

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

**Minutes of Twenty-fourth Meeting**

Date : 19 October 2016  
Time : 2:30 p.m.  
Venue : Conference Room , 15/F, North Point Government Offices,  
333 Java Road, Hong Kong

**Present**

Mr Nicholas BROOKE	Chair, Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island
Mrs Margaret BROOKE	Representing Business Environment Council
Mr LEUNG Kong-yui	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Mr SO Kwok-yin	Representing the Conservancy Association
Mr Anthony CHEUNG	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Dr Peter Cookson SMITH	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Sr Lesly LAM	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 Paul ZIMMERMAN	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Ms Jacqueline CHUNG	
Mr Stanley HO	
Mr Thomas CHAN	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Edward LEUNG	Senior Manager (Tourism) 2, Tourism Commission (TC)
Mr CHAN Chung-yuen	Chief Traffic Engineer/ Hong Kong, Transport Department (TD)
Mr MAK Chi-biu	Chief Engineer/ (Hong Kong 1), Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Mr Richard WONG	Assistant Director (Leisure Services)2, Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Mr Louis KAU	District Planning Officer/ Hong Kong, Planning Department (PlanD)
Mr Larry CHU	Secretary

**In Attendance**

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

Ms Jenny WONG	Assistant Secretary (Harbour) Special Duties, DEVB
Miss Emily SOM	Assistant Secretary (Harbour) 2, DEVB
Mr Peter MOK	Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB
Mr LAM Chun-tak	Senior Engineer 2 (Hong Kong Island Division 1), CEDD

**Absent with Apologies**

Mrs Karen BARRETTO	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Evans IU	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Mr Shuki LEUNG	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Walter CHAN	
Mr Hans Joachim ISLER	
Ms Vivian LEE	
Mr Vincent NG	
Mr NGAN Man-yu	
Mr Henry CHAN	
Ms Rosanna CHOI	
Mr David PONG	
Mr YEUNG Hoi-wing	
Mr Alvin YIP	

**For Agenda Item 2**

Mr Samuel LAI	Acting District Officer (Eastern), Home Affairs Department (HAD)
Mr Kenneth LEUNG	Executive Officer (District Management), HAD
Mr CHAN Kin-fung	Senior Engineer (Eastern & General), TD
Mr KUK Wai-kei	District Traffic Team (Eastern District), Hong Kong Police Force

**For Agenda Item 3**

Ms April KUN	Chief Town Planner/ Studies and Research, PlanD
Mr Patrick FUNG	Senior Town Planner/ Studies and Research 5, PlanD
Ms Wendy LEE	Town Planner/ Studies and Research 3, PlanD
Miss Vidyan NG	Town Planner Graduate/ Studies and Research 2, PlanD
Dr Eunice MAK	Director of Urban Planning, AECOM
Mr Kenny CHAN	Associate, Planning, AECOM
Dr Winnie LAW	Assistant Director, Kadoorie Institute, The University of Hong Kong

**For Agenda Item 4**

Miss Christine AU	Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Peter MOK	Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB
Ms Phoebe CHAN	Chief Town Planner/ Housing & Office Land Supply (HOLS), PlanD
Mr Timothy LUI	Former Senior Town Planner/ HOLS 4, PlanD
Ms Yvonne LEONG	Senior Town Planner/ HOLS 4, PlanD
Mr LI Wai-kit	Planning Assistant/ HOLS 2, PlanD

**For Agenda Item 5**

Mr MAK Chi-biu	Chief Engineer/ Hong Kong (1), CEDD
Mr LAM Chun-tak	Senior Engineer 2 (HK Island Division 1), CEDD
Ms Cathy LAM	Engineer 23 (HK Island Division 1), CEDD
Mr Charles LUK	Executive Director, AECOM
Mr Jimmy LAU	Technical Director, AECOM
Ms Betty HO	Director, Planarch
Mr Karr YIP	Founder & Creative Director, ADO
Ms Vicky LEE	Architectural Designer, ADO

**For Agenda Item 6**

Mr Richard WONG	Assistant Director (Leisure Services)2, LCSD
Mr David CHAIONG	Chief Leisure Manager (Hong Kong West), LCSD
Ms Sylvia LIM	District Leisure Manager (Central and Western), LCSD
Mr Kent CHOI	Deputy District Leisure Manager (Central and Western)2, LCSD

**For Agenda Item 7(a)**

Mr Ben MOK	Protect Cadogan Park Alliance
Ms Cherry WONG	Protect Cadogan Park Alliance
Mr David FU	Protect Cadogan Park Alliance
Ms Cynthia LAU	Protect Cadogan Park Alliance
Ms WU Sai-mui	Protect Cadogan Park Alliance
Mr WONG Kai-chiu	Protect Cadogan Park Alliance
Prof CHIU Siu-wai	Protect Cadogan Park Alliance

**For Agenda Item 7(b)**

Ms Emily MO	Assistant Commissioner for Tourism 2, TC
-------------	--

**For Agenda Item 7(c)**

Ms Maggie MAK	Senior Engineer/Central and Western, TD
---------------	---

**Action**

**Welcoming Message**

**The Chair** welcomed all to the meeting. He introduced Mr Anthony CHEUNG, alternative representative of the Hong

Kong Institute of Architects; and Mr Louis KAU, District Planning Officer/ Hong Kong, who has taken over the post from Ms Ginger KIANG, for attending the Task Force meeting for the first time.

He also informed Members that Mr Edward LEUNG, Senior Manager of TC, attended the meeting on behalf of Ms Emily MO.

## **Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 23<sup>rd</sup> Meeting**

- 1.1 **The Chair** said the draft minutes of the last meeting were circulated to Members on 12 September 2016. The revised draft minutes with Members' comments incorporated were circulated again on 20 September 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 (Paper No. TFHK/13/2016) (paragraph 2.2 of the minutes of the 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting)*

- 2.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives of the Eastern District Office (EDO), Hong Kong Police Force and TD to the meeting. **Mr Samuel LAI** briefed Members on the findings of their review on effectiveness of the interim measure of using vacant Government land at Hoi Yu Street, Quarry Bay as a laagering point of coaches and the recommended way forward.

**The Chair** enquired about information on the provision of coach parking spaces at the ex-North Point Estate site and asked whether the current Hoi Yu Street site would be released for waterfront development when the coach parking spaces at the ex-North Point Estate were available.

- 2.2 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** requested more details on the utilisation rate of the parking spaces as indicated in the paper and the survey conducted by TD, which suggested that coaches would move to the Hoi Yu Street site, after dropping off passengers.

**TD**

- 2.3 **Mr Samuel LAI** reiterated that the current temporary measure

at Hoi Yu Street would cease when coach parking spaces at the ex-North Point Estate site became available.

2.4 **Mr CHAN Kin-fung** made the following responses-

- (a) according to the developer of the ex-North Point Estate site, coach parking spaces would become available by the end of 2017. TD would keep liaising with the developer on the schedule;
- (b) TD had conducted a survey at the Hoi Yu Street site during peak hours from 5:30 pm to 7:30 pm on weekdays between April and July 2016. It was found that around 20 to 30 coaches on average would park at the site concerned, resulting in an average usage rate of 60%. It was also observed in September 2016 that the traffic along Java Road had remained smooth as some coaches had moved to the Hoi Yu Street site after dropping off passengers; and
- (c) after the coach parking spaces at the ex-North Point Estate site were available, TD would release the Hoi Yu Street site to the Lands Department (LandsD) for other uses.

2.5 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** requested TD to provide further details on the surveys conducted. He opined that TD could work with the developer to open the coach parking spaces early, even before the completion of the whole redevelopment project. It could facilitate the release of the Hoi Yu Street site for waterfront development. He also considered that improvement in traffic condition along Java Road should also be attributed to the active enforcement conducted by the police.

2.6 **Mr Stanley HO** supported the extension of the temporary measure, which had helped alleviate traffic congestion at Java Road.

2.7 **The Chair** thanked departments for updating Members and concluded that the Task Force had no objection to extend the current temporary measure until end 2017 when the coach parking spaces at the ex-North Point Estate site were available to the public.

*[Post-meeting note: The survey information requested by Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN was circulated to Members on 5 January 2017.]*

B. Proposed North Island Line (paragraph 2.22 of the minutes of the 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting)

2.8 **The Chair** informed Members that in response to Members' enquiry on the proposed North Island Line, the Transport and Housing Bureau (THB) and the Highways Department (HyD) had provided a response which had been included in the minutes of the last meeting as a post-meeting note.

2.9 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that the post-meeting note did not give an answer as to which areas of the new Central harbourfront would have to be opened up for infrastructure works in the future.

THB/HyD

*[Post-meeting note: THB and HyD replied that as the project has yet to proceed to detailed design stage, detailed information on the alignment and works areas would not be available at this stage.]*

C. Reprovisioning of Tin Chiu Street Playground (paragraph 4.27 of the minutes of the 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting)

2.10 **The Chair** informed Members that LCSD was working with relevant departments on refining the design of the Tin Chiu Street Playground taking into account Members' comments.

LCSD

*[Post-meeting note: A refined design was circulated to Members on 4 November 2016 and there was no further comment on the design.]*

D. Reassembly of Queen's Pier (paragraph 2.4 of the minutes of the 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting)

2.11 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired about the progress of the reassembly of Queen's Pier.

2.12 **Miss Christine AU** responded that upon completion of the Community Engagement exercise in May 2016, the Government was carefully analysing all the views collected and would report back to the Task Force at an appropriate juncture.

**Item 3 Urban Design Study for the Wan Chai North and North Point Harbourfront Areas - Study Progress: Stage 2 Public Engagement (Paper No. TFHK/14/2016)**

- 3.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives of the study team to the meeting.
- 3.2 **Ms April KUN** informed Members that Stage 2 Public Engagement (PE2) for the Urban Design Study for the Wan Chai North and North Point Harbourfront Areas (UDS) was concluded on 20 August 2016. In general, comments received were supportive and encouraging. The study team was compiling the PE2 Report and refining the harbourfront enhancement proposals (HEPs).
- 3.3 With the aid of a PowerPoint, **Dr Winnie LAW** briefed Members on the public comments and **Mr Kenny CHAN** highlighted the following five main directions in refining the HEPs-
- (a) to reduce the cycle track sections where cyclists were required to dismount;
  - (b) to extend the scale of the proposed boardwalk along the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter;
  - (c) to provide more greenery, tree planting and shading facilities;
  - (d) to provide more marine supporting facilities including bollards and wave attenuation measures; and
  - (e) to provide an additional pet playground within the Pierside Precinct.
- 3.4 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** raised the following-
- (a) the overall design should allow flexible uses;
  - (b) pedestrian connectivity between the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre (HKCEC) and the New Wan Chai Ferry Pier should be further enhanced;
  - (c) shared use between pedestrians and cyclists could be achieved by adopting a sensible cycle track design and the study team should also review the provision of cycling related facilities;
  - (d) bollards should be provided not only at the landing steps

but along the entire stretch of waterfront and vessels should be permitted to berth;

- (e) alfresco dining facilities could be provided outside the HKCEC;
- (f) supporting facilities for vessels to dispose sewage and waste and refill fuel would be provided within the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter; and
- (g) all metered car parking spaces along Hung Hing Road should be cancelled.

3.5 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** expressed that walkways connecting the hinterland to the waterfront should be widened and beautified. In the Celebration Precinct, the existing park adjacent to Grand Hyatt Hong Kong could be extended to the waterfront with a landscaped deck like Tamar Park. In the Revitalized Typhoon Shelter Precinct, a pedestrian connection from Causeway Bay hinterland with food and beverages services alongside could be considered. In the Pierside Precinct, the elevated landscaped deck and covered walkway should be integrated into the design. He opined that some distinctive elements could be added to the pedestrian connections instead of the mere provision of standard footbridges. He added that a parking area should be provided in the East Coast Park Precinct and some community facilities such as a town hall could be considered to complement with the park. He opined that the existing vehicle depot of the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department in North Point should be relocated.

3.6 **Mr Ivan HO** said that the study team could screen out some infeasible suggestions and comments that were not conducive to public use such as the proposed segregation between cyclists and other users. He concurred with Mr Anthony CHEUNG that accessibility and connectivity between the hinterland and the waterfront should be further enhanced and standard footbridges were undesirable. He considered that a schematic design for the precincts with concrete design concepts would be needed.

3.7 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** said that if shared use of the promenade between pedestrians and cyclists would be proposed, a management mechanism for ensuring public safety or avoiding potential conflicts should be developed. Pet garden of some considerable size might be provided in other suitable



places instead of the waterfront. More interesting maritime elements should be provided in the Water Sports and Recreation Precinct such as a new Maritime Museum.

3.8 **Mr Kenny CHAN** made the following responses-

- (a) the study team would further look into enhancing flexibility in allowing different activities and providing facilities for shared uses;
- (b) other suitable points to provide bollards would be explored;
- (c) it was a shared view that pedestrian connections between the hinterland and the waterfront should not be merely functional. In the HEPs, all the proposed landscaped decks were designed serving more than footbridges. For example, the proposed landscaped deck near the Sunset Plaza were designed as an Art Walk/ Corridor;
- (d) some members of the public did raise concerns about safety and the potential conflict between cyclists and pedestrians and their views would have to be taken into account when refining the design;
- (e) having regard to the public comments, an additional pet garden was being considered to be included as part of HEPs; and
- (f) two proposed locations adjacent to the Harbour Education Annex and Watson Road were being considered to provide some parking spaces.

3.9 **The Chair** asked the study team to incorporate comments from Members and the public when refining the HEPs and present the refined proposals to the Working Group when ready. He further asked if the study team had consulted the relevant District Councils.

3.10 **Mr Kenny CHAN** informed Members the Eastern and Wan Chai District Councils were consulted on 27 June 2016 and 12 July 2016 during Stage 2 PE.

**Item 4 Draft Planning Brief for the “Comprehensive Development Area” Zone at Site 3 of the New Central Harbourfront (Paper No. TFHK/15/2016)**

- 4.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives of DEVB and PlanD to the meeting. **Miss Christine AU** briefed Members on the background of the future development of Site 3 of the new Central Harbourfront (Site 3) and **Mr Timothy LUI** presented details of the draft Planning Brief (PB) with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 4.2 **The Chair** enquired about the design of the open space under the landscaped deck. He opined that as pedestrians would stay underneath the deck for some time, such space should also be well designed. He further enquired about the approach of resolving the potential disruptions to pedestrians in gaining access to the ferry piers during the construction stage as construction of infrastructure works in Wan Chai had brought significant inconveniences to users of ferry services.
- 4.3 **Mr Ken SO** raised whether it was feasible to retain the General Post Office (GPO) for other purposes. It would be attractive to put the building than other buildings with a modern design by the waterfront. He thought that retaining the GPO might not cause much disruption to the underground works as the proposed use for the open space was mainly passive. Separately, he opined that the public open space should be designed for diversified activities to make the harbourfront more vibrant.
- 4.4 **Mr Ivan HO** made the comments/ enquiries below-
- (a) according to some preliminary consultation with the Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design (HKIUD) and the Hong Kong Institute of Architects (HKIA), the Government should consider allowing the future developer to decide whether to demolish GPO, retain part of it or integrate it with their design. Having regard to the continual technological advancement, there might not be much need for paper communications, which was the main business of GPO. The Government might wish to reassess if it would be justifiable to allocate such a large amount of GFA in a prime location for postal service;
  - (b) whether the 325 parking spaces had incorporated the existing provision or only additional parking space;

- (c) the subject area was the only location in Central which allowed casual on-street parking for short-term parking, dropping off or picking up people near City Hall. He requested such facilities to be re-provided in the future development for the general public in particular those who would be participating in events in the City Hall;
- (d) the elevated pedestrian system in Central was a comprehensive pedestrian network. The Government should ensure the future development to further enhance it to allow better connectivity and accessibility to the waterfront;
- (e) due to the statutory height restriction, the floor-to-floor height proposed in the notional scheme (i.e. 4.15m for office use) was below the normal standard for grade A office use. The current provision might not be economically viable;
- (f) the proposed five-storey underground structure would require deep excavation which would be costly and environmentally unfriendly. He enquired if the underground space could be converted to another form of public space easily connected to the ground level rather than to be used for retail;
- (g) the impact of the phased development approach which would affect the design of the development should be further examined;
- (h) while noting that it was one of the recommendations of the Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (UDS) completed in 2011, the reconstruction of the Star Ferry Clock Tower (SFCT) was not supported by HKIUD and HKIA because the entire old Star Ferry Pier had already been demolished; and
- (i) bicycle parking should be provided within the site.

4.5 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** made the following comments/enquiries-

- (a) the amount of commercial GFA might be excessive and half of them would be used for retail purpose, which might not mirror latest market demand;

- (b) whether the PB would encourage interaction and interface between different office floors and cater for the use of specific sectors such as the creative industry. He thought cafes, shops and related uses at the ground level would be essential. While agreeing to the reduced building height, he regarded it a pity to put three levels of retail space underground instead of creating interesting and interactive amenities at the ground level;
- (c) whether it would be technically feasible for cars to have access to the bottom floors of underground car park from the ground level;
- (d) whether the 325 car parking spaces had already included the 150 spaces to be reprovisioned from the Star Ferry Car Park; and
- (e) there might not be a need to reconstruct SFCT. SFCT was not a single building but belonged to the building complex of the old Star Ferry Pier. It would not have the same degree of prominence as the Tsim Sha Tsui Clock Tower.

4.6 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** opined that the UDS had undergone a comprehensive public consultation process and it would be important to respect the conclusion reached by then unless there were substantial changes in circumstances. While he had no special feeling about SFCT, the recommendation of the UDS to reconstruct SFCT should be adhered to. Development of the site should not be delayed and left idle because of arguments about the reconstruction of SFCT. While the Government should ensure the future developer would maintain pedestrian connectivity from Statue Square to Central Piers, the quality and experience of the pedestrian's journey should also be emphasized. The temporary passageway from the United Centre to CITIC Tower was unpleasant. Connection with the footbridge system in Central would also be important.

4.7 From the harbourfront planning perspective, **Ir Raymond CHAN** welcomed the low building height profile that was adopted. He supported to make full use of the underground space so as to make best use of the site. The high construction cost would only be one-off. Besides, he considered that the future developer should be required to connect the underground levels among the three land parcels.

- 4.8 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** said that a sheltered walkway from Statue Square to the Central Piers was needed having regard to its considerable walking distance. A multiple-level deck with one level to provide a covered walkway and another to provide alfresco dining with some quality public open space should be encouraged. He added that construction period for underground levels could be long. Three levels of underground retail space with a small floor area in each land parcel might not be commercially viable. Constructing underground connection between land parcels would also be challenging due to infrastructure reserves in between. Increasing the above-ground GFA by relaxing the building height restriction could allow one level of covered deck for retail use. He agreed with Mr Ivan HO that on-street parking should be provided near the existing Star Ferry Car Park.
- 4.9 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** made the comments below-
- (a) the works for NIL underneath Lung Wo Road should be implemented along with the development of the site;
  - (b) the UDS did not focus on whether to retain GPO. Members of the public were now aware that the GPO building was an interesting piece of architecture, at least to a certain extent. Preservation of the building, or at least part of it or its façade, should not be too difficult for incorporation into the future development;
  - (c) the design for connecting different elevated levels of the development and the at-grade waterfront should be innovative instead of just having large staircases which are uncomfortable to use during hot and rainy days.
  - (d) a choice of connectivity should be proposed to integrate the hinterland to the waterfront, including a “pedestrian highway” connecting the Central Terminal Building and alternative routes via the various deck levels;
  - (e) there should be well-planned and diversified land uses at the ground level and underneath the deck to avoid repeating the mistake at the Exchange Square. We need to minimize sterilizing the frontages of the development with transport and services facilities ;
  - (f) since postal service in particular parcel/packet service was

still actively used by the public, the reprovisioned postal facilities should connect with both the ground and the deck level so that public accessibility could be easy. Meanwhile, other retail space could be put underground;

- (g) given its strategy to reduce traffic congestion especially south of Connaught and Gloucester Road corridor, TD should provide a plan showing parking and drop-off facilities in Central north of the corridor, and how goods and people could move around. A Park'n Walk strategy was needed to reduce traffic circulating for picking up or dropping off passengers, or loading/ unloading goods in congested areas. Currently the Star Ferry Car Park, the underpass and the General Post Office escalators offered this function. There was no comprehensive proposal in the draft PB on the role of the development for parking and holding vehicles in the larger Central area;
- (h) the pedestrian passageway from Jardine House to Central Piers should be a straight line with minimal obstacles and detours, and with a clear view of the existing road. This pedestrian highway should be supported with travellers.
- (i) TD should re-consider the location of some of the crossings along Yiu Sing Street and Lung Wo Road;
- (j) the future developer should maximize the amount of sunlight reaching the underground levels;
- (k) in-situ reconstruction of SFCT was supported; and
- (l) a design competition for potential developers to submit design proposals for the community to voice their preference should be held. The Government should take into account public preference of the design proposals in awarding the tender.

4.10 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** expressed that the orientation and design of the future development of the site were important and would deserve prudent handling. The attractive façade of the GPO building facing the waterfront could be retained as part of the future development. She added that the 6m wide pedestrian walkway proposed for the continuous landscaped deck spanning above Lung Wo Road and Yiu Sing Street might not be sufficient.

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

*Pedestrian Connectivity*

- (a) under the notional architectural scheme of Site 3, there would be three levels of pedestrian connections to the waterfront. At the underground level, the current subway between Statue Square and the Central Piers would be retained; the future developer would also be required to build a new underground pedestrian connection to connect the site to the MTR Central Station. Within the site, pedestrians could gain access to the Central Piers at either the street level or the elevated level through the landscaped deck;
- (b) as stated in the draft PB, there would be unobstructed barrier free pedestrian accesses with a minimum width of 6m to connect Statue Square to the existing elevated walkway from IFCII and Jardine House to facilitate pedestrian access from the hinterland to the waterfront at the south-north direction. Greening and seating would be provided along these routes and above the landscaped deck;
- (c) to avoid disruptions to the access to the Central Piers during construction stage, temporary pedestrian access including re-provisioning of the existing temporary footbridge with barrier free access would be provided by the developer before the landscaped deck was constructed;
- (d) the developer would also be required to enhance the existing footbridge leading to the Central Terminal Building;

*Parking Provision*

- (e) among the 380 parking spaces in the existing Star Ferry Carpark, 150 would be re-provisioned. The proposed provision of 325 public car parking spaces within the Site had already taken into account the need for re-provisioning of the existing Star Ferry Carpark, and the overall parking demand in the vicinity;
- (f) based on the notional architectural scheme of Site 3 , a total of about 520 ancillary parking spaces to serve office, retail and other uses would be provided in accordance

with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) requirements. Among them, about 350 car parking spaces serving the retail portion could be open for public use;

- (g) the future development at Site 3 was expected to provide a total of about 840 car parking spaces, and about 670 of them would be open for public use. A few entrances to the underground car park would be provided;

Pick-up and Drop-off Facilities/Lay-bys

- (h) the future developer was required to relocate the existing transport facilities at Man Kwong Street to the ground floor level to the north of Yiu Sing Street, and provide loading and unloading facilities and lay-bys within the site;

Vibrancy of Open Space

- (i) the public open space would be designed to allow for provision of a diversity of activities at the waterfront. Food kiosks, open air cafes and shops providing different kinds of commodities were encouraged to be incorporated into the design. Retail shops would be located at the ground level and floors above Lung Wo Road and Yiu Sing Street for pedestrians to shop conveniently;

GPO

- (j) the design concepts of Site 3 including demolition of the GPO building to make way for development were included in the UDS which had undergone a comprehensive public engagement process. Retaining the GPO building within Site 3 would render the design concept of having a continuous landscaped deck linking the hinterland to the waterfront impracticable;
- (k) the Government started planning the relocation of the GPO building as early as in 1985 after the expiry of a lease condition that restricted the building height of the GPO site. The Audit Commission urged the Government to speed up the redevelopment of the GPO site in its reports in 1998 and 2015; and

Reassembly of SFCT



- (l) reconstruction of the old SFCT at its original location after the railway works were completed was in line with the recommendation of the UDS.

- 4.12 **Ms Phoebe CHAN** supplemented that to ensure a quality pedestrian route and landscape area for public enjoyment, the future developer would be required to provide a comprehensive pedestrian network plan and landscape design in accordance with the requirements of the PB. They would be encouraged to improve the streetscape and amenity with provision of high quality paving, street furniture, lighting, tree planting and greening.
- 4.13 **Miss Christine AU** added that the proposed notional architectural design was only indicative and the future developer would need to submit a Master Layout Plan (MLP) demonstrating that the planning and design requirements of the PB were complied with for the approval of the Town Planning Board. The Task Force would be consulted again during the MLP submission stage.
- 4.14 **Mr Thomas CHAN** thanked Chair and Members for their valuable comments which would be useful for the development of this key site on the new Central harbourfront. The Government had reviewed various aspects when preparing the draft PB and would further examine Members' comments. He remarked that as the Government had already committed consultation schedules with the relevant District Council and would proceed with scheduled consultations and further discuss the matter with the Task Force. The Government would endeavour to require the future developer to comply with the harbour planning principles during the MLP submission stage.
- 4.15 **The Chair** said that the Government should proceed with scheduled consultation and arrange a working session with Members. He added that for the future land sale, the Government should require the developer to include their proposed architectural design as part of their tender submission, instead of merely relying on the premium offer when awarding the tender.

*[Post-meeting note: A design workshop was held on 2 November 2016. Members' views were summarised and conveyed to the Town Planning Board on 12 December 2016.]*

**Item 5 Proposed Boardwalk underneath the Island Eastern Corridor – Progress Update (Paper No. TFHK/16/2016)**

- 5.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives of CEDD and the project team to the meeting. **Mr LAM Chun-tak, Mr Jimmy LAU and Mr Karr YIP** updated Members of the progress of the proposed boardwalk underneath the Island Eastern Corridor (IEC) with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 5.2 **The Chair** opined that rather than introducing new elements for public comments during the upcoming Stage 2 Community Engagement (CE2), the project team might rather focus on addressing concerns and questions raised by the public during Stage 1 Community Engagement (CE1).
- 5.3 **Mr Ivan HO** commented that the recommended boardwalk scheme did not fully respond to how to connect the harbour to the people. The architectural design was not satisfactory in particular the decorative lighting was not necessary and the wavy arch structures may not be able to symbolise the Victoria Harbour as it intended to.
- 5.4 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** opined that the project team should propose a simple, interesting and unique design for the boardwalk to suit different types of users. Tree shades and shelters should be provided along the alignment and the wavy architectural structure might not be necessary. He added that cycle track was not required as there were also sufficient facilities for leisure cycling in the New Territories.
- 5.5 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** remarked that she was happy to see the progress and the project team might consider providing a few options on the design for the public to choose during CE2. She urged the Government to construct the boardwalk as early as possible.
- 5.6 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** declared that his company was involved in the hotel development in ex-North Point Estate site and he would refrain from commenting on the part near the site concerned. He echoed that providing a few design options could be better than presenting only one choice to the public. He stated that HKIA considered that the boardwalk should provide both leisure and recreational functions for public enjoyment rather than just a walkway.

- 5.7 **Mr Raymond CHAN** commented that the proposed design did not make full use of the space underneath the IEC. He preferred a simpler design for the boardwalk.
- 5.8 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** made the enquiries/comments below-
- (a) the alignment was different from the one previously presented to the Task Force, and detailed justifications should be provided by the project team for such change;
  - (b) several design options should be provided for the community to choose;
  - (c) the boardwalk would serve different uses such as walking and cycling, sit out areas and fishing platforms, etc. Food and beverage could be provided near the landings of the boardwalk;
  - (d) sufficient shades, greening and fresh water drinking fountains should be provided along the boardwalk;
  - (e) supported the proposed connection with Provident Centre, which could enhance connectivity with the hinterland;
  - (f) lighting features should be simple and subtle;
  - (g) supported the provision of a cycle track which was welcomed by many;
  - (h) disappointed that the shared use with the existing fire pier could not be achieved; and
  - (i) a subtle colouring scheme should be adopted for the overall design.
- 5.9 In response to Members' comments, **Miss Christine AU** said that CE1 had demonstrated an overwhelming positive public support on the proposed boardwalk. The views collected would form a basis for the boardwalk to provide facilities for different uses. After taking on board comments received, the study team had proposed a 10m width for the boardwalk with various activity nodes such as viewing platform, fishing platform, food and beverage kiosks and cycle track etc. so that the boardwalk could be used by the public for different activities. The proposed boardwalk scheme would be presented

to the public for comments during CE2 but the project team would further review the design and materials to seek public comments.

- 5.10 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** opined that the extended width and provision of activity nodes would not help establish the overriding public need as required under the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance. He did not see the need to further widening the boardwalk towards the harbour.
- 5.11 **The Chair** enquired if the widening of the boardwalk was proposed in response to community request, and whether there was any adjustment to the alignment after previous presentation to the Task Force.
- 5.12 **Mr MAK Chi-biu** made the following responses-
- (a) Based on the findings from Stage 1 Community Engagement (CE) for the Boardwalk, it could be concluded that the public generally agreed that there was a compelling and present need for the boardwalk in order to open up the North Point harbourfront to the public and to provide a continuous connection along the Island East harbourfront. In the process, the public also demanded for a wider boardwalk in order to fulfil their need to maximise the use of the boardwalk and ensure proper and conflict-free enjoyment of the harbour by all user groups including both pedestrians and cyclists. On the basis of the findings of the Stage 1 CE, we have put forward the recommended 10m wide Boardwalk scheme in Stage 2 CE for further public consultation;
  - (b) except for the width, the proposed alignment and level of the Boardwalk in the revised scheme were the same as the original scheme presented to and agreed by the Task Force in Stage 1 CE;
  - (c) on the current scheme, the consultant had carried out extensive structural analysis and taken into consideration a number of factors to ensure that it would require minimum reclamation for the proposed uses. While the architectural design was only indicative and could be further refined, some structural requirements would have to be met. The extra width for the boardwalk would also facilitate provision of activity nodes;
  - (d) the suggestions on providing shading and fresh water

supply would be taken on board;

- (e) the project team would develop an appropriate colour scheme for the boardwalk at a later stage;
- (f) the scheme with some illustration on its architectural design might be presented to the public during CE2 so as to allow the public to visualise the future appearance of the boardwalk; and
- (g) the project team would take note of Members' comments and further examine if several design options could be presented in CE2.

5.13 **The Chair** remarked that if only one architectural design was presented in CE2, even if it was only indicative, the public might misunderstand that the scheme was the only option.

5.14 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** opined that the community should be invited to choose from some design options during CE2, so that the project team could then commence construction as soon as possible.

5.15 **Mr Ivan HO** considered that the current design of the boardwalk had not used the road structures of IEC to provide shades for users of the boardwalk. He doubted the need to adopt a universal width of 10m along the entire boardwalk. HKIA was of the view that the boardwalk should create a sense of place with multiple uses and an interesting design. The current scheme might not be able to fulfil such requirements.

CEDD

5.16 **Mr MAK Chi-biu** responded that in order to fulfil the public need in maximising the use of the boardwalk and to ensure proper and conflict-free enjoyment of the harbour by all user groups including both pedestrians and cyclists, there needs to be a wider boardwalk. The project team had also recommended four activities nodes along the boardwalk to provide different uses, and some historic characteristics were being considered to be incorporated into the future architectural design. In response to **the Chair's** enquiry about the timetable for CE2, he informed Members that CE2 would be conducted for two months from late November 2016 to late January 2017.

5.17 **Miss Christine AU** added that clear views were gathered from the public during CE1 that the boardwalk should not only be constructed for providing waterfront connection but providing

a place with diversified activities for public enjoyment. In order to satisfy these identified public needs, the minimum width of the boardwalk would have to be 10m.

- 5.18 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** reiterated that it might be better to provide several design options for the community to choose during CE2.
- 5.19 **The Chair** asked the project team to take on board comments from Members when conducting CE2.

*[Post-meeting note: CE2 commenced on 29 November 2016 and would conclude in January 2017.]*

**Item 6 Enhancement Works of Leisure Angling Ancillary Facilities in Central and Western District Promenade (Central Section), Admiralty, Hong Kong (Paper No. TFHK/17/2016)**

- 6.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives of LCSD to the meeting. **Mr David CHAIONG** briefed Members on the enhancement the Central and Western District Promenade (Central Section) by adding ancillary angling facilities with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 6.2 **Mr Richard WONG** supplemented the followings-
- (a) relevant departments had worked out a simple and basic design for the ancillary facilities;
  - (b) the proposed enhancement could allow members of the public to better enjoy leisure angling activities along the promenade;
  - (c) display panels would be erected to provide information and educate the public on the right attitude, proper handling practices and safety rules for angling; and
  - (d) venue staff had been collecting views from anglers in different LCSD venues from time to time. A survey would be conducted on the proposed facilities during the trial period.
- 6.3 **Mr Ivan HO** enquired about the reasons for the reduction of the estimated construction cost of the project from \$3.5M to \$2M. In addition, he requested LCSD to report on the outcome of the trial to the Task Force in a year's time.

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

- (a) the proposed fishing rod holders could be added at all areas along the waterfront where people fish;
- (b) provision of working tables would bring nuisance and hygiene problems to the detriment of other users of the promenade. Anglers should continue to bring their own boxes and equipment which was more hygienic and would reduce the need for cleansing by relevant departments;
- (c) provision of more seating and shades along the waterfront for all users should be encouraged, not just anglers. If arbours and benches were to facilitate anglers, they should be provided right at the waterfront;
- (d) water fountains to facilitate water bottle refilling and wash basins were required along the whole stretch of the waterfront promenade for all users, rather than at designated zones only;
- (e) the glare of lighting was detrimental to the enjoyment of the waterfront. LCSD should ensure that lighting was minimized and indirect, and at the back of the promenade;
- (f) life buoys should be provided for all users, along all stretches of promenades along the Victoria Harbour waterfront; and
- (g) storage racks would give rise to security and management issues and hence not preferable. Anglers were self-sufficient and could keep their container or bag with equipment, supplies and fish near the location they fish.

6.5 **Mr Ken SO** commented that LCSD might need to review the design of existing railing to facilitate anglers using different types of fishing tools including rods, wires and nets. LCSD might consider collaborating with fishing associations on promoting fishing activity.

6.6 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** supported the trial and the enhancement works should commence as early as possible. Public views

should be collected during the trial period.

LCSD

- 6.7 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** considered putting arbours and benches at the hinterland side (instead of at the waterfront) undesirable. He also commented that rod holders might not be helpful as most anglers would use wire. On the other hand, he agreed that LCSD might commence the trial and refine the design after collecting public views.
- 6.8 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** opined that existing rubbish bins should be moved closer to the working table and wash basin if they were to be provided for anglers.
- 6.9 **Mr Richard WONG** made the following responses-
- (a) after consulting various stakeholders, LCSD had revised the proposal by adopting a simpler and functional design, resulting in the reduction of construction cost from \$3.5M to \$2M;
  - (b) as advised by angling associations, arbours and benches were designed for anglers to take rest having taken into consideration the needs of other users of the promenade;
  - (c) there were life buoys placed along the entire waterfront promenade and additional buoys would be provided at the location concerned;
  - (d) working staff would be deployed to ensure anglers not affecting other users of the promenade and they could also provide advice or assistance to anglers when required; and
  - (e) LCSD would conduct a survey to gather views of users and relevant stakeholders during the trial period and it would report back to the Task Force in a year's time.
- 6.10 **Ms Sylvia LIM** supplemented that the Hong Kong Sports Fishing Federation had suggested storage racks to be provided for the use of anglers.
- 6.11 **The Chair** concluded that the proposed enhancement works and trial scheme were generally welcomed by the Task Force and asked LCSD to report back in a year's time.
- 6.12 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** remarked that he had some



reservation in supporting the proposal and requested LCSD to take into account his comments when implementing the scheme.

## **Item 7 Any Other Business**

### *A. Presentation from the Protect Cadogan Park Alliance*

- 7.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives from the Protect Cadogan Park Alliance (the Alliance) to the meeting. **Mr Ben MOK** presented the Alliance's views on retaining the Cadogan Street Temporary Garden (the Park) with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 7.2 **Mr Ken SO** requested CEDD to fully justify the need for carrying out decontamination works at the site concerned in the western part of Kennedy Town.
- 7.3 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yiu** commented that the Park was open to the public for 18 years. Even if there were contaminants underneath the Park, they had not posed any threat to the health of people. Besides, the Park could help enhance accessibility to the future waterfront. He said the Government could identify another site for residential development.
- 7.4 **Ir Raymond CHAN** echoed that the Government should identify other suitable sites for residential development and retain the Park. He added that land use planning should be examined holistically.
- 7.5 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** commented that the Park, which could enhance connection between the hinterland and the waterfront, should be kept. The Government could review the land use proposal and identify other means such as increasing building height restriction over the territory to increase housing production.
- 7.6 **Mr Ivan HO** said relevant Government departments should consult the local community again and retain the Park as far as practicable.
- 7.7 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** commented that the Alliance had presented some compelling arguments. According to the Alliance's investigation, the contamination was deep underground and had not affected public health in all these years. Users of the Park, including the elderly and the kids,

were allowed to gain access to the Park for years. He did not see sufficient justification to close the Park for carrying out decontamination works.

7.8 **The Chair** said the Task Force shared the view of the Alliance to retain the Park. The Task Force's view would be conveyed to the TPB as usual.

7.9 **Mr Louis KAU** made the following responses-

(a) the content of the Alliance's presentation, was similar to that of their representation made under the Town Planning Ordinance, which would be considered by the TPB;

(b) a hearing on representations and comments in respect of the amendments to the draft Kennedy Town and Mount Davis Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) would be held in Q1 of 2017 to further listen to oral submissions made by the representers and commenters; and

(c) the amendments to the draft OZP were drawn up taking into account the need for the decontamination works as identified by relevant department and for the public to enjoy larger public open space at the waterfront.

7.10 **Mr Ben MOK** thanked the Task Force for their support for retaining the Park and asked PlanD to review the amendments to the OZP.

B. The FIA Formula E Hong Kong ePrix

7.11 In response to the Chair's invitation, **Ms Emily MO** made a brief report on the FIA Formula E Hong Kong ePrix as follows-

(a) the event was held at the new Central harbourfront on 8 and 9 October 2016 and according to the organiser, there was about 20,000 patrons attended the event in which about 25% were non-local visitors;

(b) the event was broadcasted in over 120 countries and covered by 300 reporters from local and overseas media;

(c) the event was the first international motor sport event held in the urban areas of Hong Kong;

- (d) the event had brought vibrancy to the waterfront and promoted the image of the harbourfront areas locally and globally with photos and videos of the harbour widely circulated on the social media;
- (e) the event attracted many overseas visitors including the race officials, crew of racing teams to have stayed in Hong Kong for weeks;
- (f) the event improved public awareness of using electric vehicles and demonstrated Hong Kong's capability in organising international mega events; and
- (g) while the organiser was keen to organise the event in the city again next year, the Government would meet with the organiser shortly to evaluate this year's experiences.

7.12 **The Chair** opined that despite over 20,000 patrons attended the event, most members of the public could not directly be involved in this event. He added that the success of the event, as well as that of the Central Harbourfront Event Space, had demonstrated the need for a permanent event space at the harbourfront.

TC

7.13 In response, **Ms Emily MO** said that the races were live broadcasted in free TV channel and large TV screens in the carnival area, which was open for the enjoyment of members of the public at a lower cost. On the advice of the Police, the view of the walkway leading to the Central Piers had to be blocked to facilitate crowd control for ensuring public safety, as there is a need to balance between public safety and public enjoyment. The organiser would consider how to provide more public participation opportunity in the future, if the event is to be held again.

7.14 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired about the subsidy the Government had offered for supporting the event including the necessary road works.

7.15 **Ms Emily MO** responded that the cost involved in installation of railings, grandstand construction was borne by the organiser, Formula Electric Racing (Hong Kong) Limited. The Government had contributed about \$20M for road modification works at related government road sections to ensure the safety of both car racers and spectators. This was not a recurrent expenditure and no financial support was

provided by the Government.

- 7.16 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** opined that the Government should spend the equal amount of money on enhancing greening along Lung Wo Road. He added that while the Government was willing to invest resources to assist the race which had only lasted for two days, necessary resources should be invested to improve the landscape and reduce the negative impacts of road infrastructure in harbourfront areas.
- 7.17 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** observed that there was not enough promotion of the event particularly on the related temporary traffic measures. He said the Government should help promote the event to the local community
- 7.18 In response, **Ms Emily MO** said that relevant Government departments and the organiser had conducted a series of publicity on the event and its related traffic arrangement. Members might appreciate that public awareness of new events took time to build up. Relevant government departments and the organiser would take on board comments from Members and make joint efforts to improve the arrangement and promote public enjoyment in the future, if the event is to be held again.
- 7.19 **The Chair** requested and **Ms Emily MO** agreed to share relevant information about the result of the event to Members in due course.

C. *Proposed Short Term Tenancy for Public Fee-paying Carpark Government Land at Eastern Street North, Sai Ying Pun*

- 7.20 **Ms Maggie MAK** briefed Members on the paper on the proposed short-term tenancy (STT) for public fee-paying carpark at Eastern Street North in Sai Ying Pun, which was circulated to Members on 7 September 2016. She would like to bring Member's attention particularly to the local parking demand for goods vehicles and gas cylinder wagons.
- 7.21 **The Chair** said that written response from EMSD on written comments made by Mr Paul Zimmerman on 30 September 2016 and 4 October 2016 respectively was tabled for Members' information. He further enquired about the time table for developing the site concerned into a waterfront promenade.
- 7.22 **Mr Richard WONG** responded that LCSD was working on the scope of the project and would expedite the preparation

process.

- 7.23 **The Chair** enquired about the reason for the current operator to terminate the existing STT contract.
- 7.24 **Mr CHAN Chung-yuen** responded that the current operator had its own business considerations. It might have overestimated the income and would like to terminate the STT due to financial considerations.
- 7.25 **The Chair** said that he was concerned about the public reaction on the increased number of gas cylinder wagons travelling in the area.
- 7.26 **Mr CHAN Chung-yuen** said part of the parking spaces of the STT would be used for serving existing gas cylinder wagons catering for district needs.
- 7.27 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** enquired if the future development of the site would be considered in conjunction with TD's study on commercial vehicle parking demand.
- 7.28 **Mr Ivan HO** objected to the proposal. He said that on-street parking along the Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park was popular due to limited parking space outside the Park. Relevant departments should identify alternative locations, such as sites underneath the flyovers, to address the demand holistically instead of using the precious waterfront site.
- 7.29 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** objected to the proposal and requested a continuous waterfront between the Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park and the Western Wholesale Food Market to be developed as early as possible.
- 7.30 **The Chair** concluded that unless a concrete programme for waterfront promenade development could be provided, the Task Force could not support the proposed STT.

*[Post-meeting note: A written response was issued on 23 November 2016, which was followed by an informal session on 28 November 2016. Relevant departments exchanged further views with Members on the matter and Members then raised no objection to the STT for a year certain and that relevant departments were asked to report back to the Task Force in 12 months' time.]*

- 7.31 There being no other business, the meeting ended at 7:40 pm.

**Secretariat  
Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island  
January 2017**