

Harbourfront Commission
Task Force on Harbourfront Developments
on Hong Kong Island

Minutes of Thirtieth Meeting

Date : 21 March 2018
Time : 4:30 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 Freddie HAI	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Evans IU	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Dr Eunice MAK	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Sr Francis LAM	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr Ivan HO	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Ir Raymond CHAN Kin-sek	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Dr NG Cho-nam	Representing The Conservancy Association
Mr Hans Joachim ISLER	
Mr NGAN Man-yu	
Ms Jacqueline CHUNG	Co-opted Member
Ms Lisa LAU	Co-opted Member
Mr YEUNG Hoi-wing	Co-opted Member
Ms Doris HO	Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands) ¹ , Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Edward LEUNG	Senior Manager (Tourism) 21, Tourism Commission (TC)
Mr Eddie LEUNG	Chief Traffic Engineer / Hong Kong, Transport

Mr Wilson MA	Department (TD) Chief Engineer/ South 3, 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

Miss Rosalind CHEUNG	Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
Ms Jenny WONG	Assistant Secretary (Harbour) Special Duties, DEVB
Mr Ian CHENG	Assistant Secretary (Harbour)2, DEVB
Mr Peter MOK	Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Carlos FUNG	Engineer (Harbour), DEVB

Absent with Apologies

Mrs Karen BARRETTO	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Terence LEE	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Walter CHAN	
Mr Karl KWOK	
Mr Vincent NG	
Mr Tony TSE	
Mr Henry CHAN	Co-opted Member
Mr Stanley HO	Co-opted Member

For Agenda Item 2

Mr Ringo MOK	Deputy Project Manager (South), CEDD
Mr C K LAM	Chief Engineer/South 4, CEDD
Mr Ricky CHUNG	Project Coordinator/2 (South), CEDD
Mr Derek TSE	Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong 5, PlanD
Mr Jeremy WONG	Technical Director, Black & Veatch Hong Kong Ltd
Miss Rosalind CHEUNG	Principle Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Peter MOK	Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB
Miss Ida TSE	Project Coordinator (Harbour), DEVB
Mrs Susanne WONG	District Officer (Central and Western), Home Affairs Department (HAD)
Mr Jiv MOK	Senior Executive Officer (District Management),

Ms Katty LAW	Central and Western District Office, HAD
Mr Ben MOK	Representative of Protect Kennedy Town Alliance
Ms Cherry WONG	Representative of Protect Kennedy Town Alliance

Action

Welcoming Message

The Chair welcomed all to the meeting. He welcomed and thanked Ms Lisa LAU, Creative Director of GAL Graphics Consultants Limited and Mr Henry CHAN, Chief Executive of Honoh Limited (who was in absentia) for joining the Task Force as co-opted Members.

The Chair informed the meeting that Mr Eddie LEUNG had taken over the post of Chief Traffic Engineer/ Hong Kong of the Transport Department from Mr Peter MAK; Mr Edward LEUNG, Senior Manager of Tourism Commission, attended the meeting on behalf of Mr Simpson LO; and Mr Michael CHIU, Chief Executive Officer of Leisure and Cultural Services Department, attended the meeting on behalf of Ms Rebecca LOU.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 28th Meeting

- 1.1 **The Chair** said that the Secretariat circulated the draft minutes of the 29th meeting on 15 March 2018. In response to the comments from the Protect Kennedy Town Alliance, he decided to postpone confirmation of the minutes to a later stage so that more time would be made available for Members to consider the draft minutes. He would also review the minutes to ensure that they would reflect the discussion of the last meeting.

Item 2 Matters Arising

- A. Terms of Reference (ToR) of the Task Force (paragraph 2.1 of the

minutes of the 29th meeting)

- 2.1 **The Chair** said that the revised ToR of the Harbourfront Commission was endorsed on the 30th meeting of the Commission held on 5 March 2018. Some corresponding amendments were proposed for the ToR of the Task Forces.
- 2.2 Upon the Chair's invitation, **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** briefed Members on the proposed amendments to the ToR of the Task Force which had been tabled for Members' reference (**Annex**).
- 2.3 **The Chair** suggested and **Members** agreed to confirm the revised ToR of the Task Force.

B. *Proposed Pedestrian Facilities for Public Housing Development in Kennedy Town (paragraph 4.1 of the minutes of the 29th meeting) (Paper No. TFHK/04/2018)*

- 2.4 **The Chair** welcomed representatives from CEDD, PlanD and Black & Veatch Hong Kong Ltd to the meeting. As background, he informed Members that at the last Task Force meeting, CEDD consulted Members on the associated site formation works and proposed new pedestrian connections for the public housing development at the site south of Victoria Road in the western part of Kennedy Town. CEDD would further brief Members on the supplementary information of the proposal at the meeting.
- 2.5 **Mr Ringo MOK** informed the meeting that the proposed pedestrian facilities to be implemented under the subject public housing development was in compliance with the overall planning intention for the pedestrian connectivity and accessibility to the waterfront area. **Mr C K LAM** presented the latest proposal with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 2.6 **Mr Ivan HO** commented that the proposal presented to the Task Force at the last meeting was undesirable as changes compared against the submission years ago were not marked

up for Members' ease of reference. He asked relevant departments to take note of it when submitting proposals to the Commission in future. Besides, if CEDD had noted the site constraints at the initial planning stage, they would not need to propose another location for the footbridge now.

- 2.7 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that people were likely to cross Victoria Road to the waterfront right after they got to the ground by the proposed lifts or staircase at the northeast corner of Phase 2 of the subject public housing development. He wondered if an at-grade crossing could be added to that road junction to facilitate public access to the waterfront.
- 2.8 **Mr Ivan HO** enquired about the reasons for proposing an at-grade crossing on the western side of the Government, Institution or Community (G/IC) site instead of the eastern side which might better enhance accessibility to the waterfront.
- 2.9 **The Chair** asked CEDD to describe in details how the proposed footbridge would connect people to the waterfront. Besides, he asked whether the proposed elevated walkway could be replaced with at grade crossing.
- 2.10 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired if connections to hiking trails in Mount Davis would be included in the proposal.
- 2.11 **Mr Ringo MOK** made the following responses -
- (a) the revised location of the footbridge aimed to address local residents' grave concern about the close proximity of the originally proposed footbridge to the existing residential building. CEDD would take on board the views of local residents and relevant stakeholders when implementing the projects;
 - (b) the proposed footbridge would span across Victoria Road to provide a safe grade-separated access connecting Ka Wai Man Road and the subject public housing development with

the developments to the north of Victoria Road; and

(c) the footbridge comprised two sections of about 30m span. For the lower section spanning across Victoria Road, the deck level would be about +12mPD and that for the higher section spanning between Victoria Road and the subject public housing development would be about +26mPD. Lift shafts would be provided to facilitate the pedestrian circulation going from one deck to another, and from the ground level to the footbridge.

2.12 **Mr Derek TSE** supplemented that to enhance the overall connectivity and accessibility of the waterfront area, another set of footbridges to the east of the aforesaid footbridge had also been proposed under the Land Use Review for the Western Part of Kennedy Town so as to connect the Ka Wai Man Road area with the future waterfront park via a proposed private housing site. In order to retain Cadogan Street Temporary Garden, the Town Planning Board had decided to revise the zoning from residential to "Open Space" and "G/IC" zones. Hence, that set of proposed footbridges was subject to review by the Government and Members' views above would be taken into account in the review.

2.13 **Mr C K LAM** said that, while a section of the hiking trail to Mount Davis would be permanently closed, the public could use the footpath adjacent to the new access road connecting the remaining section of the hiking trail to reach Mount Davis. Upon completion of the project, the public could still use the footpath and the existing hiking trail to go to Mount Davis.

2.14 **Mr Ivan HO** enquired about the mPD of the proposed footbridge right above the at grade crossing.

2.15 **Mr Ringo MOK** responded that the existing level of Victoria Road at the point of the crossing of the proposed footbridge was about +6mPD. According to the highway design standard, normally 5.1m headroom would be allowed for bridges crossing over roads.

- 2.16 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** expressed that he hoped the Government would improve the hiking trail to Mount Davis for public enjoyment.
- 2.17 **Mr Ringo MOK** said that he would convey Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN's comments to relevant departments for consideration.
- 2.18 **Mr Ivan HO** was concerned about the visual impact as well as the need of the proposed lift tower which would be as high as six-storey.
- 2.19 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that Members would like to know about the design of the proposed pedestrian facilities in due course.
- 2.20 **The Chair** asked the Government to note Members' comments. He said that CEDD's proposed pedestrian facilities were agreeable to the Task Force from harbourfront accessibility perspective and invited the department to consult Members on the detailed design in future with a view to further enhancing accessibility to the waterfront.
- 2.21 **Mr Ringo MOK** responded that the Government would take on board Members' comments when designing the concerned pedestrian facilities in particular the lift shafts.
- 2.22 **Mr Freddie HAI** requested the relevant departments to provide an integrated connection to the G/IC instead of a free standing elevated tower.
- 2.23 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** echoed with Mr Freddie HAI and said that the proposed footbridge should connect the public housing development as well as the adjacent area with an integrated design.

- 2.24 **Mr Ringo MOK** responded that CEDD would allow flexibility in the future design of the pedestrian facilities.
- 2.25 **The Chair** thanked CEDD for their presentation and asked them to take into account Members' comments when taking forward the proposal.
- C. *Proposed Short-term Use at the Three Berths Released from Western District Public Cargo Working Area (WDPCWA) (paragraph 2.2 of the minutes of the 29th meeting) (Paper No. TFHK/05/2018)*
- 2.26 **The Chair** welcomed representatives from the Harbour Unit and the Central and Western District Office (C&WDO) to the meeting. He asked and Members agreed that representatives from the Protect Kennedy Town Alliance (the Alliance) could attend the meeting and express their views.
- 2.27 In response to the Task Force's request at the last meeting, **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** presented details of the public consultation conducted, as well as the suggested way forward for the proposed short-term use with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 2.28 **The Chair** enquired about the cost for the enhancement works for the 5 500m² public open space which were to install railings and other works to improve public safety and amenities. He also enquired if LCSD had agreed to take up management of the waterfront portion after completing the enhancement works.
- 2.29 **Mr Ivan HO** enquired about the cost, items to be involved and estimated completion time in respect of the enhancement works at the waterfront portion; and whether public would be allowed to enter the site before completing the works.
- 2.30 **Ir Raymond CHAN** commented that, in view of the diverse views of the community, the current proposal was a suitable compromise to meet public aspirations of early enjoyment. He

enquired if the proposed leisure farm would be in operation only after installation of railings along the waterfront.

2.31 **Sr Francis LAM** supported the current proposal and urged for early implementation .

2.32 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** raised the following questions and comments -

(a) a place-making exercise with the community should be conducted before a concrete land use proposal was decided. Only Members of the Task Force and the Central and Western District Council (C&WDC) were consulted before the proposal was put forward;

(b) the long-term use for the site and implementation timetable for the long-term development were not provided for Members to offer substantive comments on the proposed short-term use;

(c) the site should be used for enjoyment by the public in the manner they desired. He enquired about the types of activities to be allowed in the future public open space, especially if the existing uses such as cycling, dog-walking, jogging, drone-flying and fishing etc. would be permitted; and

(d) whether there were alternative structures other than railings such as stepped terraces so that an open and pleasant setting could be maintained while ensuring public safety.

2.33 **Mrs Susanne WONG** in response to the Chair's question said that from a district perspective, the current proposal was a good balance of the views from HC, C&WDC and the concern groups received so far.

2.34 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** supported the current proposal as it might be difficult for a non-profit-making organisation (NPO) to manage and maintain the entire site of about 7 500m². It

should be more manageable if the NPO operated only the hinterland part of the site. NPOs would also be able to collaborate with LCSD in organising diversified activities at the future public open space. Besides, installation of railings, though visually less desirable, might be the best option to ensure public safety. He opined that the sea wall along the site was a vertical one making it difficult to be converted into a stepped terrace.

2.35 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** made the following comments -

(a) a place-making exercise with the community should be conducted to contemplate the long-term use of the site;

(b) other alternatives to replace the proposed railings in the long run should be explored; and

(c) Members and the community should be consulted on the facilities and activities permissible at the future public open space.

2.36 **Mr Ivan HO** supported the current proposal. He said that some members of the public did not share the Alliance's view to open the subject site "as is" but preferred that the site should be properly managed by a government department to ensure public safety. While the community might have diversified views, he supported making the subject site available for public enjoyment as soon as possible through the proposed temporary use. Permanent land use should be reviewed to meet the changing needs. He opined that a good design of railings was more important than arguing over whether railing would be needed and he did not object to having railings along the harbourfront.

2.37 **Mr Freddie HAI** said that the current arrangement of trespassing was undesirable. He supported the current proposal and requested LCSD to adopt a more flexible management taking into account public aspirations. He also had no objection to having railings along the waterfront but

urged to come up with a good design.

2.38 **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** made the following responses -

- (a) in order to open the site for public enjoyment as early as possible, it was proposed to complete the enhancement works at the waterfront portion of around 5 500m² for conversion into public open space by around 2018 Q4 with an estimated cost of around \$30M;
- (b) relevant stakeholders would be consulted on the design; some works items would include railings, benches, lighting and paving. The Government aimed at opening the open space in phases starting from early 2019; and
- (c) LCSD had agreed to take up management of the subject open space after completion of the enhancement works. The department would facilitate NPOs to organise different kinds of activities such as play days for young kids and bazaars thereon as appropriate.

2.39 **The Chair** invited and **Mr Ben MOK** made the following comments on behalf of the Alliance -

- (a) the Secretariat had not invited the Alliance to attend this meeting which was committed by the Chair at the last meeting;
- (b) DEVB had not carried out any public engagement activities on the proposal subsequent to the last meeting;
- (c) the community groups conducted a follow-up survey asking people to choose among three options namely DEVB's Proposal 1, DEVB's Proposal 2 and the Alliance's proposal to open the site as is. Despite the survey had listed DEVB's proposals first, they were not supported by survey participants. The Alliance proposal had the public support because it was drawn up based on public aspirations;

- (d) DEVB should organise a public forum to engage the general public on the use and design of the site before proceeding further;
- (e) the site had been used by the public flexibly and actively in the past ten years and there was no rush to change the status quo;
- (f) the Government should provide further information on the regulation, guideline or rule requiring to install railings along the harbourfront, otherwise other alternatives should be proposed to address the safety issue;
- (g) the Government should identify another suitable site for operating a leisure farm for public enjoyment; and
- (h) it did not align with public aspiration if LCSD imposed restrictions at the future public open space and did not permit those activities that members of the public were currently enjoying at the site.

2.40 **The Chair** enquired about the number of people participated in the survey and the location of conducting those interviews.

2.41 **Mr Ben MOK** responded that the community groups received around 4 000 objections to the leisure farm proposal in their first survey and around 200 objections to DEVB's two proposals in their follow-up survey which was still ongoing. The surveys were conducted online and on-site at WDPCWA and the adjacent area at different times.

2.42 **Dr Eunice MAK** supported the current proposal in principle. She opined that the Government should seek views on the design of the future public open space and adopt a new approach in managing the site.

2.43 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired about the long-term planning for the site and whether some of the existing activities would be permitted after completing the enhancement works.

He opined that an innovative railing design should be adopted and place-making exercise should be conducted with the community in addition to consultation with HC and C&WDC. Besides, he doubted if leisure farming was suitable at the site having regard to high water salinity.

- 2.44 **Mr Freddie HAI** opined that the detailed design of the future open space could be considered by Members separately at a later stage. The Government would have a better understanding on Members' views about the design in particular on the railing design and management model to allow diversified activities at the site.
- 2.45 **Ir Raymond CHAN** was concerned that members of the public currently accessing to the site were unsafe and illegal. He supported the Government to take forward the current proposal as soon as possible without dragging on details about the design.
- 2.46 **Mr Evans IU** commented that while the current proposal was about land use and management agents of the site, the detailed design of the future open space could be discussed separately with proper consultation.
- 2.47 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** asked the Government to make use of the site for organising creative activities and performances.
- 2.48 **Ms Katty LAW** made the following remarks -
- (a) she opined that LCSD should not manage the site as an ordinary community park in accordance with the established manner. Diversified activities such as cycling and kite-flying which were being practiced at the site should continue to be allowed;
 - (b) the Government should establish a dedicated office to coordinate with various NPOs on using the site instead of relying on a government department so that flexibility

would be preserved for the types of activities/ events to be organised thereon;

- (c) there was no rush to take forward any temporary use at the site as it was being enjoyed by members of the public. A comprehensive place-making exercise to engage the community on the future land use and design of the site should be conducted. For instance, resurfacing the site was considered not necessary in view of the good condition of the current paving; and
- (d) the Government should further discuss with HC, C&WDC and the community before taking forward the current proposal.

2.49 **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** responded as follows -

- (a) the Government agreed with Members that the site should be a vibrant public open space and aimed at allowing various uses and activities;
- (b) the Government had sought views of different social welfare groups and non-profitable organisations on the management and kinds of activities for the site and gathered that they also considered that improvements to the existing paving was necessary before the site could be used for community activities;
- (c) the Government had started to engage relevant stakeholders on the proposed temporary use since 2016 and a total of seven meetings were attended to seek views from HC, C&WDC and concern groups. The proposal was thoroughly deliberated and views of stakeholders had been taken into account, where appropriate;
- (d) on the long-term use of the site, a technical study was commissioned by CEDD suggesting using the subject site as a landing place for transport infrastructure connecting the future East Lantau Metropolis (ELM). However, this was only the consultant's recommendation, and the Government

had yet to decide whether to adopt it or not. HC and the general public would be engaged should there be any development proposal involving the Kennedy Town waterfront;

(e) the Architectural Services Department would be responsible for designing the public open space taking into account the views relevant stakeholders including the HC; and

(f) LCSD would manage the future public open space in the established manner and the Government would support and provide facilitation to organising vibrant and energetic events there.

2.50 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired if the activities currently enjoyed by members of the public at the subject site over the years would be permitted after it had been handed to LCSD.

2.51 **Mr Ivan HO** said that the existing paving was designed in the early years for loading and unloading of goods at the WDPCWA. It was not up to standard for leisure activities and resurfacing was considered necessary.

2.52 **The Chair** concluded as follows –

(a) there was general support from Members for taking forward the current proposal in terms of land use; and

(b) design in relation to the future public open space could be further discussed separately. The Government should engage the Task Force in due course when the proposal on the design of the future public open space was available.

2.53 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** objected to the proposal of letting LCSD to manage the future public open space in the established manner. He added that the Government did not conduct proper place-making exercise for the site, and the expected completion of enhancement works by Q4 2018 would not allow a comprehensive public engagement exercise to be

conducted on the design of the site.

2.54 **Dr Eunice MAK** asked the Government to engage the relevant parties during the design stage.

2.55 **Mrs Susanne WONG** supplemented that the C&WDC planned to carry out a comprehensive public engagement exercise on the long-term use of the subject site, and the current proposal for the short-term use was put forward with a view to releasing the subject site for early public enjoyment in a safe manner as soon as possible. She added that C&WDC would continue to work closely with LCSD in promoting more diversified and creative uses and design of the public open space portion of the subject site.

2.56 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** commented that a place-making exercise would be needed to engage the community on the use of the site now instead of after 5 to 10 years.

2.57 **Ms Doris HO** said that the Government agreed to the conclusion made by the Chair. The Government has no intention of conducting a place-making exercise for this site but was prepared to engage stakeholders during the design stage.

DEVB

2.58 **Mr Ben MOK** said that a comprehensive public engagement exercise was also necessary for the short-term use. He urged the Government to keep their promise of actively engaging the community on the design of the site and asked for details including the timetable and target groups to be engaged. He said that the Alliance was ready to help organise a workshop on the matter and would like to invite the Government to attend. He opined that existing activities permissible at the site should also be allowed on the future public open space and urged the Government to fully engage the community on the design so that the enhancement works would be completed to address public aspirations.

2.59 **The Chair** reiterated that the Task Force supported the Government to take forward the proposed temporary land uses as proposed in the paper, and asked the Government to engage the Task Force on the design and management of the public open space portion of the site in due course.

Item 3 Any Other Business

3.1 **The Chair** informed that the revised Action Area table setting out the latest developments in the harbourfront areas was circulated to Members on 16 March 2018.

3.2 There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 6:25 pm.

Secretariat

Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island

Harbourfront Commission

April 2018

Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island

Terms of Reference

The harbourfront areas under the purview of the Task Force are marked blue on the map attached.

The Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island will take into account the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines, and will assist the Harbourfront Commission in the following areas with respect to harbourfront developments in the harbourfront areas and adjacent waters within the harbour limit on Hong Kong Island —

- (a) to provide comments on and monitor the planning, land/marine use, urban design and implementation of harbourfront development proposals;
- (b) to advocate harbourfront enhancement measures and projects and advise on their implementation strategies;
- (c) to advise on suitable management models for harbourfront sites, with a view to proactively fostering partnership with the non-governmental sector including the local District Councils, commercial enterprises, social enterprises, community-based trusts, special purpose companies and other non-governmental organisations;
- (d) to provide advise—advice and guidance to the community and stakeholders including the Harbour Office, government departments, project proponents and others as needed and/or organise public engagement activities regarding the planning and urban design of harbourfront development projects; ~~and—~~
- (e) to promote the harbourfront to locals and visitors through marketing and branding efforts—; and
- (f) to lead relevant studies commissioned by the Harbour Office on behalf of the Harbourfront Commission, including providing advice on the preparation of briefs/scope of work, assessment criteria for selecting consultants, evaluation of the study process and outcomes, and the recommendations.

The Task Force shall report to the Harbourfront Commission on its recommendations and progress on a regular basis.