

**Harbour Front Enhancement Committee  
Task Group on Urban Design Study  
for the New Central Harbourfront**

**Minutes of First Meeting**

Date : 6 December 2007  
Time : 9:00 a.m.  
Venue : Conference Room  
15/F, North Point Government Offices  
333 Java Road, North Point, Hong Kong

**Present**

Ir. Dr. Greg Wong (Chairman)	Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr. Roger Nissim	Business Environment Council
Professor S.C. Wong	Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Dr. Ng Mee-kam	Citizen Envisioning @ Harbour (CE@H)
Dr. Alvin Kwok	Conservancy Association
Mr. Kim Chan	Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Mr. Dennis Li	Society for Protection of the Harbour Ltd.
Mr. Jimmy Kwok	
Mr. Michael Hui	
Mr. Samuel Mok	
Mr. Derrick Pang	
Miss Amy Yuen	Principal Assistant Secretary (Planning & Lands) 2, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Ms. Sharon Ho	Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport) 5, Transport and Housing Bureau
Mr. Eric Fung	Chief Engineer/Hong Kong 1, Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr. Herbert Leung	Deputy Director (General), Lands Department
Miss Ophelia Wong	Deputy Director/District, Planning Department (PlanD)
Mr. Roy Li (Secretary)	Senior Town Planner/Special Duties 2, PlanD

**In Attendance**

Ms. Lydia Lam	Assistant Secretary (Planning) 3, DEVB
Mr. Raymond Chiu	Assistant Director/Special Duties, PlanD
Ms. Phyllis Li	Chief Town Planner/Special Duties, PlanD

**For Item 3**

Ms. Phyllis Li	Chief Town Planner/Special Duties, PlanD
Miss Faith Ng	CityU Professional Services Ltd. (CPS)
Mr. Kevin Manuel	CPS
Mr. Tony Yeung	Aedas Ltd. (Aedas)
Ms. Santafe Poon	Aedas

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr. Andy Leung	Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr. Charles Brooke	
Mr. Patrick Lau	

**Item 1 Election of Chairman**

**Action**

- 1.1 **The Secretary** welcomed all Members, representatives from bureaux/departments and the Consultants for attending the first meeting of the Task Group on Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (TGUDS) of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC).
  
- 1.2 **The Secretary** invited Members to make nomination for election of the Chairman of the TGUDS. **Mr. Jimmy Kwok** nominated **Ir. Dr. Greg Wong** to be the Chairman of the TGUDS, and **Professor S.C. Wong**, **Mr. Kim Chan** and **Mr. Michael Hui** seconded the nomination. As there was no other nomination, **Ir. Dr. Greg Wong** was elected Chairman of the TGUDS ipso facto.

- 1.3 **Ir. Dr. Greg Wong** thanked the support of Members and took up the chairmanship and the proceedings of the meeting.

**Item 2 Membership, Terms of Reference, and Tentative Meeting Schedule of the Task Group (Paper No. 1/2007)**

- 2.1 **The Chairman** referred Members to Paper No. 1/2007 and remarked that the Membership List at Annex A of the paper should be in order. The Chairman then sought Members' comments on the draft Terms of Reference (TOR) at Annex B of the paper.
- 2.2 **Dr. Alvin Kwok** said that the TGUDS had provided a platform for HEC to provide input to the Government on the Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (the Study). He remarked that the TGUDS should play a more proactive role in the Study than the general public. **Mr. Roger Nissim** said that it would be more meaningful if the TGUDS could put forward recommendations in addition to comments on the Study.
- 2.3 **Mr. Dennis Li** referred to the first paragraph of the draft TOR and suggested that the TGUDS should also provide input to the design and development of the new Central harbourfront.
- 2.4 **Miss Ophelia Wong** declared interest as she was the chairperson of the Steering Group for the Study. She said that the TGUDS was set up within HEC to provide input to the Study. Comments and advice from members would be very much appreciated. The TOR should also take into account the scope of the Study, which was for refinement of the existing urban design framework in the OZP.
- 2.5 **The Chairman** said that the Study was commissioned with certain study objectives and scope. PlanD had

completed the Stage 1 Public Engagement of the Study, while Stage 2 Public Engagement would be forthcoming. He said that it would be reasonable for the TGUDS to give advice and comments based on the study proposals, instead of deriving new plans and proposals which might deviate from the study objectives and scope.

- 2.6 **Dr. Alvin Kwok** agreed that the TGUDS was not tasked to carry out the Study. However, the TGUDS should take a more proactive role in advising the Government on the public engagement and the design and development of the area. He therefore suggested amending point (a) in the second paragraph of the draft TOR to read “Provide comments on the Study and formulate opinions on the design and development of the new Central harbourfront based on the findings of the Study”.
- 2.7 **Mr. Roger Nissim** said that the TGUDS should make recommendations to the Study, taking into account the findings of the public engagement activities, and that the TOR should be expanded to cover this aspect.
- 2.8 **Dr. Ng Mee-kam** suggested replacing the word “opinions” in Dr. Kwok’s proposed amendments with “views”, and swapping points (a) and (b) in the second paragraph of the draft TOR to accord importance to public engagement as raised by Mr. Nissim. She added that the TGUDS should be informed of the findings of the Stage 1 Public Engagement of the Study and how the controversial issues were being addressed before proceeding with the future tasks. She also suggested that the TOR should make reference to HEC’s Harbour Planning Principles (HPP) and Harbour Planning Guidelines (HPG).
- 2.9 **Professor S.C. Wong** said that the TOR should allow flexibility for deliberation of the TGUDS on the Study.

It would become more restrictive if the terms were written in a very specific rather than general terms. **Mr. Jimmy Kwok** remarked that the TGUDS would naturally follow HEC's HPP and HPG, and thus there was no need to specify them in the TOR of the TGUDS.

2.10 **Miss Ophelia Wong** said that CPS was still working on the Report on the Stage 1 Public Engagement and the findings would be reported to the TGUDS at the next meeting. She said that the TOR was meant to indicate the input of the TGUDS to the Government which might not be sequential, and the findings of the public engagement activities would be taken into consideration as well as the comments provided by Members on the Study. **Miss Ophelia Wong** suggested amending the TOR to read "Provide comments on the Study and formulate views on the design and development of the new Central harbourfront based on, inter alia, the findings of the Study and HEC's HPP and HPG". Members agreed to the proposed amendments.

2.11 As requested by **the Chairman, the Secretary** recapitulated the revised draft TOR as follows:

"To assist HEC in providing input to the Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (the Study).

Specifically, the Task Group will –

- (a) Advise on the public engagement strategy and activities to be organized for the Study;
- (b) Provide comments on the Study and formulate views on the design and development of the new Central harbourfront based on, inter alia, the findings of the Study and HEC's Harbour Planning Principles and Harbour Planning Guidelines; and
- (c) Report to HEC on its input to the Study on a

regular basis.”

- 2.12 The meeting agreed that the Membership and the revised Terms of Reference for the TGUDS could be submitted to the HEC for endorsement. **Secretary**

[Post-meeting Note: A slightly revised Terms of Reference as suggested by the Chairman on 13.12.2007 is attached at **Annex A.**] **All to Note**

- 2.13 **The Chairman** suggested that the TGUDS should hold meetings on a bi-monthly basis. **Miss Ophelia Wong** proposed that additional working meetings could be held on a need basis.

**Item 3 Study Progress and Work Plan for the Stage 2 Public Engagement (Paper No. 2/2007)**

**A. Background**

- 3.1 **The Chairman** asked **Ms Phyllis Li** to brief members on the Stage 1 Public Engagement and the background of the Study before she began with her powerpoint presentation. **Ms. Phyllis Li** said that that the Study was commissioned in late March 2007 as requested by the Town Planning Board (TPB) to refine the existing urban design framework for the new Central harbourfront and to prepare planning/design briefs for the key sites to guide future developments. Stage 1 Public Engagement for the Study was launched in early May 2007 and officially ended in end June 2007. The focus of the Stage 1 Public Engagement was to collect public views and suggestions on matters of general principles, such as urban design objectives/issues for the study area and sustainable design assessment framework, taking into consideration HEC’s HPP and HPG and TPB’s Vision Statement for Victoria Harbour. The Study also sought views on the major urban design considerations for the key sites, and possible locations

and design ideas for reconstructing the old Star Ferry Clock Tower and reassembling Queen's Pier.

- 3.2 **Ms. Phyllis Li** continued to say that the Stage 1 Public Engagement had included a Focus Group Workshop (FGW) for the participation of the relevant professional and academic institutions in the North Point Government Offices to facilitate more in-depth discussions. A Community Engagement Forum (CEF) was held in the Joint Professional Centre to collect views from the general public, relevant stakeholders and concern groups, and members of the relevant public and advisory bodies on the Study. In both events, members of TPB and HEC were invited to serve as facilitators in the group discussions. View collection forms were distributed through various channels to solicit public views. An exhibition on the Study was held in May to June 2007 at the new Star Ferry Pier, and a study website had been set up to help disseminate relevant information on the Study and to collect views. Public views received till September 2007 through different channels would be compiled into a report, which would be submitted to the TGUDS for consideration at the next meeting.
- 3.3 **Ms. Phyllis Li** said that taking into account the public views gathered from the Stage 1 Public Engagement, the existing urban design framework for the new Central harbourfront was being refined to address urban design issues such as pedestrian connectivity, historical link, design compatibility with the urban skyline, preservation of views to the ridgelines, etc. The design concepts for the key sites were also being examined. In addition, the outcome and design merits of the entries to the International Urban Planning and Design Competition organized by Designing Hong Kong for the new Central harbourfront were being reviewed and would also be taken into consideration. Design options at different locations for reconstructing the old Star

Ferry Clock Tower and reassembling Queen's Pier were being considered. She said that CPS would brief Members later at this meeting on the proposed work plan for the Stage 2 Public Engagement, which involved a variety of public engagement activities including a large-scale public exhibition to facilitate better public understanding of the proposals for the Study.

- 3.4 **The Chairman** asked whether Aedas had taken into consideration the findings of the Stage 1 Public Engagement in their preparation work for the Stage 2 Public Engagement. In response, **Ms. Phyllis Li** said that Aedas had taken into account the findings of the Stage 1 Public Engagement, as highlighted in Paper No. 2/2007, in deriving the study proposals for the Stage 2 Public Engagement. The study proposals would contain design options for public consultation. She said that the Stage 1 Public Engagement Report would be submitted to TGUDS for consideration prior to the commencement of the Stage 2 Public Engagement.
- 3.5 **The Chairman** asked whether the TGUDS should consider the Stage 1 Public Engagement Report first before discussing the Work Plan for the Stage 2 Public Engagement. **Dr. Ng Mee-kam** said that the outcome of the Stage 1 Public Engagement would have a bearing to planning for the future public engagement exercise. **Dr. Alvin Kwok** said that according to past experience, the booking of venues and other logistic arrangements would take time. The delay in the consideration of the Work Plan would adversely affect the preparation work for the Stage 2 Public Engagement. He said that it was important for Aedas to give full consideration to the public views collected during the Stage 1 Public Engagement organized by CPS. **Mr. Jimmy Kwok** said that the meeting should discuss the Work Plan as set out in the agenda.
- 3.6 **Miss Ophelia Wong** said that it would be desirable to



seek the advice and comments from the TGUDS as soon as possible to facilitate the preparation work for the Stage 2 Public Engagement, especially with regard to the booking of venues and other logistic arrangements. She said that the Stage 1 Public Engagement Report, together with explanation on the study proposals and how they had taken into consideration the public views, would be submitted to the TGUDS at the following meeting. She added that this would allow the Consultants to have sufficient preparation for the presentation.

- 3.7 Upon the Chairman's enquiry, **Miss Faith Ng** said that the main findings of the Stage 1 Public Engagement were highlighted in paragraph 4 of Paper No. 2/2007. She said that the opinions collected in the Stage 1 Public Engagement were diverse. While the opinions on the urban design objectives/issues, sustainable design criteria, and the major urban design considerations for the key sites were less controversial and differences in opinions were mainly on the priority order of various criteria and considerations, there were diverse public views on the arrangements for reassembling Queen's Pier and reconstructing the old Star Ferry Clock Tower. For both, some preferred locating them at their original locations, while some suggested other locations away from Central or no reassembly/reconstruction at all. There was also some support for reassembling Queen's Pier at a waterfront location and with the marine function revived, and for locating the reconstructed Star Ferry Clock Tower at the new Central waterfront to create a visual linkage between the harbour and the city. She said that CPS was compiling the Report on the Stage 1 Public Engagement and would report to the TGUDS at the next meeting.
- 3.8 **Dr. Ng Mee-kam** commented that information provided in paragraph 4 of the Paper was very brief. She also asked whether the Stage 1 Public Engagement Report

would include the findings of the workshop on the Central harbourfront organized by CE@H. **Miss Ophelia Wong** clarified that CE@H's report had been passed to Aedas for consideration at the commencement of the Study in late March 2007, and that the Stage 1 Public Engagement Report would not cover CE@H's report as it was submitted before the Stage 1 Public Engagement.

- 3.9 In answering the Chairman's question on the coordination between the two consultants, **Ms. Santafe Poon** said that the study team of Aedas had attended all the activities and consultation sessions organized for the Stage 1 Public Engagement and had been working closely with CPS in soliciting the public views on design related matters concerning the new Central harbourfront. She said that Aedas had obtained CE@H's report at the commencement of the Study. In addition, public views collected from different channels and the findings of the Stage 1 Public Engagement based on the analyses of both CPS and Aedas itself would be taken into consideration in deriving the study proposals/design options for the Stage 2 Public Engagement.
- 3.10 **Miss Amy Yuen** said that while the TGUDS would consider the Work Plan for the Stage 2 Public Engagement at this meeting, separate working meetings could be arranged as necessary for discussion on the study proposals. As those were still being finalized, it would not be appropriate to open such meetings to the public.
- 3.11 **Mr. Kim Chan** suggested that the Work Plan for the Stage 2 Public Engagement should be considered first to facilitate preparation work, in particular for the booking of venues, while the details of the study proposals could be examined at the future meeting.

## **B. Consultants' Presentation and Members' Comments**

- 3.12 Upon the Chairman's invitation, **Miss Faith Ng** briefed Members on the Work Plan for the Stage 2 Public Engagement as detailed in the Paper with the aid of a powerpoint presentation.
- 3.13 **Mr. Dennis Li** remarked that there were eight key sites in the study area and enquired how the Consultants would ensure receiving public comments on all the eight sites.
- 3.14 **Miss Faith Ng** said that public views had been sought on the major urban design considerations for the eight sites during the Stage 1 Public Engagement, and such views were consolidated in the public engagement report. **Ms. Phyllis Li** added that taking into consideration the public views, Aedas would formulate study proposals for individual sites and illustrate the proposals with physical models and other illustrative materials for public consultation. The public would be provided with the details, and comment cards would be distributed to collect public views on individual sites.
- 3.15 **Dr. Alvin Kwok** said that the Stage 2 Public Engagement should keep its focus and avoid reverting back to issues previously raised, especially for those participants who had been engaged in the Stage 1 Public Engagement. In response, **Miss Faith Ng** said that the situation would be avoided as the public would be informed of the findings of the Stage 1 Public Engagement. **The Chairman** remarked that the Consultant should consider means to avoid the public from repeating views as collected in Stage 1, and public views taken or not taken on board should be clarified at the outset of the Stage 2 Public Engagement.
- 3.16 **Dr. Ng Mee-kam** said that whether the public would reiterate their views would depend very much on the

public acceptance of the findings of the Stage 1 Public Engagement presented by the Consultant. **Mr. Kim Chan** said that it should be clearly explained to the public that the study proposals for the Stage 2 Public Engagement had already taken consideration of the public views previously collected for the Study.

3.17 **Miss Ophelia Wong** said that the focus of the Stage 1 Public Engagement was on issues relating to general urban design principles. Noting the diverse views obtained, different design concepts for the key sites, illustrated by physical models, would be proposed for public consultation with an aim to building consensus.

3.18 **The Chairman** asked whether any controversies were noted from the Stage 1 Public Engagement on the development parameters of the key sites. **Ms. Phyllis Li** replied that the urban design objectives/issues identified during the Stage 1 Public Engagement were not controversial. Heritage conservation was considered relatively more important at the CEF. She said that the public generally preferred lowering the development intensity and breaking up building footprint for the waterfront developments. She added that the study proposals would be based on the majority public views, and explanation would be provided to the public on why some public views could not be accommodated.

3.19 **Mr. Kim Chan** noted that the public exhibition would be held on Hong Kong Island and Kowloon, and asked whether venues in other areas would be considered. **Miss Faith Ng** explained that the exhibition venues would be concentrated around the study area as well as Kowloon. She said that the public engagement events would be widely publicized to the general public, through various advertising channels.

3.20 **The Chairman** asked whether API would be used for

publicity. In response, **Ms. Phyllis Li** said that the use of API would be considered and was being arranged.

- 3.21 **Dr. Ng Mee-kam** suggested that emails could also be used to promulgate the public engagement events. She asked whether the second CEF (CEF 2) would be held as a closing public engagement event for the Stage 2 Public Engagement, and the time table for the various events proposed. In response, **Ms. Phyllis Li** said that the website for the Study would also be used to promulgate the events. She explained that the large-scale public exhibition would mark the launch of the Stage 2 Public Engagement, and roving exhibitions would be held at various venues to supplement. The first CEF (CEF 1) would be to facilitate explanation and exchange of views on the study proposals, while CEF 2 would be held at the end of the Stage 2 Public Engagement to consolidate the public views received and to facilitate another round of consensus building. Opinion surveys and consultation with the relevant advisory bodies would be held in parallel with the public engagement activities.
- 3.22 **The Chairman** asked whether the TGUDS would be involved in consulting the DCs on the Study, and whether CEF 2 would be held after consulting all the relevant DCs. **Miss Ophelia Wong** said that similar to the Kai Tak experience, interested members of the TGUDS would be welcomed to accompany the study team in the DC consultation. She said that CEF 2 would be held after all the consultation sessions with DC and LegCo.
- 3.23 **Mr. Roger Nissim** said that the public might be suffering from consultation fatigue and there had been various proposals relating to the new Central harbourfront. He noted that Designing Hong Kong had earlier held a public exhibition for the International Urban Planning and Design Competition. He

suggested placing the models of the Competition together with those for the Study. **The Chairman** remarked that he had reservation on the suggestion as the design proposals in some of the entries were rather conceptual and might not be able to comply with the relevant ordinances and regulations.

- 3.24 **Miss Ophelia Wong** said that the Consultant had examined the design merits of the entries and proposed incorporating them in the design options to be submitted to the TGUDS for consideration at the next meeting. She shared the Chairman's view that some of the proposals in the Competition might not be implementable, and she considered it not appropriate to include the models in the exhibition for public engagement.
- 3.25 **Professor S.C. Wong** said that the proposals of the winning entries of the Competition were quite innovative but rather conceptual and might not be technically feasible. While there were merits in making reference to them, he had reservation in exhibiting the models from the Competition as this might confuse the public.
- 3.26 **Mr. Roger Nissim** said that the public should be explained as to what were feasible and what were not in the proposals put forward in the Competition. **Dr. Ng Mee-kam** said there should be a platform for the public to appreciate different proposals.
- 3.27 **Miss Ophelia Wong** said that instead of providing critiques on the entries to the Competition, it would be more positive to highlight the design merits of the entries and how they had been taken into consideration in the design proposals. She understood that the Jury of the Competition had put more weighting on innovation. For the proposals in the Study, they would guide the development of the sites and should be

implementable.

- 3.28 **Dr. Ng Mee-kam** said that in evaluating the proposals, reference should be made to HEC's HPP and HPG. She then asked about how the proposed 3D interactive computer model to be installed at the public exhibition would operate.
- 3.29 **Ms. Phyllis Li** said that the 3D interactive computer models would allow viewers/players to visualize animation clips and the combination of different design options within the study area. However, there would not be unlimited choice of options.
- 3.30 **Mr. Michael Hui** suggested that teenagers and school children should be encouraged to join the public engagement events. In response, **Ms. Phyllis Li** said that guided tour could be arranged for schools.
- 3.31 **Dr. Alvin Kwok** asked whether the 3D interactive computer model could form part of the opinion survey on the preferred options. In response, **Ms. Phyllis Li** said that the visitors to the public exhibition would be invited to fill in the comment cards on their preferred options.
- 3.32 **Dr. Alvin Kwok** said that Central Piers could be a good venue for the public exhibition. In response, **Miss Ophelia Wong** said that in view of the weather condition in March, indoor venues would be better. **The Chairman** suggested that IFC and Landmark could be possible venues which were covered and had maximum exposure to visitors. **Mr. Roger Nissim** suggested that the Harbour Business Forum could be approached for providing venues in commercial buildings in and around Central, similar to the exhibition venues of the Competition.

## **C. Conclusion**

3.33 Members generally agreed to the Work Plan for the Stage 2 Public Engagement and the proposed events and activities.

3.34 **The Chairman** concluded that the study team should brief the TGUDS at the next meeting on the findings of the Stage 1 Public Engagement, how the study proposals would take into consideration the findings of the Stage 1 Public Engagement. The TGUDS also noted that the study consultant was also reviewing the submissions of the four finalists in the International Urban Planning and Design Competition for the new Central harbourfront organized by Designing Hong Kong and requested the study consultant to report on the useful ideas for input to the Study.

**PlanD and  
Consultants**

## **Item 4 Any Other Business**

4.1 **The Chairman** suggested that Members could give some more thoughts on the role of the TGUDS and exchange views again at the next meeting.

4.2 **The Chairman** requested **the Secretary** to schedule the next meeting for January 2008 and inform Members in due course.

**Secretary**

4.3 There being no other business, the meeting closed at 11:40 am.

**HEC Task Group on Urban Design Study  
for the New Central Harbourfront  
December 2007**



**Harbour-front Enhancement Committee**  
**Task Group on Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront**  
**Terms of Reference**  
*(suggested amendments by the Chairman are highlighted in bold italics)*

To assist HEC in providing input to the Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (the Study).

Specifically, the Task Group will –

- (a) Advise ***the Government*** on the public engagement strategy and activities to be organized for the Study;
- (b) Provide comments on the Study and formulate views on the design and development of the new Central harbourfront based on, inter alia, the findings of the Study and HEC's Harbour Planning Principles and Harbour Planning Guidelines; and
- (c) Report to HEC on ***the input of the Task Group*** to the Study on a regular basis.

**共建維港委員會**  
**中環新海濱城市設計研究專責小組**  
**職權範圍**

協助共建維港委員會就中環新海濱城市設計研究(該研究)提供意見。

專責小組的具體任務包括 –

- (a) 就該研究所籌備的公眾參與策略及活動**向政府**提供意見;
- (b) 按該研究的結果及共建維港委員會發表的海港規劃原則及指引等考慮,就該研究提供意見及就中環新海濱的設計及發展方面表達看法; 以及
- (c) 定期就專責小組對該研究所提出的意見,向共建維港委員會作出匯報。