

Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront

Results of Stage 2 Public Engagement

1. Background

1.1 The Stage 2 Public Engagement for the “Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (the Study)” was conducted from 11 April to end-July 2008. Public views and suggestions were collected through various public engagement activities including public exhibitions, roving exhibitions, focus group workshop (FGW), community engagement forum (CEF), comment cards, interview questionnaires, telephone polls, and briefings to relevant public and advisory bodies, and the 18 District Councils (DCs). The public was also invited to send in their written comments.

1.2 The focus of the Stage 2 Public Engagement was to collect public views and suggestions on, inter alia, the proposed urban design vision and refined urban design framework for the new Central harbourfront as well as the design concepts for the key sites, including the design concepts for re-assembling Queen’s Pier and reconstructing the old Star Ferry Clock Tower.

2. Highlights of the Stage 2 Public Engagement

2.1 A Consultation Digest detailing the design proposals was distributed to the public through various channels. A wide range of public engagement activities was held as follows:

- two public exhibitions (with 13,700 visitors);
- seven roving exhibitions (with 11,340 visitors);
- FGW (attended by 49 participants from relevant professional groups and academic institutions) and CEF (attended by 142 participants from the general public) organized by CityU Professional Services Ltd; and
- guided tours for 7 schools and 2 interested organizations.

2.2. Other than the above, the Public Policy Research Institute of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University (PPRI) was commissioned to collect public opinions through different sources:

- 1,872 comment cards were collected;
- 365 valid face-to-face interviews were completed at the public exhibition venues; and
- 2,471 successful telephone interviews were conducted.

2.3 A total of 64 written submissions were received from various organizations and individuals. A list of these submissions is at **Appendix A**. The submissions have been uploaded to the study web-site at:

http://www.pland.gov.hk/p_study/prog_s/UDS/eng_v1/comments_eng.htm

2.4 Briefings were provided to all 18 DCs, relevant public and advisory bodies, interested professional groups and organizations. A list of the briefings conducted is at **Appendix B**.

3. Overall Findings on the Public Opinions

3.1 **Quantitative data analyses** were performed on the responses to the close-ended questions in the comment cards, face-to-face interviews, telephone polls and quantitative data recorded in the FGW and CEF, whereas **qualitative data analyses** were performed on any other comments and suggestions raised in the comment cards and face-to-face interviews, the FGW, the CEF, the written submissions, and records of briefings to the relevant public and advisory bodies and 18 DCs. By transcribing and coding the qualitative data into a total of 10,203 **text units** (i.e. a sentence or a group of sentences expressing a particular view), PPRI has triangulated the findings of **both** quantitative and qualitative findings from different sources to outline the main profiles of public opinions obtained.

3.2 Overall speaking, the results from the responses to the close-ended questions of the comment cards, face-to-face interviews and telephone polls generally corroborated with one another for most of the issues. The number of positive comments from the qualitative data, in terms of the number of text units, on the various themes also supported the results from the quantitative data in most of the issues. A summary of the findings is set

out below.

Overall Design Vision

3.3 There was an overwhelming support for the overall design vision of creating a vibrant, green and accessible new Central harbourfront. Based on the quantitative findings, the respondents/participants of the following agreed or strongly agreed to the overall design vision:

Comment cards	84%
Face-to-face interviews	90%
Telephone polls	81%
FGW	100%
CEF	90%

3.4 About 59% of the relevant views recorded in the qualitative analysis were considered positive. The majority views were that the overall design vision of creating a vibrant, green and accessible new Central harbourfront was generally supported and the reduced development intensity proposed in the refined urban design framework was generally appreciated. Some members of the public considered that the design vision lacked a distinctive identity and mix of uses.

Sustainable and Balanced Approach

3.5 There was general support for adopting a sustainable and balanced approach in designing the new Central harbourfront. The quantitative data shows that the majority of the respondents/participants agreed or strongly agreed to the sustainable and balanced approach:

Comment cards	79%
Face-to-face interviews	85%
Telephone polls	74%
FGW	100%
CEF	81%

3.6 About 59% of the relevant views recorded in the qualitative analysis were considered positive. The public was generally in agreement with the sustainable and balanced approach in designing the new Central harbourfront, including some who considered that the design was

multi-functional and fit well with the surrounding environment. The DCs consulted generally considered that the proposals should cater for the development of the Central Business District (CBD) while giving consideration to lowering development intensity, promoting greening, and providing abundant quality open space and facilities for the public. Some members of the public considered it more appropriate to concentrate commercial development in the CBD while others preferred more open space and recreational facilities.

The Refined Urban Design Framework

3.7 The following data presents the percentages of the respondents/participants who agreed or strongly agreed that the refined urban design framework has satisfied the following sustainable design principles:

Sustainable design principles	Comment cards	Face-to-face interviews	FGW	CEF
(i) Diverse uses and activities	63%	77%	80%	59%
(ii) Respecting natural setting	73%	72%	73%	60%
(iii) Respecting existing urban fabric	60%	64%	58%	43% ¹
(iv) Promoting harbourfront enhancement	74%	85%	81%	81%
(v) Respecting cultural heritage	56%	55%	44% ²	36% ³
(vi) Ease of pedestrian access to harbourfront	71%	78%	44% ⁴	52%
(vii) Promoting Greening and Environmentally Friendly Building Design	77%	79%	47% ⁵	58%

¹ For the CEF, about 29% of the participants disagreed or strongly disagreed, and about 28% adopted a neutral stance.

² For the FGW, about 12% of the participants disagreed or strongly disagreed, and about 43% adopted a neutral stance.

³ For the CEF, about 31% of the participants disagreed or strongly disagreed, and about 33% adopted a neutral stance.

⁴ For the FGW, about 24% of the participants disagreed or strongly disagreed, and about 31% adopted a neutral stance.

⁵ For the FGW, about 47% of the participants disagreed or strongly disagreed, and about 7% adopted a neutral stance.

3.8 The data sets show that the majority agreed that the refined urban design framework has generally satisfied the sustainable design principles. Nevertheless, there were relatively lower levels of majority agreement (slightly less than 50%) in the FGW that the refined urban design framework has satisfied the principle of “promoting greening and environmentally friendly building design”, “respecting cultural heritage” and “ease of pedestrian access to harbourfront”.

3.9 The majority of the respondents/participants agreed or strongly agreed that the refined urban design framework has met the public aspirations for a vibrant, green and accessible new Central harbourfront:

Comment cards	54%
Face-to-face interviews	57%
FGW	81%
CEF	51%

3.10 About 35% of the relevant views recorded in the qualitative analysis were considered positive, 25% negative, and 40% were neither positive nor negative but making other views and suggestions (such as further scope for improvement in terms of vibrancy, place-making and suggestions on detailed design aspects).

Design Concepts for Key Sites (Figure 1)

Sites 1 and 2

(CDA Site adjoining Central Piers No. 4 to 6 and Commercial Site north of International Finance Centre (IFC) II)

3.11 The proposed design concepts for Sites 1 and 2 were generally supported, particularly as shown in the quantitative findings of the comment cards and face-to-face interviews. However, about half of the participants in the FGW disliked both Concept A (Hotel & Office) and Concept B (Office & Office) and about another half preferred Concept A, or Concept B, or liked both concepts. For those who had chosen between Concepts A and B, there was a clear preference for Concept A as compared to Concept B:

	Like both concepts	Prefer Concept A	Prefer Concept B	No preference	Dislike both concepts
Comment cards	9%	54%	13%	6%	14%
Face-to-face interviews	4%	59%	9%	11%	16%
Telephone polls	6%	31%	10%	29%	20%
FGW	14%	31%	2%	0%	53%
CEF	2%	37%	10%	18%	33%

3.12 About 84% of the relevant positive views recorded in the qualitative analysis were related to Concept A, while about 16% were related to Concept B. The supportive views were that commercial development at the sites was needed, the development intensity was acceptable, and the design was attractive. The negative views were related to the hotel and office buildings at the sites, in particular Site 1, for blocking views, obstructing air flow or pedestrian circulation, or not giving recognition to the adjacent iconic building of IFC II.

Site 3

(CDA site north of Statue Square)

3.13 The proposed design concepts for Site 3 were generally supported. There was more support for Concept B (Larger Landscaped Deck) as compared to Concept A (Reduced Landscaped Deck), though the preference was not clear in the face-to-face interviews and FGW:

	Like both concepts	Prefer Concept A	Prefer Concept B	No preference	Dislike both concepts
Comment cards	8%	22%	57%	4%	5%
Face-to-face interviews	2%	42%	42%	11%	3%
FGW	0%	49% ⁶	49%	3%	0%
CEF	4%	33%	53%	6%	5%

⁶ For the FGW, about 49% of the responding participants (i.e. 19 out of 39 participants) preferred Concept A. Among them, 12 showed a clear preference for Concept A while 7 qualified that they preferred Concept A subject to further improvement to the at-grade pedestrian connection.

3.14 About 53% of the relevant positive views recorded in the qualitative analysis were related to Concept B, while about 47% were related to Concept A. The proposed reduction in building density, the breaking up of the site into smaller footprints, the provision of multi-level links for pedestrian choice, the provision of landscaped decks and open spaces, and the provision of retail facilities at the site were generally supported. The negative views were generally related to the design of the landscaped deck and the lack of street-level activities.

Site 4
(Site north of City Hall)

3.15 The design concepts had received general support. Most responses in the comment cards, face-to-face interviews, and CEF were in favour of Concept A (More Separate Blocks with Star Ferry Clock Tower) as compared to Concept B (Fewer Separate Blocks without Star Ferry Clock Tower). On the other hand, Concept B was preferred in the FGW.

	Like both concepts	Prefer Concept A	Prefer Concept B	No preference	Dislike both concepts
Comment cards	7%	43%	33%	7%	6%
Face-to-face interviews	1%	53%	31%	9%	6%
FGW	26%	13%	38%	3%	21%
CEF	1%	32%	15%	33%	20%

3.16 About 63% of the relevant positive views recorded in the qualitative analysis were related to Concept A, and 37% were related to Concept B. The small and separate blocks with open vista in the design concepts were generally supported. The negative views were mainly related to whether the proposed building would match with City Hall and whether the small blocks would likely attract tenants.

Sites 5 and 6

(Site north of CITIC Tower and near the HKCEC Extension)

3.17 For Sites 5 and 6, the majority of the respondents/participants liked the design concepts for the sites:

Site 5

Comment cards	66%
Face-to-face interviews	73%
FGW	82%
CEF	76%

Site 6

Comment cards	79%
Face-to-face interviews	66%
FGW	86%
CEF	73%

3.18 For Sites 5 and 6, about 55% and 58% of the relevant views recorded respectively in the qualitative analysis were positive. The proposed arts and cultural facilities at the sites were generally supported. There were concerns on the possible duplication of such facilities with those in West Kowloon. There were suggestions for further improvement to the accessibility and vibrancy of the area (e.g. providing retail bridges or wider landscaped walkways and areas for street performance). Some considered that the massing was too bulky.

Site 7

(Waterfront Promenade)

3.19 The proposed design concepts were generally supported. The majority of the responses in the comment cards, face-to-face interviews, and telephone polls were in favour of Concept B (Urban Green), while more participants in the FGW and CEF were in favour of Concept A (Urban Park).

	Like both concepts	Prefer Concept A	Prefer Concept B	No preference	Dislike both concepts
Comment cards	15%	26%	47%	5%	3%
Face-to-face interviews	4%	28%	60%	4%	4%
Telephone polls	16%	21%	45%	14%	2%
FGW	21%	31%	5%	33%	10%
CEF	8%	47%	31%	3%	12%

3.20 The majority (i.e. about 68%) of the relevant positive views in the qualitative analysis were related to Concept B, while about 32% were related to Concept A. There were positive views on the design concepts which were considered to be commendable and having their own special characters. The negative views were mainly relating to the design and themes of the proposed promenade.

Re-assembling Queen's Pier and Site 8

3.21 The majority of the responses in the comment cards, face-to-face interviews, and CEF were in favour of Concept A (Queen's Pier by the Harbour). There was also clear support from the DCs for Concept A in that 16 out of the 18 DCs consulted have passed motions in support of, inter alia, re-assembling Queen's Pier at the harbourfront for public use. The views of FGW were diverse. While more responses were in favour of Concept B (Queen's Pier at Original Location), there were also many views which liked both concepts, liked Concept A, or had no preference. For the telephone polls, there was quite an even distribution among those who preferred Concept A, those who preferred Concept B, and those with no preference. The findings are as follows:

	Like both concepts	Prefer Concept A	Prefer Concept B	No preference	Dislike both concepts
Comment cards	7%	49%	27%	5%	7%
Face-to-face interviews	1%	58%	26%	7%	9%
Telephone polls	10%	27%	27%	27%	6%
FGW	20%	16%	39%	16%	8%
CEF	1%	55%	25%	13%	6%

3.22 About 61% of the relevant positive views recorded in the qualitative analysis were related to Concept A, while about 39% were related to Concept B. Positive views on each of the proposed design concepts included Concept A could revive the pier function of Queen’s Pier and the design was symmetrical, while Concept B could respect the historical significance of Queen’s Pier and its spatial relationship with Edinburgh Place and City Hall. On the other hand, there were concerns about the time and resources implications for re-assembling the pier. A small number of respondents advocated no reassembly of Queen’s Pier at all.

Reconstructing Old Star Ferry Clock Tower

3.23 There was a general support for the proposed design concepts, but there was no obvious convergence of views on their preference. More responses in the comment cards and CEF liked Concept A (Clock Tower at Site 4), while more responses in the face-to-face interviews, telephone polls, and FGW liked Concept B (Clock Tower close to Original Location). The findings are summarized as follows:

	Like both concepts	Prefer Concept A	Prefer Concept B	No preference	Dislike both concepts
Comment cards	6%	49%	22%	8%	11%
Face-to-face interviews	1%	29%	42%	15%	13%
Telephone polls	7%	23%	39%	23%	4%
FGW	0%	13%	56%	26%	5%
CEF	4%	42%	16%	10%	27%

3.24 The relevant positive views in the qualitative analysis were quite evenly distributed between Concepts A and B. About 49% of the relevant positive views recorded in the qualitative analysis were related to Concept A, while 51% were related to Concept B. The design concept for turning the old Star Ferry Clock Tower as a focal point and maintaining an axial relationship with City Hall and the re-assembled Queen’s Pier was generally supported. There were however views that there was no need to reconstruct the Clock Tower and that the design did not match with the surrounding environment.

Other Issues

3.25 Other issues that were raised in many of the comments received included sustainable building design, greening, provision of eco-friendly facilities, concerns on roads and pedestrian access, a tree-lined boulevard along Road P2, provision of more multi-purpose facilities, the public engagement process for the Study, harbour reclamation, proposals for cycling tracks or other environmentally friendly transport modes, and management of the harbourfront development.

4. Written Submissions

4.1 Diverse views were expressed in the 64 written submissions. Alternative proposals were made in some of the submissions such as those from the Hong Kong Urban Design Alliance (HKUDA), Retail Development Consultants (RDC), IFC Development Ltd, Paul Zimmerman

and other individuals.

4.2 Major views and suggestions raised in the written submissions were:

- (a) The proposed urban design vision and sustainable design approach were generally agreed by the professional institutes (e.g. HKIE, HKIS, and HKIA). Some (e.g. Civic Party, Society for Protection of the Harbour, Designing Hong Kong (DHK), and IFC Development Ltd.) opined that the scope of the UDS should not be limited by the existing OZP planning framework. Some suggested enhancing vibrancy, redistributing GFA to achieve harmonized design at the waterfront, better land-water interface, providing more at-grade pedestrian links and wider landscaped decks, providing tram lines and cycle tracks along the waterfront promenade, reducing the width of Road P2, achieving better defined open spaces, promoting environmentally-friendly building design, introducing greening ratio, and ensuring effective implementation mechanisms.

- (b) Sites 1 and 2: Some (e.g. Margaret and Nicholas Brooke, DHK, MTRC, HKIS, Conservancy Association (CA), Democratic Party (DP), Harbour Business Forum (HBF), IFC Development Ltd, and Action Group on Protection of the Harbour (AGPH)) opposed to hotel and office blocks at the sites, especially Site 1, for blocking views, obstructing the waterfront, or not giving recognition to the adjacent IFC II which is an icon building; and suggested deleting the hotel and office altogether, changing to low-rise, transferring the GFA to Site 5 or other sites, or reducing the GFA. HKIA and HKIP also requested the hotel building at Site 1 be reviewed. HKIP supported the hotel use but also suggested to transfer the GFA to Site 5 or other sites. Nevertheless, the British Chamber of Commerce in Hong Kong (BCC) supported office development at the sites to alleviate the pent-up demand in the CBD. There were also suggestions for providing wider footbridges, removing the bus terminus, and allowing additional floors at the Central Piers for more commercial activities to help cross-subsidize the operating cost of the ferry services (e.g. Miriam Lau, HK Resort Co Ltd, DHK, and HBF).

- (c) Site 3: The proposed reduction of building density and separate building blocks were generally supported. Some (e.g. Save Our Shorelines (SOS) and DHK) preferred Concept A (Reduced Landscaped Deck) and called for a review of the required road space, improving the at-grade pedestrian linkages, and enhancing street level visibility. Concept B (Larger Landscaped Deck) was preferred by HKIE, HKIS, BCC and some individuals.
- (d) Site 4 and Reconstructing the Old Star Ferry Clock Tower: There were different views on the preferred design concepts. Those who preferred Concept A (More Separate Blocks with Star Ferry Clock Tower) (e.g. HKIE and HKIS) supported the concept of reinstating the Clock Tower as a focal point. For those who preferred Concept B (Clock Tower close to the Original Location) (e.g. Margaret and Nicholas Brooke, DP, AGPH, and HKIA), some commented that the Clock Tower should not be reconstructed in isolation. Some individuals considered that there was no need for reconstructing the Clock Tower. In addition, HKIS and BCC had commented on the need to ensure economic viability of the proposed floor space, and HKIP had commented on further enhancing the view corridors and accessibility.
- (e) Sites 5 and 6: The design concept for the Arts and Cultural Precinct was supported by HKIE, HKIS, SOS, etc. There were suggestions for enhancing accessibility and vibrancy, provision of water-based activities such as Maritime Museum, and including hotel uses in the area (e.g Margaret and Nicholas Brooke).
- (f) Site 7: While there were different views on the preferred design concepts, some (e.g. SOS and HKIE) suggested a hybrid concept incorporating the design merits of both Concepts A and B (i.e. Urban Park and Urban Green). There were also suggestions for providing the PLA berth offshore.
- (g) Re-assembling Queen's Pier and Site 8: HKIE, HKIS and several individuals preferred Concept A (Queen's Pier by the

Harbour) so as to revive its pier functions. Quite a number of submissions (e.g. Margaret and Nicholas Brooke, Civic Party, Green Sense, DHK, CA, DP, AGPH, Local Action, and HKIA) preferred Concept B (Queen's Pier at the Original Location) to achieve an integrated design with City Hall and Edinburgh Place. HKIP indicated that a majority of the responses to their survey preferred Concept B.

- End -

Appendix A

Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront Stage 2 Public Engagement

List of Written Submissions

No.	Individuals/Organizations	Date of Submission
1	Doris Liu	11.4.2008
2	Tammie Chan	12.4.2008
3	Tay Wing Kit, Paul	12.4.2008
4	Icy Hung	13.4.2008
5	Eric Kwan	15.4.2008
6	Richard Ho	9.5.2008
7	Lam Tsz Leung	15.5.2008
8	Suet (signature illegible)	19.5.2008
9	Jacqueline Wong	20.5.2008
10	Hong Kong Cycling Information Net, The Hong Kong Cycling Alliance and Ho Loy	20.5.2008
11	Cheung Chau Bela Vista Villa Owners' Incorporation (Kwok Cheuk Kin)	21.5.2008
12	Margaret and Nicholas Brooke	28.5.2008
13	Peter Wood	6.6.2008
14	Wilson Chao	9.6.2008
15	Dakota Smith	10.6.2008
16	Save Our Shorelines (John Bowden)	23.6.2008
17	The Hong Kong Institution of Engineers (Ir Dr Lo Wai Kwok)	26.6.2008
18	Angela Spaxman	26.6.2008
19	Yu Kin Chun	27.6.2008
20	Wong Sai Kit	28.6.2008
21	Eric Larson	1.7.2008
22	Lau Kin-Yee, Miriam (Legislative Councillor)	2.7.2008
23	MTR Corporation Ltd (Steve Yiu)	4.7.2008
24	Society for Protection of the Harbour (Christine Loh)	4.7.2008
25	Raymond Tam	7.7.2008
26	Trevor Lu	8.7.2008

No.	Individuals/Organizations	Date of Submission
27	Hong Kong Resort Company Limited (Wilson Cheung)	8.7.2008
28	Centre for Environmental Policy and Resource Management, Department of Geography and Resource Management, The Chinese University of Hong Kong (Dr. Joanna Lee)	8.7.2008
29	Lo Shing Kai	9.7.2008
30	The Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors (Yu Kam Hung)	9.7.2008
31	Civic Party	9.7.2008
32	Chan Ka Hon	9.7.2008
33	Green Sense (Roy Tam)	10.7.2008
34	Paul Zimmerman (Report on the 'Make the Central Waterfront Everyone's Favourite Destination' Public Workshop)	9.7.2008
35	Nomometric Design and Planning Consultants Ltd (Richard Yu)	10.7.2008
36	The Conservancy Association	10.7.2008
37	Shu Lok Shing	10.7.2008
38	Hongkong Land Ltd (Y.K. Pang)	10.7.2008
39	Democratic Party, C&WDC Councillors (Kam Nai Wai, Wong Kin Shing, Yuen Bun Keung, Ho Chun Ki, Yeung Sui Yin and Cheng Lai King)	10.7.2008
40	Chow Mung Har	10.7.2008
41	Action Group on Protection of the Harbour (Cheng Lai King)	10.7.2008
42	Designing Hong Kong Ltd (Paul Zimmerman)	10.7.2008
43	Local Action (Chen Yun Chung, Szeto May and Ip Lam Chong)	10.7.2008
44	Kam Nai Wai (Democratic Party, C&WDC Councillor)	10.7.2008
45	The Hong Kong Institute of Planners (Kim Chan)	10.7.2008
46	United Social Service Centre Ltd (Cheng Lai King)	10.7.2008
47	The Hong Kong Institute of Architects (Dr Ronald Lu)	10.7.2008
48	IFC Development Ltd (David Dumigan)	10.7.2008

No.	Individuals/Organizations	Date of Submission
49	Hong Kong Urban Design Alliance (Dr. Peter Cookson Smith / Paul CHU Hoi Shan)	10.7.2008 & 18.8.2008
50	Jonathan	10.7.2008
51	Benny Wai	10.7.2008
52	Yomei Shaw	10.7.2008
53	The British Chamber of Commerce in Hong Kong (Brigadier Christopher Hammerbeck)	10.7.2008
54	Harbour Business Forum (Jon Addis)	11.7.2008
55	Chinese-Scottish Band (Cheung Yue Pau)	9.7.2008
56	Yeung Cheung Sing, Lawrence	9.7.2008
57	Alexander M. Duggie	10.7.2008
58	Wong Yui Hin	17.7.2008
59	Keith Ng	20.7.2008
60	Doug Woodring	25.6.2008
61	Lau Siu Wah	25.7.2008
62	Retail Development Consultants	13.8.2008
63	Hong Kong & Kowloon Ferry Ltd (April Lam)	28.8.2008
64	Tony Chan (plans only)	24.5.2008

Appendix B

Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront Stage 2 Public Engagement

Briefings to Relevant Public and Advisory Bodies

Date	Public and Advisory Bodies
11 April 2008	Legislative Council (LegCo) Home Affairs Panel
11 April 2008	Town Planning Board (TPB)
22 April 2008	LegCo Development Panel
23 April 2008	Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC) Task Group on Urban Design Study
29 April 2008	HEC
29 May 2008	Land and Building Advisory Committee (LBAC)
26 June 2008	Antiquities Advisory Board (AAB)

Briefings to the 18 District Councils (DCs)

Date	DC
24 April 2008	Eastern
6 May 2008	Tuen Mun
6 May 2008	Kwun Tong
15 May 2008	Central & Western
20 May 2008	Wan Chai
27 May 2008	Sai Kung
27 May 2008	Tsuen Wan
5 June 2008	North
16 June 2008	Islands
17 June 2008	Sham Shui Po
26 June 2008	Yuen Long
26 June 2008	Southern
26 June 2008	Yau Tsim Mong
8 July 2008	Tai Po
8 July 2008	Wong Tai Sin
10 July 2008	Kwai Tsing
24 July 2008	Kowloon City
24 July 2008	Sha Tin

Briefings to the Interested Organizations

Date	Organizations
15 April 2008	The Hong Kong Institute of Architects
23 April 2008	The Hong Kong Institute of Planners
14 July 2008	The Hong Kong General Chamber of Commerce

RECOMMENDATIONS OF TASK GROUP ON URBAN DESIGN STUDY FOR THE NEW CENTRAL HARBOURFRONT

The Task Group's recommendations are as follows :

(a) Use and Development Intensity of Sites 1 & 2

The scale of the proposed developments at Sites 1 and 2 was excessive. Task Group recommended that high-rise developments at the new Central harbourfront should be avoided; the proposed GFA for these sites could be redistributed to other locations, such as Site 5.

(b) Removal of Public Transport Interchange (PTI) from Site 2

Task Group Members generally welcomed the revised proposal on the public transport facilities after the comprehensive review conducted by TD, which was to remove the PTI at Site 2 and to replace it by bus laybys.

(c) Reconstruction of old Star Ferry Clock Tower (SFCT)

Most Task Group Members indicated preference for reconstruction of the old SFCT at its original location after CEDD confirmed its technical feasibility of putting additional foundation to support the Clock Tower. Members considered that the surrounding environment of the Clock Tower and its visibility should be well planned.

(d) Reassembly of Queen's Pier (QP)

Majority of the Task Group Non-Official Members preferred the reassembly of QP at its original location with a large lagoon in front of it with some land around for a variety of activities, while other Members including the Official Members preferred reassembly of QP by the harbour.

(e) Additional Decks over Roads/Infrastructures

Task Group Members generally welcomed the integrated pedestrian walkway system proposed to improve the connectivity between the waterfront and the hinterland through the area around the HKAPA extension and the Hong Kong Visual Arts Education Centre. Members considered that other than facilitating circulation, the walkways should be designed to allow appropriate activities to enrich the pedestrian experience and enhance vibrancy.

(f) Amendments of OZPs

Task Group Members generally considered that the OZPs could be amended to cater for the new design concepts arising from the Study to create a vibrant, green, accessible waterfront.

(g) Other recommendations

Some Task Group Members suggested breaking up the developments and public spaces to create a more human-scale waterfront environment; reducing and mitigating the presence of the PLA berth; and provide a continuous cycle track along the waterfront.

The Task Group has mapped out its recommendations as set out above for consideration by the Government in finalizing the urban design proposals for the new Central harbourfront. The Task Group also recommends that the HEC should monitor progress of and continuously be engaged on the design and development of the new Central harbourfront. Concerned Government departments should report progress and consult HEC on specific issues that may arise during the detailed design and implementation stage.

Note: The abovementioned recommendations by the Task Group are extracted from the “Summary Report of the Task Group on Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (July 2009)”, which has been presented to and endorsed by the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC) at its meeting on 17 August 2009. The full report can be downloaded from HEC’s website or at the following link -

http://www.harbourfront.org.hk/hec/eng/meetings/doc/agenda090817/Paper17_2009_Annex.pdf.

**Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront
Planning and Design Proposals for the Key Sites**

Site	Zoning	Proposed Design Concept under Stage 2 PE	Final Design Concept	Recommended # GFA(m ²) / Building Height (mPD)
Site 1 (1.89ha)	“CDA”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Hotel and Office” versus “Office and Office” Additional floor for retail and dining above Central Piers 4 to 6 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Civic Node primarily for public enjoyment. Two blocks of 2 storeys for retail, restaurant and exhibition uses at Site 1; One 6-storey iconic block for cultural, retail, restaurant, entertainment, tourism, “GIC” uses and festive activities at Site 2 Additional 1.5 commercial floors above Central Piers 4 to 6 Extensive landscaped deck and public open space of about 1.7 ha for greening, open space and festive events Removal of PTI from Site 2 to allow more ground level space and street level activities 	16,120 (including retail, restaurants, exhibition, gallery, etc. and 12,600 at Central Piers 4 – 6) (+25mPD)
Site 2 (0.41 ha)	“C”			19,000 (including exhibition, gallery, retail, theatre, etc.) (+60mPD)
Site 3 (5.23ha)	“CDA”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retail and office developments Reduced versus Larger landscaped deck 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retail and office developments Larger landscaped deck with enhancement to pedestrian connections and visual permeability More at-grade open space with street activities Reconstruction of SF Clock Tower at original location 	157,400 (including 44,800 for office; 105,200 for retail; 3,800 for 150 car parking spaces; 3,600 for public transport facilities) (+50/+40/+30mPD)
Site 4 (1.7ha)	“OU” WRCLU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waterfront-related commercial and retail development Smaller and more separate blocks with SF Clock Tower versus Fewer but larger blocks without SF Clock Tower 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waterfront-related commercial and retail development Small and separate building blocks with intimate courtyard spaces Alfresco dining and restaurants Without SF Clock Tower 	7,500 (+20mPD)
Site 5 (1.16ha)	“GIC”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arts and culture-related uses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hotel and office developments Possible additional office development south of Site 5 of approx. 21,000m² GFA being explored 	58,000 (25,000 for office and 33,000 for hotel) (+80mPD)
Site 6 (1.89ha)	“OU” WRCLU & “O”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waterfront-related commercial and leisure uses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waterfront-related commercial and leisure uses with a marine theme Further improvement to pedestrian connectivity 	2,900 (+15/+20mPD)
Site 7 (7.8ha)	“O”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waterfront promenade Urban park versus Urban green 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waterfront promenade A hybrid of urban park and urban green concepts Additional alfresco dining within the park 	480 (+10mPD)
Site 8 (0.22ha)	“OU” WRCLU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> QP by the Harbour and refurbishment of Central Piers 9 and 10 versus entrance and viewing deck for Central Piers 9 and 10 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> QP by the Harbour and refurbishment of Central Piers 9 and 10 Improve design of Ferry Plaza 	1,200* (+11.24mPD)

Estimated amount of total GFA is subject to refinement upon detailed design

* Roof-over area of Queen’s Pier

Legend 圖例

Anchoring Public Spaces along the waterfront 海濱的匯聚公共空間

Leisure and Recreation Facility 消閒及康樂設施

- A1 Board Walk 木板步行徑
- A2 Ferry Plaza 渡輪廣場
- A3 Statue Square Corridor (with Landscaped Deck and Landscaped Open Space at-grade) 皇后像廣場走廊 (包括園景平台及地面園林休憩用地)
- A4 Clock Tower & Gallery 鐘樓及展覽館
- A5 Entrance Plaza 入口廣場
- A6 Reassembled Queen's Pier 重組的皇后碼頭
- A7 Bicycle Station 單車站
- A8 Water Feature 水景
- A9 Edinburgh Place 愛丁堡廣場
- A10 Harbour Place (Waterfront-related Commercial and Leisure Uses) 海港廣場 (與海濱有關之商業及休憩用地)
- A11 Viewing Platform 觀景平台
- A12 Cycle Track 單車徑
- A13 Food and Beverage Kiosk 餐飲設施
- A14 Festival Lawn 草坪
- A15 Harbourfront Promenade 海濱長廊
- A16 Viewing Platform (Sculpture Garden Theme) 觀景平台 (雕塑花園主題)
- A17 Woodland 園景林地
- A18 Waterfront Event Plaza 海濱廣場
- A19 Green Carpet 草坡
- A20 Marine Place (Waterfront-related Commercial and Leisure Uses) 海岸廣場 (與海濱有關之商業及休憩用地)
- A21 La Ramblas 林蔭步行區
- A22 Art Event Plaza 藝術廣場
- A23 Public Landing Steps 公眾登陸梯級
- A24 Marine Place Boardwalk 海岸廣場走廊

Public Facility 公共設施

- B1 Elevated Walkway 高架行人走廊
- B2 CWB Ventilation Building 中環灣仔繞道通風大樓
- B3 Landscaped Deck 園景平台
- B4 Electricity Supply Station (below elevated walkway) 電力供應站 (於高架行人走廊之下)
- B5 Environmentally Friendly Transport Reserve 環保交通工具預留空間
- B6 Tree-Lined Boulevard 翠綠林蔭道
- B7 PLA Berth 解放軍軍事碼頭
- B8 Ventilation Shaft 通風塔
- B9 Military Access 軍用通道
- B10 Electricity Supply Station 電力供應站
- B11 Hong Kong Academy for Performing Arts Extension 香港演藝學院擴建部分
- B12 Proposed Hong Kong Visual Arts Education Centre 擬建之香港視覺藝術教育中心
- B13 Landscaped Deck to HKCEC West 通往香港會議展覽中心西面的園景平台

Commercial Facility 商業設施

- C1 Retail / Cafe / Alfresco Dining over the Pier 碼頭上蓋之零售商店/茶座/露天飲食設施
- C2 Retail / Exhibition / Gallery 零售商店及展覽設施
- C3 Iconic Building 地標性建築
- C4 Office with Retail below 辦公室大樓及低層零售商店
- C5 Landscaped Podium with Retail below 園景平台及低層零售商店
- C6 Retail 零售商店
- C7 Office 辦公室大樓
- C8 Landscaped Podium 園景平台
- C9 Hotel 酒店



**URBAN DESIGN STUDY FOR THE
NEW CENTRAL HARBOURFRONT**

IMPLICATIONS OF THE REVISED PROPOSALS

ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS

The revised proposals have sought to strike a balance between public aspirations for maintaining the attractiveness of the waterfront and realising the fuller development potential at the new harbourfront for addressing the needs of Central business District (CBD). The proposed development of a civic code in Sites 1 and 2 with retail, entertainment and exhibition facilities, and the revised planning design proposals at Sites 4 and 6, should add vibrancy and attraction to the waterfront, whilst also taking cognizance of the demand for commercial space through the re-provisioning of office and hotel developments in Site 5. The proposed office and commercial developments in Site 3 should add to the supply of Grade A offices and valuable retail space, thereby maintaining the competitiveness and vibrancy of our CBD. In addition, all these proposals, if implemented, can be expected to generate additional business and employment opportunities in the area.

FINANCIAL AND CIVIL SERVICE IMPLICATIONS

2. On current planning, the private sector partner is expected to shoulder the construction and operating costs of the two sites without any financial contribution from government. For the 1.5 additional commercial floors above each of Central Piers 4 to 6, they are to be undertaken as government's public works project at an estimated construction cost of \$236 million (in September 2009 prices).

3. The proposed location of the reassembled QP between Central Piers 9 and 10 would incur additional engineering and design works, and the total re-assembly and associated costs are about \$220 million. As for the reconstruction of the old SF Clock Tower, the additional cost for constructing the foundation for a supporting deck to span over an existing box culvert would be in the order of \$20 million. We do not expect that government funding would be required for the remaining sites. In any case, we will seek the capital and recurrent funding, if any, in accordance with the established resource allocation procedures.

4. Additional workload arising from the implementation of the revised proposals would be absorbed by the existing staff of the relevant bureaux/departments.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

5. The revised proposals are in compliance with the Harbour Planning Principles and Harbour Planning Guidelines promulgated by HEC. They are also in line with the Urban Design Guidelines in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines. There is no significant change in the strategic infrastructure proposals. Any environmental implications arising from the revised proposals would be minimized with the incorporation of suitable mitigation measures in accordance with established environmental standards and guidelines.

SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS

6. A sustainability assessment was carried out for the revised MLP, which is based on the following sustainable design principles derived from the Public Engagement exercise of the Study:

- Diverse uses and activities;
- Respecting the natural context and existing urban fabric;
- Promoting harbourfront enhancement;
- Respecting cultural heritage;
- Ease of pedestrian access to harbourfront; and
- Promoting environmentally friendly building design and greening.

7. The results indicate that the refined MLP for the new Central harbourfront would bring about a range of benefits; particularly in the social and mobility aspects, such as accommodating leisure, cultural and government facilities, creating a significant landscaped area and quality waterfront at the heart of the city, cultivating a sense of place, meeting the need for essential strategic transport infrastructure and facilitating the ease of movement.

8. While the proposals would bring about environmental nuisances such as noise, air, waste and impact on marine water quality during the construction and operation stages, such implications would be kept to a minimum with the incorporation of environmental mitigation measures as recommended in the approved EIA and sustainable building design for the developments.