

Harbourfront Commission
Task Force on Harbourfront Developments
on Hong Kong Island

Minutes of Twenty-fifth Meeting

Date : 12 January 2017
Time : 10:30 a.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
Mrs Karen BARRETTO	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Anthony CHEUNG	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Evans IU Po-lung	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Dr Peter Cookson SMITH	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Sr Emily LI	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr Ivan HO	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Ir Raymond CHAN	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Walter CHAN	
Mr Hans Joachim ISLER	
Mr Vincent NG	
Mr NGAN Man-yu	
Mr YEUNG Hoi-wing	
Mr Alvin YIP	
Miss Christine AU	Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Edward LEUNG	Senior Manager (Tourism) 2, Tourism Commission (TC)
Mr Peter MAK	Chief Traffic Engineer/ Hong Kong, Transport Department (TD)
Mr Alfred WONG	Chief Engineer/ Hong Kong 1, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Mr Michael CHIU	Chief Executive Officer (Planning)1, Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)

Mr Louis KAU District Planning Officer/ Hong Kong, Planning
Department (PlanD)
Mr Larry CHU Secretary

In Attendance

Ms Jenny WONG Assistant Secretary (Harbour) Special Duties,
DEVB

Absent with Apologies

Mr Shuki LEUNG Representing Real Estate Developers Association
of Hong Kong

Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN
Mr Henry CHAN
Ms Jacqueline CHUNG
Ms Rosanna CHOI
Ms Vivian LEE
Mr Stanley HO
Mr David PONG

For Matters Arising

Mr Alfred WONG Chief Engineer/ Hong Kong 1, CEDD
Mr LAM Chun-tak Senior Engineer2 (HK Island Division)1, CEDD

For Agenda Item 3

Miss Christine AU Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
Miss Ida TSE Project Coordinator (Harbour), DEVB

Action

Welcoming Message

The Chair welcomed all to the meeting. He informed Members that Mr Peter MAK had taken over the post of Chief Traffic Engineer/Hong Kong of TD from Mr CHAN Chung-yuen and Mr Alfred WONG had taken over the post of Chief Engineer/Hong Kong 1 of CEDD from Mr MAK Chi-biu. Both attended 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; and Mr Michael CHIU, Chief Executive Officer of LCSD, attended on behalf of Mr Richard WONG.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 24th Meeting

- 1.1 **The Chair** said the draft minutes of the last meeting were circulated to Members on 5 January 2017. The revised draft with Members' comments incorporated was circulated again on 11 January 2017. There being no proposed amendment, the minutes were confirmed at the meeting.

Item 2 Matters Arising

- A. *Proposed Boardwalk underneath the Island Eastern Corridor – Stage 2 Community Engagement (paragraph 5.19 of the minutes of the 24th meeting)*

- 2.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives of CEDD to the meeting. **Mr LAM Chun-tak** briefed Members on the progress of Stage 2 Community Engagement (CE2) of the proposed Boardwalk underneath the Island Eastern Corridor (IEC) with the aid of a PowerPoint.

- 2.2 **The Chair** enquired about the following -

- (a) comments received from the Eastern District Council (EDC) and the community during CE2;
- (b) whether the four activity nodes were presented during CE2; and
- (c) whether the four activity nodes would increase the extent of reclamation.

- 2.3 **Mr Evans IU** enquired if there would be toilet facilities in the proposed activity nodes.

- 2.4 **Mr Ivan HO** suggested that an additional access point should be provided to the eastern section from North Point Vehicular Ferry Pier (NPVFP) to Hoi Yu Street to enhance its

connectivity to the hinterland.

2.5 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** made the following comments-

- (a) the current proposal had not incorporated all the comments from Members made at the last Task Force meeting. The only adjustment to address Members' comments was replacing the wavy structure with a simpler design;
- (b) he considered that the proposed width of the boardwalk was wider than what was required and there was no strong demand for incorporating a cycle track into the boardwalk; and
- (c) the design of the glass wall and street furniture could be further improved.

2.6 **Ir Raymond CHAN** enquired about the area of the boardwalk that would be put underneath IEC. He also asked about the latest estimation on project cost.

2.7 **Sr Emily LI** said that the estimation of project cost would be an important consideration. She also enquired if there was any measure to mitigate traffic noise from IEC.

2.8 **Mr LAM Chun-tak** made the following responses -

- (a) EDC generally supported the proposed scheme and requested for early implementation. The provision of a 10m-wide boardwalk was to provide space for multiple uses and more recreational facilities for public enjoyment. The provision of cycle track was also generally accepted by EDC while some expressed concern over safety issues and requested segregation of the cycle track from the pedestrian walkway;
- (b) Members of the public who participated in the public forums generally welcomed the proposed scheme;
- (c) sufficient toilet facilities would be provided around the

activity nodes including one inside the future waterfront open space north of Oil Street activity node, another near Tong Shui Road and in the garden close to NPVFP;

- (d) an additional access point is suggested to be provided at Provident Garden to make connections to the boardwalk; another access point would be provide near NPVFP for people to gain access to the upper deck of NPVFP through an existing ramp and a proposed lift;
- (e) the area covered by IEC was marked in red on the first slide of the PowerPoint. The structural capacity of the existing highway structures was not sufficient to support the 10m-wide boardwalk directly under the IEC. The existing dolphins adjacent to IEC would be used to support some sections of the boardwalk. There were also headroom constraints for the boardwalk under the IEC;
- (f) the project team would work out a pragmatic cost estimate at the detailed design stage; and
- (g) an environmental assessment would be conducted to assess the noise impact under the investigation study.

2.9 **The Chair** expressed concern over the impact of putting the boardwalk adjacent to rather than directly underneath IEC as originally planned.

2.10 In response, **Mr LAM Chun-tak** said that the alignment of the boardwalk was basically the same as the one proposed in CE1. The only change was to increase the proposed width.

2.11 **Ir Raymond CHAN** said that the boardwalk could become an independent structure if it was put adjacent to IEC.

2.12 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** said that she was worried if additional reclamation would be involved when the boardwalk was placed adjacent to IEC. Such reclamation might not be able to satisfy the requirements of the Protection of Harbour Ordinance (PHO) and affect early

implementation of the project.

- 2.13 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** echoed Mrs Margaret BROOKE's view. He opined that the original scheme recommended years ago should be adopted as it would involve less reclamation.
- 2.14 **Miss Christine AU** responded that as mentioned by CEDD, the structural capacity of the existing highway structures and the headroom constraints rendered the 10m-wide boardwalk unable to be wholly placed directly under the IEC and without additional piles. The alignment of the boardwalk presented to the public during CE2 basically followed what was presented during CE1, with the only difference with the width, which was increased to allow for multiple uses. The technical study was also examining issues relating to the compliance with PHO. The proposed 10m width would be the minimum that could fulfil the compelling and present need as supported by the public during CE1. In the end, the project team would be able to provide cogent and convincing materials to demonstrate that the proposed scheme would satisfy the overriding public need test as required for compliance with PHO.
- 2.15 **Mr Hans Joachim ISLER** said that the change in the refined scheme was not significant and would not affect marine uses and water sports activities in nearby waters. The refined scheme could allow a wider variety of leisure activities on the boardwalk, which would be welcomed by majority of the public and help address their growing aspirations for outdoor activities.
- 2.16 **Mr Ivan HO** recalled that the technical constraint of insufficient headroom was discussed by the Task Force before and requested for more background information. He queried if such technical constraints had led to shifting of the boardwalk.
- 2.17 **Mr LAM Chun-tak** made the following responses-
- (a) the headroom underneath the IEC at both ends of the

western section of the boardwalk near Oil Street and Tong Shui Road respectively were insufficient for accommodating the boardwalk. For the eastern section of the boardwalk, the headroom would also be not enough for fireboats and other vessels to gain access to the existing piers if the boardwalk was put underneath IEC; and

- (b) the proposed alignment was derived from the scheme that was discussed in HC in 2013 with minor modifications made after conducting a detailed technical study.

2.18 **The Chair** said that as CE2 was still in progress, the project team should report back to the Task Force on the result of CE2 and respond to issues raised by Members with detailed justifications and background information.

CEDD

2.19 **Ir Raymond CHAN** requested the project team to advise whether the refined scheme would still fall within the original project scope and the rough estimation of project cost.

B. Temporary on-street metered parking for coaches at Hoi Yu Street, Quarry Bay, Hong Kong (paragraph 2.2 of the minutes of the 24th meeting)

2.20 **The Chair** informed the meeting that as requested by a Member, the survey information on utilization of the parking spaces at the temporary coach laagering point at Hoi Yu Street in Quarry Bay was circulated to Members on 5 January 2017.

C. Proposed North Island Line (paragraph 2.9 of the minutes of the 24th meeting)

2.21 **The Chair** informed the meeting that in response to a Member's enquiry on further information on the alignment of North Island Line and areas to be used for railway works, the Transport and Housing Bureau and the Highways Department replied that the project had yet to proceed to

detailed design stage. Information on the alignment and works areas was not available at this stage.

D. Reprovisioning of Tin Chiu Street Playground (paragraph 4.27 of the minutes of the 24th meeting)

2.22 **The Chair** said that LCSD and the Architectural Services Department had refined the design taking into account Members' comments. The revised design was circulated to Members on 4 November 2016.

2.23 In response to the Chair, **Mr Peter MAK** updated Members on the future land use of the North Point Ferry Pier and NPVFP as follows-

(a) NPVFP was the only pier on Hong Kong Island that was able to meet the operational requirements for cross-harbour vehicular ferry service including vehicles carrying dangerous goods. The vehicles carrying dangerous goods were prohibited from using cross harbour road tunnels. Such ferry service was essential for ensuring continuous supply of livelihood goods including some dangerous goods such as oxygen tanks for hospitals, petrol and liquefied petroleum gas for fuel stations; and

(b) TD had no plan to decommission or re-develop NPVFP at the moment. To cater for the need of passenger ferry services, three passenger ferry routes connecting North Point and Hung Hom/Kowloon City/Kwun Tong would continue to be operated at the two passenger ferry piers in North Point.

2.24 **Miss Christine AU** supplemented that under the IEC boardwalk project, an activity node would be provided near the existing piers in North Point. The Harbour Unit would look into the development plan of the area holistically when taking forward the boardwalk project.

2.25 **Ir Raymond CHAN** commented that the Government should conduct a comprehensive risk assessment on the

operation of NPVFP when taking forward the boardwalk underneath IEC.

- 2.26 **The Chair** asked and TD agreed to take into account the operation of NPVFP when vetting the future development plans of the area.

E. *Draft Planning Brief for the "Comprehensive Development Area" Zone at Site 3 of the New Central Harbourfront (paragraph 4.15 of the minutes of the 24th meeting)*

- 2.27 **The Chair** informed Members that a design workshop was held on 2 November 2016 for Members to provide further views on the draft planning brief. Members' views raised at the meeting were summarised and conveyed to the Town Planning Board (TPB) on 12 December 2016. The revised planning brief was endorsed by the Metro Planning Committee of TPB on 23 December 2016. In response to Members' request, the Government would continue to look into how best to dispose the site, including whether a "two-envelope" tender approach would be feasible and in the best public interest.

- 2.28 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** requested the Government to consult Members on urban design requirements to be included in the land lease for the future developer to follow.

- 2.29 **Miss Christine AU** thanked Members for their useful comments raised at the previous Task Force meeting and the subsequent design workshop. Members' comments had been suitably incorporated in the revised planning brief as endorsed by TPB. The Government was aware that Site 3 was located at a prominent harbourfront location and would continue to explore whether the suggested "two-envelope" tender approach would be feasible. She said that Harbour Unit would aim to report the progress by mid-2017.

F. *Enhancement Works of Leisure Angling Ancillary Facilities in Central and Western District Promenade (Central Section) (paragraph 6.11 of the minutes of the 24th meeting)*

2.30 **The Chair** said that the enhancement works were commenced in early December 2016 for completion in March 2017. LCSD would be invited to report back to the Task Force on the effectiveness of the enhanced facilities in a year's time.

G. *Presentation from the Protect Cadogan Park Alliance (paragraph 7.8 of the minutes of the 24th meeting)*

2.31 **The Chair** informed the meeting that the extract of the confirmed minutes of the last Task Force meeting and the PowerPoint presentation made by the Protect Cadogan Park Alliance would be conveyed to the TPB after the meeting.

[Post-meeting notes: Extract of the minutes and the PowerPoint presentation were conveyed to TPB on 20 January 2017.]

2.32 In response to the Chair's question, **Mr Louis KAU** updated Members that hearings on the representations and comments on the amendments to the relevant outline zoning plan were scheduled from mid-February to early March 2017. PlanD would update the Task Force on the decision of TPB when available.

H. *The FIA Formula E Hong Kong ePrix (paragraph 7.19 of the minutes of the 24th meeting)*

2.33 **The Chair** informed Members that TC would report the result of the race to Members.

I. *Proposed Short Term Tenancy for Public Fee-paying Carpark Government Land at Eastern Street North, Sai Ying Pun (paragraph 7.30 of the minutes of the 24th meeting)*

2.34 **The Chair** said a written response was circulated to Members on 23 November 2016, which was followed by an informal working session on 28 November 2016. Relevant departments exchanged further views with Members on the need for continuing the short-term tenancy (STT) car park as a stop-gap measure. Members raised no objection to the

retender of the STT for a fixed term of one year. The STT was re-tendered and awarded on 20 December 2016.

Item 3 Proposed Temporary Use at the Three Berths Released from Western District Public Cargo Working Area in Kennedy Town (Paper No. TFHK/01/2017)

- 3.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives of the Harbour Unit to the meeting.
- 3.2 As background, **Miss Christine AU** informed Members that three vacant berths were released from the Western District Public Cargo Working Area by the Marine Department in August 2016. The Working Group on the Central & Western District Harbourfront of the Central and Western District Council discussed the possible temporary uses for the released berths at its meeting on 20 December 2016. A motion was passed after the discussion, which requested the Government to specifically consider using the released berths to develop a community farm for public enjoyment. She then took Members through the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 3.3 **The Chair** commented that the proposal might not be commercially viable. He enquired about the operational arrangements on taking forward the proposal.
- 3.4 **Mr Evans IU** supported the proposal in principle and asked if the site was suitable for leisure farming as the area concerned could be windy. He further enquired if at-grade access points would be provided for the site and whether the proponent would be required to seek TPB's permission on the proposed temporary use.
- 3.5 **Mr YEUNG Hoi-wing** supported the proposal and supplemented that the width of the proposed promenade could be further widened. Other uses such as ancillary commercial activities might be allowed at the site.
- 3.6 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** enquired about the justifications

for using the waterfront site for operating a community farm as the site might not be easily accessible from the hinterland and the proposed use might not be commercially viable. Other greening proposal, such as planting of trees along the waterfront, should be considered for the site.

- 3.7 **Mr Walter CHAN** asked how the food and beverage (F&B) services could integrate with the proposed community farm as these uses might not be compatible with each another.
- 3.8 **Mrs Karen BARRETTO** said some members of the public had been using the site for a long time. She considered that the Government should consult existing users on the proposal. While she had no objection to the proposed community farm, the proposal might not be able to create a tidy landscaped area at the waterfront.
- 3.9 **Mr Alvin YIP** said that the Government could make reference to previous academic researches on community farming and farming near the sea when taking forward the proposal.
- 3.10 **Mr Ivan HO** said he supported this innovative initiative. Noting that the trees in Belcher Bay Park adjacent to the site were growing well and healthily after just ten years, he believed that the environment of the site should also be suitable for planting or farming.
- 3.11 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** opined that the Government should invite non-profit-making organisations (NPOs) to operate the community farm as the proposal might not be implemented purely on commercial basis. She added that some storage spaces should be provided to patrons of the farm.
- 3.12 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** echoed with Mr Ivan HO and supported the proposal. Having regard to its remote location and segregation from nearby residential neighbourhood, he opined that there were not many other options for temporary use for the site. He asked the Government to improve the accessibility to the site when taking forward the proposal.

- 3.13 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** enquired if the idea of developing a community farm came from the local community. While he supported the idea, the Government might wish to invite other initiatives from the community. He considered it better to develop the entire site into a well-designed public open space in the long run.
- 3.14 **Mr Evans IU** said that he fully supported the proposal. He would like to have more information on the operation model of the proposed community farm and how local residents could benefit from the initiative.
- 3.15 **Mr Ken SO** supported the initiative. He asked if the Government would open the community farm for free public enjoyment similar to the programme currently operated by LCSD. He suggested setting a size limit for each patron to rent the farm so that more people could enjoy leisure farming. In addition, only organic farming should be allowed at the site.
- 3.16 **Miss Christine AU** made the following responses -
- (a) the proposed community farm would provide public enjoyment not only for the local community but residents from the territory who were interested in leisure farming;
 - (b) taking into account the Commission's aspiration of promoting greening and the neighbouring environment, the Government considered that a community farm including a 10m-wide waterfront promenade would enable public enjoyment at this waterfront site. The idea was raised and supported by the Central and Western District Council;
 - (c) the Government would adopt a two-envelope tender approach when letting out the site. Tenderers would be required to submit a technical proposal on the operation model for the community farm to ensure that the proposed temporary use would be able to meet the established social objectives. The tender

exercise would be open to all interested parties including NPOs;

- (d) while majority of the site would be occupied by a community farm, it was proposed to allow ancillary commercial uses such as F&B services to complement leisure farming. It would also help sustain operation of the site on a commercial basis;
- (e) the Government would make reference to some existing community farms operated by NPOs when formulating tender requirements and tenancy agreement for the proposed community farm;
- (f) when taking forward the proposal, the Government would provide safe public accesses to the site and carry out enhancement works at the site if necessary; and
- (g) it was proposed to allow using part of the site for organising events such as workshops on organic farming and green living so as to educate patrons and raise the community's awareness of adopting an environmental friendly lifestyle.

3.17 **The Chair** enquired if the community farm would be fenced off for the exclusive access of patrons. **Miss Christine AU** responded that while some protection might be needed to protect the planting plots, public access to the waterfront promenade and the open space adjacent to the community farm would be provided. It was envisioned that ancillary uses such F&B services and community events would also be open to the general public.

3.18 **The Chair** concluded that the Task Force supported this innovative proposal and asked the Harbour Unit to keep Members posted on the progress of implementing the initiative.

Item 4 Any Other Business

- 4.1 There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 12:00 pm.

Secretariat

Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island

Harbourfront Commission

February 2017