

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

Minutes of Thirty-first Meeting

Date : 7 May 2018
Time : 3:30 p.m.
Venue : Conference Room (Room G46) at Upper Ground Floor,
Hong Kong Heritage Discovery Centre, Kowloon Park,
Tsim Sha Tsui, Kowloon

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
Mrs Karen BARRETTO	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Anthony CHEUNG	Representing Hong Kong Institute of 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 Terence LEE	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Dr NG Cho-nam	Representing The Conservancy Association
Mr Walter CHAN	
Mr Hans Joachim ISLER	
Mr Karl KWOK	
Mr Stanley HO	
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 Department (TD)
Mr Wilson MA	Chief Engineer/ South 3, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Ms Rebecca LOU	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 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
Ms Sylvia LIM	District Leisure Manager (Central & Western), LCSD

Absent with Apologies

Mr Evans IU	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Mr Vincent NG	
Mr NGAN Man-yu	
Mr Tony TSE	
Mr Henry CHAN	Co-opted Member
Ms Lisa LAU	Co-opted Member
Ms Jacqueline CHUNG	Co-opted Member
Mr YEUNG Hoi-wing	Co-opted Member
Ms Vivian YIP	Co-opted Member

For Agenda Item 2

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), Central and Western District Office, HAD

Mr Esmond AU	Senior Architect/22, ArchSD
Mr Kevin SY	Architect/209, ArchSD
Ms Jackie LEE	Senior Project Manager 330, ArchSD
Ms Cherry WONG	Representative, Protect Kennedy Town Alliance

For Agenda Item 3

Miss Rosalind CHEUNG	Principle Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Peter MOK	Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Carlos FUNG	Engineer (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Jeffrey CHAN	Associate Director, Atkins
Mr Willis LAI	Engineer I, Atkins
Mr Deven YOUNG	Senior Design Associate, Alta Global Operations (ALTA)
Mr Fred YOUNG	Programme Coordinator, ALTA
Mr Jason NI	General Manager, ALTA
Mr Martin TURNER	Chairman, Hong Kong Cycling Alliance
Mr CHAN Ka-leung	Representative, Hong Kong Cycling Alliance

Action

Welcoming Message

The Chair welcomed all to the meeting. He welcomed and thanked Ms Vivian YIP Wan-yi, presenter in Radio Television Hong Kong (who was in absentia) for joining the Task Force as co-opted Member.

The Chair informed the meeting that Mr Edward LEUNG, Senior Manager of Tourism Commission, attended the meeting on behalf of Mr Simpson LO.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 29th and 30th Meetings

- 1.1 **The Task Force** confirmed the minutes of the 29th meeting.
- 1.2 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** requested the Secretariat to add his suggestion of asking the Government to consider alternative structures such as stepped terraces at the Kennedy Town waterfront made at the 29th meeting to its minutes.

[Post-meeting notes: Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN's above suggestion was made at the 30th meeting and had already been included in the minutes of that meeting.]

- 1.3 **The Chair** decided to postpone confirmation of the minutes of the 30th meeting to a later stage so as to further consider the comments from the Protect Kennedy Town Alliance on the draft minutes.

[Post-meeting notes: The draft minutes of the 30th meeting will be confirmed at the 32nd meeting to be held on 7 September 2018.]

Item 2 Matters Arising

- A. *Proposed Advance Waterfront Promenade at the Three Berths Released from Western District Public Cargo Working Area (WDPCWA) (paragraph 2.26 of the minutes of the 30th meeting)*

Briefing by DEVB, the Central and Western District Office (C&WDO) and the Architectural Services Department (ArchSD)

- 2.1 **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG, Mrs Susanne WONG and Mr Kevin SY** respectively briefed Members on the proposal with the aid of PowerPoints.
- 2.2 **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** supplemented that the Government planned to consult the Central and Western District Council (C&WDC) on 11 May 2018 before finalising the design. The advance promenade would be open in phases for public enjoyment starting from Q4 2018.

Discussion

Design concept

- 2.3 **Dr Eunice MAK, Ir Raymond CHAN, Mr Walter CHAN and Mr Ivan HO** supported the proposed design.

Paving material

- 2.4 **Dr Eunice MAK** suggested replacing the concrete paving at the multi-purpose area with other heat absorbent materials in view of the strong sunlight during summer time. **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** believed that concrete paving might be the only safe solution for organising various events at the site.
- 2.5 **Mr Ivan HO** did not support using timber paving for the whole site as it would easily deteriorate and require frequent repairing. The Government's proposed paving material had maintained some sort of balance. Tile pattern might be adopted to create a lively layout for the site even when there was no event at it.
- 2.6 **Mr Esmond AU** understood the merits of timber in terms of heat absorbency and walking comfortability but after taking into account the cost, maintenance effectiveness and construction time, the Architectural and Services Department (ArchSD) had recommended a mixed use for the site, i.e. timber decking at the promenade and brick paving for the multi-purpose area.

Railing design and setting back of railing

- 2.7 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** wondered if the Government had explored alternative options such as stepped terraces to replace railings at waterfront sites. **Ms Cherry WONG** said that railing should be kept to a minimum to maintain a pleasant setting. **Mr Hans Joachim ISLER** commented that railing was not necessary as it would give people a false sense of security. **Mr Ivan HO** had reservations about the high construction cost for stepped terraces. **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** believed that railing was required for meeting statutory requirements and from public safety angle. **Ir Raymond CHAN** supported the

provision of railing for safety sake.

- 2.8 **Mr Esmond AU** responded that railing of at least 1.1m high was needed to comply with existing statutory requirements. Besides, ArchSD would explore other design ideas such as stepped terrace at other suitable waterfront sites such as the open space next to Sun Yet Sen Memorial Park as far as practicable.
- 2.9 **Ir Raymond CHAN** considered that setting back the railing just for preserving the existing bollards would encourage unsafe access to the seaward side of the railing unless the setback could be made sufficiently wide to facilitate safe and unobstructed access. **Mr Ivan HO** believed that the setting back was already a good balance between bollard preservation and public safety. **Mrs Karen BARRETTO** enquired if the bollards were for public use. **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** suggested the Government to provide proper public access to the bollard area for people to keep fishing at this popular place.
- 2.10 **Mr Esmond AU** responded that setting back the railing was required to maintain a necessary distance from the existing seawall, service channel and bollards.

Pet garden

- 2.11 **Ms Cherry WONG** said that the Protect Kennedy Town Alliance consulted some dog owners groups who requested opening up the whole site for pet rather than having only a small designated pet garden. **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** echoed Ms Cherry WONG's view.
- 2.12 **Mr Ivan HO** said that an enclosed pet garden could avoid any disturbance arising from dog walking to other users. He observed that some users might not manage their dogs properly.

Rain shelter

- 2.13 **Mr Ivan HO** appreciated the rain shelter and toilet facilities near the bus terminus, and suggested providing drinking fountains nearby. **Mr Walter CHAN** suggested providing sufficient seatings in the rain shelter.
- 2.14 **Mr Esmond AU** would take on board Members' comments on seating provision at the rain shelter area.

Opening hours

- 2.15 **Mr Walter CHAN** wished to see the site be open 24 hours for public access.
- 2.16 **Mr Esmond AU** responded that the fence along the entrance abutting the Western District Public Cargo Working Area would be partly removed for public access while that along the entrance abutting the bus station would be completely taken away.
- 2.17 **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** supplemented that both major entrances of the site would be open for public 24 hours a day under the management of LCSD.

Multiple activities /space uses at the advance promenade

- 2.18 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired about the permissible activities at the advance promenade. He requested the same information for respective sites along the eastern and central waterfront on Hong Kong Island for reference. He believed that existing uses such as cycling, dog-walking, fishing and drone-flying etc should be allowed. **Mrs Karen BARRETTO** supported mixed use of the site.

2.19 **Mrs Susanne WONG** responded that to diversify the uses of the multi-purpose area, C&WDO would explore the possibility of partnering with Non-Government Organisations (NGOs) in hosting a wider range of activities at the site for public participation.

Making the advance promenade a pilot site for new design and use

2.20 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** asked the Government to make use of the site as a pilot scheme for allowing different kinds of activities and experimenting alternative management modes. **Mr Hans Joachim ISLER** concurred that the Government should take the opportunity to try something new at the subject site which occupied only a relatively small area. The principle should be having a flexible and open design with minimal restrictions to users.

2.21 **Ms Cherry WONG** considered the design a conventional one and doubted if it could bring out the characteristics of Sai Wan Pier and become a pilot project that would cater for different types of activities.

2.22 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** supported the pilot scheme concept. She added that the Government should spend time to make a decent design to the satisfaction of the public.

2.23 **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** responded that the Central and Western District Office (C&WDO) was considering to organise a design competition to engage local teenagers on the design of street furniture.

Public consultation

2.24 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** requested the budget and programme for consulting the public on the design proposal. Proper place-making exercise should engage local people and stakeholders in public forums and meetings to collect their

views for the Government to come up with a few proposals and then further engage the community on these proposals before drawing up the final plan. **Ms Cherry WONG** considered it very significant to engage the public so that the subject promenade could be designed to the satisfaction of them.

- 2.25 **Mrs Susanne WONG** informed the meeting that before coming up with the two proposals presented at an earlier meeting, the Government had already engaged various groups and stakeholders. In response to the views collected, the proposal suggests that the majority portion of the site will be open to free access, while public engagement activities will also be organised at remaining portion of the site, i.e. the leisure farm. She added that C&WDC Members had been playing their roles as representatives for the residents in their constituencies as appropriate. The Government would continue engagement with the local community in particular on the wider range of activities to be organised.

Other suggestions or comments

- 2.26 **Ms Cherry WONG** regarded the poor hygiene condition of the toilets, narrowness of the promenade and the slippery surface of the elderly fitness equipment at the newly open promenade under the Signature Project Scheme in Central and Western District unsatisfactory.
- 2.27 **Mrs Karen BARRETTO** suggested the lighting design should ensure no glare affecting visitors enjoying the sunset harbour view.
- 2.28 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired if tuck shops would be available at the site.
- 2.29 **Mrs Susanne WONG** responded that the C&WDO would work closely with the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) on site management.

Way forward

- 2.30 **Mrs Susanne WONG** said that the issue had been discussed at various meetings. The Government's objective was to provide a safe open space for public enjoyment as soon as possible. They would introduce new elements by diversifying the type of activities and events at the site.
- 2.31 **Miss Rosanne CHEUNG** supplemented that the Development Bureau would work with the Architectural Services Department to improve tile pattern at the site. Drinking fountains would be provided and connectivity to the site would also be improved in the long run.
- 2.32 **Sr Franis LAM** supported the Government to go ahead with the proposed basic infrastructure so that the site could be open for public use safely as soon as possible.
- 2.33 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** commented that the Government might take forward the proposal based on the majority view on the design and management model for the site.
- 2.34 **The Chair** invited the Government to explore suitable pilot projects and engage the community with new concepts on design and management.

Item 3 Enhancing the Design of Cycle Track within Waterfront Promenades (Paper No. TFHK/06/2018)

- 3.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives from DEVB, Atkins China Limited, Alta Global Operations and Hong Kong Cycling Alliance.

Introduction

- 3.2 **The Chair** informed the meeting that DEVB engaged Consultants to commence in 2017 a feasibility study to recommend an evaluation mechanism on identifying suitable design options for a shared-use cycle track along the harbourfront, as well as to put forward specific proposals for providing a continuous shared-use cycle track along the harbourfront from Sheung Wan to Sai Wan Ho.
- 3.3 **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** said that the Commission recognised cycling as an environmentally-friendly transport means and that cycle tracks could bring vibrancy to the waterfront. Different cycle track proposals had been made in the various district-based planning studies, including those for Central, Wan Chai, North Point and Island East. These proposed cycle tracks run along the waterfront from Central to North Point, and then towards Quarry Bay through the proposed boardwalk underneath the Island Eastern Corridor (IEC). These ideas also received general support from some District Councils within the harbourfront area. In view of these aspirations, DEVB engaged a Consultant to commence in 2017 a feasibility study –
- (i) to recommend an evaluation mechanism on identifying suitable design options for a shared-use cycle track along the harbourfront in Hong Kong; and
 - (ii) to put forward specific proposals for providing a continuous shared-use cycle track along the waterfront from Sheung Wan to Sai Wan Ho.
- 3.4 The Consultants had completed their overseas researches and had come up with a draft evaluation mechanism for Hong Kong.

Presentation by the Consultants

- 3.5 **Mr Jeffrey CHAN** brought Members through Atkins China Limited's findings, and **Mr Devon YOUNG** presented Atla Global Operations' evaluation and prioritisation methodology,

both with the aid of PowerPoints.

- 3.6 **Mr Martin TURNER** said that different end-users had different needs or expectations on the cycle track design along promenades. Some might wish to ride only a certain part of the cycle track or as a short transport means between two harbourfront destinations; some might ride along the whole length of the cycle track as a leisure or sports activity; and some might use the harbourfront cycle track to learn cycling. So the main point was to identify the target users and to strike a balance between enjoying the harbourfront by cycling and moving along it by cycling as a transport option. Another point was whether shared use would be considered in terms of space or responsibility. He believed there was no need to categorise people into pedestrian and cyclists who were the same people at different moment in time.

Discussion

Elevated solution

- 3.7 **The Chair** viewed that most people would find the elevated solution visually intrusive particularly along the harbourfront. **Mr Ivan HO** objected to the elevated solution which might screen off the harbourfront.
- 3.8 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** expressed that as long as the elevated highway is high enough, it would not block the harbourfront view from ground level.

Target users and shared use concept

- 3.9 **Sr Francis LAM** was worried that the harbourfront cycle track might be used by courier companies as a fast track to travel

between Sheung Wan and Sai Wan Ho.

- 3.10 **Dr NG Cho-nam, Ir Raymond CHAN, Mr LEUNG Kong-yui and Mr Anthony CHEUNG** shared that promenades should be used for leisure rather than for transport, and the priority of use should be given to pedestrians.
- 3.11 **Dr Eunice MAK** supported the idea of cycle track along the harbourfront. She was concerned about the potential conflicts among different users including pedestrians, commuters and cyclists, particularly at the narrow sections of the promenades.
- 3.12 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** suggested that a quota system on the number of bikes at the harbourfront cycle track at weekends and on public holidays might help alleviate the conflicts among users.

Tailor-made design

- 3.13 **Mr Ivan HO** expressed that the evaluation mechanism presented lacked urban design concept. **Dr Eunice MAK** and **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** asked the Consultants to study local examples and provide tailor-made shared-use design for the harbourfront.

Way forward

- 3.14 **Mr Devon YOUNG** responded that Members' comments would be taken on board and incorporate into the future study as appropriate.
- 3.15 **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** added that comments on urban design and visual impact would be taken into account when reviewing the evaluation mechanism. Overseas examples was just to deduce some relevant design options for reference. The Consultants would also look for local examples.

- 3.16 **The Chair** thanked DEVB and the Consultants for the presentation and invited them to update Members on the study progress in future.

Item 4 Any Other Business

Wan Chai Development Phase II

- 4.1 **Mr Wilson MA** reported that the works for Wan Chai Development Phase II project were being implemented in phases. Two works contracts had been completed in July 2013 and May 2016 respectively. Another two works contracts were on-going. Following completion of the reclamation works, the remaining works for the waterfront areas in Wan Chai North including underground utilities and services, paving blocks, emergency vehicular access, railings, landscape works, etc. were underway for completion in phases by early 2019 tentatively.
- 4.2 **The Chair** asked the Government to update Members in due course on the latest progress of implementing harbourfront enhancement projects along Wan Chai waterfront after the Wan Chai Development Phase II project had completed in early 2019.

Urban Design Study for the Wan Chai North and North Point Harbourfront Areas

- 4.3 **Mr Louis KAU** informed that the Study Team was following up on finalising the harbourfront enhancement proposals taking into account various comments from the public, the Harbourfront Commission and relevant Government departments. The Study Team was refining the implementation plan and working on the details on how to proceed with the implementation of the harbourfront enhancement proposals.

The Government's target was to complete the Study in 2018.

- 4.4 **Ms Doris HO** supplemented that the Study should be completed in 2018. The Government was working on the implementation details and design, and considering to organise design competitions to engage the public in the design process. In terms of Water Recreation Precinct, the Government was considering to outsource the management to a suitable water sports council. The Task Force would be briefed on the details at an appropriate time.
- 4.5 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** asked the Government to also brief Members on the latest progress of improving water quality at the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter and introducing wave attenuation at the former Cargo Working Area.

Proposed Boardwalk underneath the IEC

- 4.6 **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** said that taking into account the views collected during the Stage 2 Community Engagement Exercise (CE2), including comments of the Task Force and the Eastern District Council, the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) was working with relevant departments in revising the scheme of the Boardwalk in an attempt to meet the aspirations of different parties. In general, efforts were being made to place suitable parts of the Boardwalk under the IEC footprint. Meanwhile, the Government was studying carefully the legal implications of the proposals, including the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance. The Government planned to consult the Task Force in Q3 2018 before rolling out the Stage 3 Community Engagement Exercise (CE3).

Private Industrial Development at Hoi Yu Street in Quarry Bay

- 4.7 **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** informed that the case involved the construction of a proposed industrial building carried out by a

private lot owner in accordance with the building plans. These plans had been approved before the area concerned was rezoned from “Industrial” to “Other Specified Uses (Cultural and/or Commercial, Leisure and Tourism related Uses)”. Although the construction works were not in contravention of any town planning and building regulatory regimes or lease conditions, the Government had been communicating with the private lot owner to explore whether there would be an alternative development proposal which was more compatible with the current planning intention. The discussion was ongoing. As and when there was any substantive progress with the discussion, the Government would make a public announcement of the way forward and report to the Commission suitably.

Future Developments of Site 3 of the new Central Harbourfront

4.8 **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** briefed Members that Site 3 was one of the key sites under the “Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront”. It was zoned “Comprehensive Development Area” on the Draft Central District (Extension) Outline Zoning Plan. The Government was taking forward the preparatory work for the disposal of Site 3, including making suitable arrangement for reprovisioning the government facilities therein. The progress would be subject to the deliberations of other items by the LegCo Public Works Subcommittee. Another preparatory work was to authorize the necessary road works in accordance with the statutory requirements. The Lands Department had gazetted the road works in relation to the development of Site 3 in end 2017. The Government was trying to resolve the objections received. After completing these procedures, the site would be released for public land sale.

4.9 **The Chair** expressed that given the iconic location of the site, the Task Force had requested the Government to take into account the design elements during the land sale, rather than following the traditional land sale arrangements. He asked DEVB to take note of it. **Mr Ivan HO** and **Mr Paul**

ZIMMERMAN shared Chair's view.

- 4.10 **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** responded that in accordance with the approved planning brief, a list of urban design requirements had already been incorporated into the brief.
- 4.11 **Ms Doris HO** supplemented that design aspect could be partly addressed by the master layout plan submitted by the land developer in accordance with the approved planning brief which also included continuous landscape deck and public open space apart from commercial GFA.
- 4.12 **The Chair** suggested the Government considering putting the item in the agenda of the next Commission meeting.
- 4.13 There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 6:15 pm.

Secretariat

Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island

Harbourfront Commission

September 2018