would not necessarily improve the overall berthing capabilities of the area;

- (c) reassembling QP at its original location could enhance the heritage and historic value of QP and Edinburgh Place, both of which were built over 50 years ago; and
- (d) the Concern Group advised that there were 1 049 people opted for in-situ reassembly of QP. He enquired about the Government's response to this figure. Since the option of in-situ reassembly was not included in the survey form used during the CE exercise, he would like to know if the Government had received any views other than choosing one of the three options proposed in the survey form.

2.15 **Miss Christine AU** made the following responses-

- (a) to reassemble QP between Piers 9 and 10 was based on the recommendation of the Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (UDS) which had undergone an extensive and comprehensive public engagement exercise. To reassemble QP at its original location would go against the recommendation of the UDS;
- (b) to reassemble QP at its original location or near the City Hall would be more costly than putting it between Piers 9 and 10; and
- (c) to reassemble QP at its original location or near the City Hall would create conflicts with existing and planned development. Depending on its exact location, it would entail realignment of Lung Wo Road and impose constraints on other infrastructure works such as the Airport Railway Extended Overrun Tunnel and the proposed North Island Line.

2.16 On marine traffic impact, **Mr Raymond CHAN** responded that a marine traffic impact assessment had been carried out. After thorough discussion with the Marine Department, it was agreed that the proposed opening of one additional landing step at QP could facilitate public use.

2.17 **The Chair** enquired about the costs of the three options of reassembling QP between Piers 9 and 10.

2.18 **Mr Eddie LAM** responded that the project cost for options A, B and C were estimated to be \$303M, \$248M and \$230M respectively.

2.19 On the figures presented by the Concern Group, **Mr Eddie LAM** responded that the Government had recorded the same, that 1 049 people preferred reassembling QP at its original location. However, if adding the number of people choosing the architectural options for reassembly of QP between Piers 9 and 10, i.e. any one of the three options as presented in the CE exercise, the figure would be almost 1 800.

2.20 **Mr Franklin YU** made the following comments-

- (a) while he personally preferred to assemble QP at its original location, he would respect the recommendation of the UDS as it had gone through a thorough public engagement process. He considered that at this stage, reopening the discussion on the reassembly location would only further delay the implementation of the reassembly works;
- (b) the Government should incorporate historic elements of QP into the design of the proposed piazza fronting City Hall in order to remind people of the original location of QP;
- (c) he would like to know about the practical arrangement for vessels to use QP; and
- (d) the arrangement of landing steps at the two sides of QP using option III may not be able to comply with heritage conservation principle as the original setting would disappear. If the original configuration could no longer be maintained due to site constraints, the Government might consider displaying photos and models to demonstrate the original setting.

2.21 In response, **Miss Christine AU** said that the future QP, if reassembled between Piers 9 and 10, would be a public pier. Vessels could use the landing steps of QP for embarkation and disembarkation. On the design of the piazza fronting the City Hall, the Government consulted the Task Force in May 2014 and obtained Members' support.

Among others, design elements would be provided at the original location to commemorate the historical significance of QP. She added that the reassembly of QP and the construction of the piazza would be considered holistically. During the CE exercise, the Government had received suggestions about displaying historical records or notes of the old QP at its future location between Piers 9 and 10. The Government would take these views into account.

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

- (a) instead of incorporating new elements into the piazza, the Government should reassemble the QP near its original location to preserve its historic setting;
- (b) the Government should consider whether it would be cost effective to revive the landing steps of QP;
- (c) to open three landing steps of QP would require additional maneuvering space for vessels to turn around. Members should be provided with the full marine traffic assessment report to examine the related safety issue;
- (d) some individuals believed that the urban design options offered during the public engagement exercise of the UDS in 2007 were not fair. At that time, one of the four options was to put QP near its original location but in front of a lagoon which would require Lung Wo Road to be entirely re-routed; and another option was to relocate QP somewhere else. He thought the public had not been provided with sufficiently substantiated options to choose from; and
- (e) he enquired which area of the new Central harbourfront would have to be opened up for infrastructure works in the future such as the proposed North Island Line and the Airport Railway Extended Overrun Tunnel.

**THB/HyD**

*(Post-meeting note: The North Island Line (NIL) is one of the seven railway schemes recommended in the Railway Development Strategy 2014 (RDS-2014). The NIL will be an extension of the Tung Chung Line and Tseung Kwan O Line along the northern shore of the Hong Kong Island. The NIL is expected to play an important role in diverting the harbour-crossing passenger traffic, alleviating*



*the loading of the existing MTR Island Line and meeting the transport demand of the expanding Central Business District. The existing overrun tunnel of the Airport Railway with its partial extension to the east of the Hong Kong Station is about 120m long. In order to enhance the capacities for the existing Airport Express Line and the Tung Chung Line, there is a need to fully extend the Airport Railway Extended Overrun Tunnel (AREOT) by 460m. According to the preliminary design of NIL, the NIL and AREOT will form an integrated tunnel structure, in order to minimise the number of road opening works arising from these railway infrastructure.*

*According to RDS-2014, the indicative implementation window for planning purpose of NIL is 2021 to 2026. As NIL is still in the early planning stage, its alignment and implementation is contingent upon the technical and financial studies as well as public consultation at the detailed planning stage. The Government will carefully consider all relevant factors and strike a reasonable balance among various interests of the community when mapping out the way forward for the railway project.)*

2.23 **Mr Ivan HO** commented that there had been diverse and even polarized views over the location to reassemble QP. The argument had lasted for ten years and it would never cease even if repeated rounds of public consultation was to be launched. Regardless of personal preference for the location of the reassembled QP, Members should respect the procedural justice of the UDS process, as well as its recommendations. He regretted that the community had already paid considerable social cost in arguing over the issue. He urged Members to narrow down their differences so that the reassembly works could finally proceed.

2.24 In response to the marine function of the reassembled QP, **Miss Christine AU** said that the project team had conducted a detailed marine traffic assessment and evaluated the manoeuvring space required for vessels in consultation with the Marine Department. Sea trials for berthing different types of vessels were also conducted at the location between Piers 9 and 10 where QP was proposed to be reassembled. Results of these trials were positive.

2.25 **Mr Raymond CHAN** supplemented that the location of the landing steps of the old QP were narrower when compared with the current standard, so they would be more suitable for smaller vessels. The general public would be welcomed to use QP according to their needs and preferences.

2.26 **Mr Alvin YIP** queried the urgency to reassemble QP and added that he personally did not mind completing the reassembly at a later stage of the new Central harbourfront development. He opined

that the CE exercise did not provide other possible reassembly locations and only consulted the public on the three options for reassembly between Piers 9 and 10. If the reassembly was not urgent, more studies could be conducted to identify alternative design option. He echoed with Dr NG Cho-nam that AAB should be consulted on the issue.

2.27 **Miss Christine AU** made the following responses -

- (a) the community had different views on the time frame to complete the reassembly of QP;
- (b) she reiterated that the CE exercise was conducted based on the recommendation of the UDS. Hence, the Government aimed to seek views on two matters - (i) the proposed architectural designs of QP and (ii) the arrangement of the two side landing steps; and
- (c) notwithstanding the above, other views from the public on the project were welcomed. The public comments received would be examined and analysed before deciding the way forward.

2.28 **Sr Emily LI** enquired about the time frame for completing the reassembly works and whether the cost estimates were based on the proposed works schedule. She noted that the cost difference between options B and C was minimal.

2.29 **Mr Franklin YU** enquired about the size of vessels that could be able to berth at QP and the estimated utilization rate. He also enquired about the time frame to complete reassembling QP.

2.30 **Ms Rosanna CHOI** enquired if there were precedents of putting three piers closely adjacent to each another. She remarked that public safety was her key concern.

2.31 On behalf of Mr Vincent NG who was in absentia, **Mr Ivan HO** stated that the QP project should proceed as soon as possible as committed by the Government.

2.32 **Mr Raymond CHAN** reiterated that the project team had conducted a marine traffic impact assessment and a sea trial to examine marine safety issues. The Marine Department was generally satisfied with the project team's recommendation of opening the three landing steps in QP. He supplemented that vessels with a length of not exceeding 35m would be permitted to use public piers including QP. The masters of vessels would have the ability to decide whether it would

be safe to use QP under each individual circumstance.

2.33 On the estimated cost of reassembling QP, **Mr Eddie LAM** said that the additional cost of around \$18M for option B over option C was for adding a gable wall in front of the curved roofs of Piers 9 and 10. The cost estimate for the whole project was based on the current price level. The Government would have to review the estimate if there was any adjustment to the implementation schedule.

2.34 **Miss Christine AU** said that the Government would examine and analyse all comments received during the CE exercise to decide on the way forward. The key steps before commencing construction were to submit a section 16 application to the Town Planning Board and seek funding approval from the Finance Committee of the Legislative Council. These factors would determine the overall schedule of the project.

2.35 **The Chair** asked the Government to give weight to the comments raised by Members and the Concern Group and reflect them in the CE report. He thought the report should be very comprehensive. He asked the Government to report back to the Task Force when the CE report was available. In addition, he considered that consultation with AAB on the reassembly would be required. In response, **Miss Christine AU** pointed out that as advised earlier by Mr Henry LO, the team's architectural expert, it was not necessary to consult AAB at the current stage.

**DEVB  
CEDD**

D. *Proposed Boardwalk underneath the Island Eastern Corridor (Paragraph 5.14 of the minutes of the 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting)*

2.36 **The Chair** said that the Stage 1 Community Engagement was completed on 31 March 2016. CEDD was consolidating and following up on the public views received and expected to report back to the Task Force in Q3 2016. He urged CEDD to report back as soon as practicable.

E. *Federation Internationale de l'Automobile Formula E Champion (Paragraph 6.20 of the minutes of the 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting)*

2.37 **The Chair** reported that a paper provided by the Highways Department setting out measures to enhance the greening alongside Lung Wo Road, which would be implemented through minor road improvement works to facilitate the organization of the Formula E race, was circulated to Members on 10 May 2016. The layout plan and design of the race circuit, once available from the Organiser, would be circulated to Members.

*(Post-meeting note: The layout plan of the Formula E race including the design of the race circuit was circulated to Members on 12 September 2016.)*

2.38 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** requested for the Government's response including the cost estimate of replacing the concrete barriers in Lung Wo Road with planters.

*(Post-meeting note: A written response on replacing the existing concrete barriers with stone planters was circulated to Members on 20 June 2016.)*

F. Ground Decontamination Works at the Site of the Ex-Kennedy Town Incineration Plant/Abattoir and Adjoining Area (Paragraph 7.15 of the minutes of the 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting)

2.39 **The Chair** informed Members that CEDD's written response was circulated to Members on 16 May 2016.

G. Land Use Review of the Western Part of Kennedy Town (Paragraph 7.20 of the minutes of the 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting)

2.40 **The Chair** said that the relevant minutes of the Task Force and Members' comment on the proposed land use at the Cadogen Street Temporary Garden site had been conveyed to the Town Planning Board for reference.

H. Study Conducted by the Worcester Polytechnic Institute (Paragraph 8.7 of the minutes of the 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting)

2.41 **The Chair** informed Members that the presentation made by the study team and Members' comments had been conveyed to relevant departments for consideration. As it was a territory-wide matter, the presentation had been circulated to all Commission members on 10 May 2016.

2.42 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** requested for a rough timeline for connecting all waterfronts. **The Chair** asked the Harbour Unit to take on board Member's comments.

**Item 3 The Urban Design Study for the Wan Chai North and North Point Harbourfront Areas - Study Progress and Stage 2 Public Engagement Work Plan (Paper No. TFHK/09/2016)**

3.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives of the study team to the meeting. **Dr Eunice MAK** and **Mr Kenny CHAN** presented the progress of the Urban Design Study for the Wan Chai North and North

Point Harbourfront Areas (UDS) including the work plan of the Stage 2 Public Engagement (PE2) with the aid of a PowerPoint.

3.2 **The Chair** informed Members that Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN had proposed comments on the draft PE2 Digest. His comments and the study team's responses were tabled at the meeting for Members' reference. He enquired about the wave attenuation in the Water Sports and Recreation Precinct.

3.3 **Mr Kenny CHAN** responded that making reference to the advice of marine specialists and information gathered from the wave models developed under the Wai Chai Development Phase II (WDII) project, the projected wave height near the shores of Wan Chai and Causeway Bay would be around 1m. The study team would study the technical feasibility of the Harbourfront Enhancement Proposals (HEPs) for the ex-Public Cargo Working Area (PCWA) and the Revitalized Typhoon Shelter Precinct based on the projected wave height. Mitigation measures would be proposed at the next stage of the study, if required.

3.4 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** expressed reservation on allocating the entire PCWA for water sports and activities in the Water Sports and Recreation Precinct as there were sufficient and convenient swimming pools and beaches across the territory. He was not sure if a floating swimming pool and urban beach would be the best option for this remaining water basin on the north shore of Hong Kong Island. He asked for more detailed information on wave attenuation and boat mooring for Members to comment on proposed water use options.

3.5 **Mr Alvin YIP** suggested incorporating public art element in HEPs to create a vibrant waterfront with character.

3.6 **Mr Franklin YU** said the following-

- (a) he enquired about the alternative use of urban beach in the Water Sports and Recreation Precinct during winter and whether there would be an automatic system proposed for renting bicycles along the proposed cycle track;

- (b) to avoid it becoming an unattractive dead-end, more activities should be provided at the breakwater viewing deck in the Revitalized Typhoon Shelter Precinct. If the use of water body in the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter (CBTS) would be restricted, the study team might consider tying pontoons to the breakwater to allow some ad hoc activities, so that the breakwater would become an attraction for visitors from time to time;
- (c) for similar reasons, the Ventilation Building in the East Coast Park Precinct could be dressed up, or some new features could be added near it in order to upgrade the site into a prominent landmark; and
- (d) suitable water-borne transport service should be provided for visitors to travel around key attractions within the harbour, for example, between the Wan Chai Ferry Pier and the West Kowloon Cultural District.

3.7 On the Water Sports and Recreation Precinct, **Mr Henry CHAN** suggested sufficient supporting facilities such as toilet, changing room and spectator stand be provided to support the water sports and recreational activities. In addition, arts and cultural elements proposed for the Celebration Precinct should also be introduced to other Precincts in collaboration with professionals such as the Hong Kong Arts Development Council.

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

- (a) alfresco dining could be provided outside the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre (HKCEC) by setting back the Emergency Vehicular Access (EVA);
- (b) he enquired about the number of parking spaces to be provided in the proposed coach parking areas in the study area. The provision should be sufficient to meet public needs by making reference to the number of coach parking currently using HKCEC and the area outside of

the Golden Bauhinia Square;

- (c) the walkway between the Exhibition Station and the Wan Chai Ferry Pier should be widened to become a distinctive architectural feature. With a delicate design, the walkway could provide an enjoyable and interesting walking experience for visitors;
- (d) bollards should not only be provided at the landing steps but along the entire waterfront so that vessels could be permitted to berth;
- (e) detailed information on wave attenuation should be included in the PE2 Digest so that the community could understand the constraints when deciding the suitable type of water activities to be proposed for the study area;
- (f) all metered car parking spaces along Hung Hing Road should be cancelled;
- (g) agreement should be obtained from the Royal Hong Kong Yacht Club (RHKYC) in order to extend public access into RHKYC on Kellett Island; and
- (h) the provision of noise barriers, if any, along the waterfront should not be supported in view of adverse visual impact.

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

- (a) the study team was aware of the issue of wave attenuation and would further look into it and more information would be provided to Members in the next stage;
- (b) the urban beach concept was put forward in response to public comments received during Stage 1 PE, especially from the younger generation. The study team would seek public feedback on the proposal during PE2 and

then further review;

- (c) the study team shared Members' suggestion of incorporating art element into the urban design concept ;
- (d) the study team had recommended to include a bike rental system with checkpoints along the waterfront;
- (e) while water-borne transport service to connect both sides of the harbour would be desirable, business interest and viability to realise the idea would be critical. The study team would include infrastructural support necessary to facilitate the provision of such services in the future ;
- (f) the study team would further liaise with RHKYC on extending the public access at the eastern edge of Kellett Island;
- (g) the temperature of winter in Hong Kong would not be too low for the public to enjoy water recreation activities in the Water Sports and Recreation Precinct, although direct water contact such as swimming might not be possible;
- (h) public transport facilities such as parking spaces, loading/unloading bay, drop-off and pick-up points had been planned near the key attractions along the waterfront;
- (i) the study team agreed to seek HKCEC's views on the idea of providing alfresco dining near HKCEC;
- (j) 24 and nine additional coach parking spaces were proposed at the two proposed coach parking areas at Convention Avenue and Wan Shing Street respectively;
- (k) the study team agreed to explore planning more bollards along the waterfront and would further examine the technical feasibility of the proposal;



- (l) under the current proposal, around 11 metered car parking spaces would be kept along Hung Hing Road. The study team would review the arrangement with TD with a view to cancelling more metered parking spaces to improve pedestrian environment; and
- (m) visitors to the waterfront along CBTS might have grave concern over nearby traffic noise, the study team was examining various mitigation options from functional and design perspectives and would seek feedback from the public before deciding on whether to propose any noise barrier for the area.

3.10 **Mr David PONG** opined that public art could be displayed in various locations. He was confident that local professionals could manage to create suitable pieces taking into account sites constraints and the available space.

3.11 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** commented that the HEPs would be able to enhance the attractiveness of the northern shore of Hong Kong Island. He commented that the study team should actively promote the HEPs to the general public during PE2. He hoped the engagement activities could help gather some genuine feedbacks from the community.

3.12 **Mr Ivan HO** made the following comments-

- (a) all public car parking spaces at Hung Hing Road should be eliminated to facilitate streetscape enhancements for public enjoyment;
- (b) objected to any suggestion of putting noise barriers along the waterfront unless an innovative and convincing physical design was available;
- (c) quoting the public art pieces along the southern bank of River Thames in London as an example, he suggested incorporating art pieces along the waterfront after engaging the public in the PE process; and

- (d) the proposed urban beach concept was supported as such feature was attractive to the younger generation and children.

3.13 **The Chair** asked the study team to take on board comments from Members when refining the HEPs. **The Chair** further enquired about the schedule for the study team to update Members on the progress.

3.14 **Ms April KUN** responded that PE2 would be launched by end May/early June and last for about two months. The study team would report the public views received to the Task Force. She added that Members were most welcomed to participate in the activities and workshops of PE2.

3.15 **The Chair** asked PlanD to circulate the PE2 program and the finalised Digest to Members for reference.

**PlanD**

*(Post-meeting note: The PE2 program and the finalised Digest were circulated to Members on 3 June 2016 and 10 June 2016 respectively. The PE2 was launched on 11 June 2016 and concluded on 20 August 2016.)*

#### **Item 4 Reprovisioning of Tin Chiu Street Playground (Paper No. TFHK/10/2016)**

4.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives of LCSD, ArchSD and HD to the meeting. As background, he informed Members that the Government proposed to allocate the site of the existing Tin Chiu Street Playground (TCSP) for developing subsidised housing. To maintain public service, the leisure facilities of TCSP would be reprovisioned at a harbourfront site, which was currently being used as a works area for the Harbour Area Treatment Scheme Stage 2A project.

4.2 **Mr Michael CHIU** and **Mr Allen LEUNG** presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.

4.3 **The Chair** enquired about the type of surface to be used for the future basketball court and football pitch and whether there would be any enhancement works on the waterfront area.

4.4 **Mr Anthony YOW** responded that the future basketball court and football pitch would be hard-paved. The waterfront area would fall beyond the scope of the reprovisioning project.

4.5 **The Chair** expressed the view that it would be more desirable if the whole site including the future promenade could be designed and enhanced in one go.

4.6 **Mr Ivan HO** commented that erecting 6m-high fence on the side of the football pitch facing the waterfront should be avoided. The Government should consider swapping the adjacent existing children's playground with the sports facilities to be reprovisioned to allow better interface with the waterfront promenade. In other words, the football pitch should be located next to Java Road while the children's playground should be placed near the waterfront.

4.7 **Mr Franklin YU** made the following comments-

- (a) he echoed with Mr Ivan HO's view that the fence should be located away from the waterfront while leisure facilities should be put closer to the waterfront;
- (b) the entire temporary works area should be converted into an open space;
- (c) the proposed cul-de-sac at Ting Chiu Street should be set back to widen the waterfront promenade and improve east-west connectivity;
- (d) the pedestrian pavement along Tin Chiu Street outside the existing children's playground should also be widened;
- (e) on the interfacing between the children's playground, sports courts and the promenade, instead of raised planters, LCSD might consider using low-rising greenery to allow more openings in between the facilities; and
- (f) the boundary wall of North Point Vehicular Ferry Pier (NPVFP) could also be beautified in the future.

4.8 **The Chair** enquired about the utilization rate of the existing sports facilities in TCSP. He opined that since the number of people to benefit from the sports facilities might be limited, the Government might wish to make better use of the entire site to serve the wider community.

4.9 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** remarked that 5-a-side football was

popular in Hong Kong and there was a league tournament organized for the sport by the Hong Kong Football Association (HKFA). Spectator seating should be included in the reprovisioning works.

4.10 **Mr Eric FOK** made the following comments-

- (a) there were not many 11-a-side football pitches in Hong Kong due to limited land resources. 5-a-side football would be a good alternative to promote football development in Hong Kong. He was encouraged to see that a new 5-a-side standard football pitch would be provided through the reprovisioning project;
- (b) the waterfront space should benefit the wider community from harbour enhancement point of view. To strike a balance, while the primary use of the football pitch and basketball court should be maintained, other community activities such as local carnivals and fairs could also be organised within the facilities. A good example of mixed use of sports facilities was the Southorn Playground in Wan Chai;
- (c) sufficient ancillary facilities such as changing rooms, drinking fountains and kiosks should be provided within the site;
- (d) according to the current design, the entrance to the football pitch would be provided at the south-east corner near the basketball court. To facilitate players who might need to drop off their heavy gear at the cul-de-sac, he suggested providing one additional entrance at Tin Chiu Street near the waterfront; and
- (e) the Government might consider soliciting views from the wider community on the reprovisioning project.

4.11 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** enquired about the direct pedestrian linkage between the reprovisioning site and the existing promenade at ex-North Point Estate site as she considered the current design would not be easy for pedestrians to gain access to the football pitch from the promenade.

4.12 **Mr Michael CHIU** made the following responses-

- (a) while agreeing that a better design could be achieved by

including the site of the existing children's playground, the current proposal aimed to provide a like to like reprovisioning of TCSP to facilitate the subsidized housing development.;

- (b) the utilization of the existing football pitch and basketball court by nearby residents were quite high. With the upgrading the football pitch and basketball court, the utilization rate was expected to be raised further; and
- (c) ancillary facilities such as changing rooms and public toilets were available in the adjacent children's playground.

4.13 **Mr Allen LEUNG** supplemented that-

- (a) the cul-de-sac and the promenade area fell beyond the scope of the reprovisioning project;
- (b) widening the pavement along Tin Chiu Street also fell beyond the scope of the reprovisioning project. Members' suggestion of widening the pedestrian pavement along Tin Chiu Street all the way to Java Road would encroached upon the existing children's playground and this could only be achieved by taking up area of the children's playground. Further study by concerned parties would be required after the meeting;
- (c) Member's suggestion to replace concrete planters and enhance the interface between the reprovisioned sports facilities and the children's playground would be taken on board;
- (d) Member's suggestion on beautifying the existing boundary wall of NPVFP could be further explored by concerned parties upon clarification of its ownership; and
- (e) the feasibility of including more spectator seating and further refining the design such as adding another entrance to the football pitch could be further examined.

4.14 **Mr Anthony LI** said that the cul-de-sac had already been set back for 10m from the waterfront. It was the optimum design to allow 12m-long coaches to turn around. The width of the footpath along Tin Chiu Street varied from 3m to 5m in order to provide some motorcycle

parking spaces along the street.

4.15 **Sr Emily LI** enquired if NPVFP would give rise to any safety concern to users of the sports facilities and the children's playground and whether the pier could be relocated. The entire area could become a continuous waterfront promenade with sports facilities facing Java Road.

4.16 **Mr Franklin YU** requested relevant departments to review the project by looking into the overall planning of the adjacent children's playground and the waterfront portion in addition to the current project area.

4.17 **The Chair** agreed that the reprovisioning project should be reviewed holistically.

4.18 **Mr Michael CHIU** told Members that the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) had confirmed that NPVFP would not pose any danger to users of the children's playground. If a redesigning of the entire area was required, it would require much longer time for implementation and had to go through the procedures of a capital works project. Given the need to vacate the current site of TCSP for subsidized housing, the proposed reprovisioning was considered a more desirable way forward.

4.19 **The Chair** expressed his concern over the current scope of the project as the facilities to be reprovisioned would be permanent in nature.

4.20 **Mr Ivan HO** objected to the proposed reprovisioning and urged the proponent departments to review the planning of the entire area holistically. The construction works could be carried out in phases to shorten the closure of the children's playground.

4.21 **Mr Franklin YU** commented that the current proposal was not acceptable. He would opt for a design that would swap the sports facilities and the children's playground even if the works would take a longer time to complete.

4.22 **Mr Eric FOK** opined that the football pitch would be welcomed and highly utilised since there was a lack of such facilities in the territory. He considered that the construction works could be carried out in phases so that the children's playground would not be closed before opening of the new one.

4.23 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** expressed support to the comments made by the Chair and other Members in respect of the overall planning of the area.

4.24 **Miss Christine AU** said that the proponent departments would take into account Members' comments to review the reprovisioning project. She considered that the proposed Boardwalk underneath the Island Eastern Corridor project would provide a good opportunity to look into the holistic development of the area.

4.25 **The Chair** concluded that the Task Force had no in-principle objection to the reprovisioning of TCSP to the site concerned to facilitate subsidised housing development. However, Members opined that the design of the reprovisioned TCSP should be considered in conjunction with the adjacent children's playground and the nearby waterfront portion.

4.26 In response, **Mr Michael CHIU** said that EDC had expressed support to the reprovisioning project and the Government would have to consult the district council again on any revised design after taking into account Members' comments.

4.27 **The Chair** asked the proponent departments to take on board Members' comments and report back to the Task Force with a revised design.

**LCSD  
ArchSD**

#### **Item 5 Hong Kong Observation Wheel at the New Central Harboufront (Paper No. TFHK/11/2016)**

5.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives of Executive Counsel Limited and Swiss AEX Holding Limited to the meeting. **Mr PEIRSON-SMITH** briefed Members on the operation of the Hong Kong Observation Wheel (the wheel) with the aid of a PowerPoint.

5.2 In response to the Chair's enquiry, **Mr PEIRSON-SMITH** expressed that efforts and investment were made to operate the wheel in accordance to the Tenancy Agreement. They had not encountered major challenges. The wheel was supported by an experienced maintenance and operation team and enjoyed a good safety record. To further enhance its service, the operator had brought in new food and beverages outlets and committed to working alongside with the District Council and other parties to organise charitable activities. To allow a better experience for the public, 90% of the site area was available for free public

access. Shaded seats and free wifi were also provided at the site.

5.3 **Mr Ivan HO** encouraged the operator to engage the community further in particular to allow more underprivileged to enjoy a free ride on the wheel.

5.4 **Mr Henry CHAN** echoed that the operator might engage the community further by inviting the underprivileged from other districts to enjoy a free ride. He enquired if the operator had encountered any issue when obtaining licence from relevant departments when organising food related events.

5.5 **Mrs Karen BARRETTO** opined that it was not visually appealing to look at the construction areas in Site 3 from the wheel.

5.6 **Mr Franklin YU** considered it helpful if the operator could offer free transfer service for the underprivileged in addition to free rides. He also enquired about the lifespan of the wheel and the requirements if the wheel would become a permanent feature.

5.7 **Mr PEIRSON-SMITH** made the following responses-

- (a) the operator engaged the community by working with charity organisations from all over the territory. A staff was designated to handle relevant matters;
- (b) the idea of providing free transfer service for the underprivileged to the site could be further explored;
- (c) licences for food-related events were granted smoothly. The operator maintained close collaboration with relevant departments;
- (d) the wheel was 60m in height and each cabin could carry up to eight persons and provide a 360 degree view of the area including the harbour and the event site. While the harbour was a splendid attraction, it would also be interesting to see the gradual development of the area and different kinds of events;
- (e) the lifespan of the current wheel was at least 30 years. Since the operator had constructed a solid foundation for the wheel, the wheel could stand at its current location for the next 30 years with suitable maintenance; and



- (f) it was the operator's vision that the wheel could become a permanent landmark and icon on the harbourfront.

5.8 **Miss Christine AU** commented that DEVB had been working with departments in implementing various temporary uses with a view to bring vibrancy to the harbourfront. The new Central harbourfront was enlivened with the co-existence of passive open space, pet garden, event space and the wheel and many people were attracted to visit the harbourfront and take part in the many different activities. She concurred that the wheel played a significant role in becoming an icon on the coastline of the northern Hong Kong Island. The presentation made by the operator would be helpful for the Government and the Task Force to consider the future use of the site concerned, which would be further discussed under item 6.

5.9 **The Chair** thanked the operator for the presentation and appreciated the efforts made in making the site a vibrant destination for both local residents and tourists.

#### **Item 6 Temporary Use at the Observation Wheel Site (Paper No. TFHK/12/2016)**

6.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives of DEVB to the meeting. **Miss Christine AU** presented the proposed temporary use of observation wheel at a reduced site for another three years from mid-2017 to mid-2020 with the aid of a PowerPoint.

6.2 **The Chair** enquired whether the existing tenant would be allowed to sell the wheel to a new tenant if they were unsuccessful in winning the open tender exercise.

6.3 In response, **Miss Christine AU** said that the Government was aware of the possible shift of ownership of the wheel. There were two foreseeable scenarios – i) the incumbent and future tenants could form an agreement to transfer the ownership of the existing wheel to continue its operation. ii) the incumbent tenant to demolish the existing wheel, after which the new tenant will construct a new one.

6.4 **The Chair** was concerned that the second scenario would result in disruption of service to the public.

6.5 **Miss Christine AU** responded that while noting the possibility

of service disruption for around a year or more, it would be desirable to implement the proposed temporary use by letting out the site through an open tender exercise to ensure fair and transparency and to protect public interest.

6.6 **Mr Franklin YU** enquired if there was a clause in the current short-term tenancy (STT) for the tenant to demolish the existing wheel upon termination of contract. He considered that the incumbent tenant, if unsuccessful in winning the new open tender exercise, should contribute the demolition fee to the Government for subsidising the new tenant in carrying out the related demolition and construction works. If the incumbent tenant was awarded of the new tenancy, they should not be entitled to collect the subsidy.

6.7 **Miss Christine AU** responded that there was a clause in the current tenancy agreement to require the tenant to demolish the wheel after termination of the tenancy agreement.

6.8 **The Chair** suggested DEVB to liaise with the incumbent tenant to sort out whether the existing wheel could be sold to the new tenant. If necessary, a relevant clause should be included as one of the conditions of the new tenancy.

6.9 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** opined that there might be limited commercial interest from new bidders. Therefore, there might be ground to consider renewing the tenancy with the incumbent tenant.

6.10 **Mr Henry CHAN** commented that the incumbent tenant might have a partnership with InvestHK and suggested the new tenant, if any, should also maintain the same partnership.

6.11 **Mr Ivan HO** said that DEVB should take into account the underground foundation structure already built within the site when drawing up the tender specifications. He considered that a buffer area between Site 3 and the reduced site for operating the wheel would be required to facilitate future development of Site 3.

6.12 **Mr David PONG** expressed that the incumbent tenant would enjoy an overwhelming advantage over other bidders. Extension of the existing tenancy might give the Government a better position to negotiate with the incumbent tenant on financial terms.

6.13 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** expressed concern over the possibility of disrupting the current service to the public if the existing

wheel and foundation structure had to be demolished and rebuilt under the open tender approach.

6.14 **Mr Thomas CHAN** made the following responses-

- (a) the current STT had already been extended for one year until June 2017 under the support of the Task Force. It would be highly unprecedented for the Government to let out a site for commercial operation for another three years without going through an open tender process;
- (b) in view of the changes in the site condition especially with the part belonging to Site 3 to be carved out, there would be adjustments to tenancy requirements. Since the current tenancy conditions could not be enforced as they were now, a new tenancy agreement would have to be signed from the legal point of view; and
- (c) the Government would adopt a two-envelope tender approach to evaluate tenders from both technical and financial aspects. The Government was aware that the incumbent tenant would have an advantage, while the chance of having other bidders who were willing to make significant investment could not be completely excluded. Under an open tender exercise, the Government could ensure the new tenancy for the next three years would be awarded fairly and transparently.

6.15 **Mr Franklin YU** commented that Site 3 was originally designed for low rise building structures and a landscaped deck to facilitate connectivity between the hinterland and the waterfront. With the existing wheel becoming a landmark adjacent to Site 3, the future development in Site 3 might need to be adjusted and the developer might need to work with the wheel operator to consider a coordinated site design.

6.16 **The Chair** suggested the Government to handle the proposed open tender exercise with caution having regard to the possibility of service disruption.

6.17 **Miss Christine AU** responded that DEVB would take Members' views into account when preparing tender documents to facilitate transitional arrangement, if deemed necessary.

6.18 **The Chair** enquired if the condition of the vacant sites in Site 3 could be enhanced in the interim.

6.19 **Miss Christine AU** responded that DEVB had been working with relevant departments to keep the vacant sites in Site 3 tidy in the interim and would further explore enhancement options.

**Item 7 Any Other Business**

7.1 There being no other business, the meeting ended at 6:10 pm.

**Secretariat**

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