

**Legislative Council Panel on Development**  
**Subcommittee on Harbourfront Planning**

**Administration's Responses to the Summary of Views of Various Organizations and Individuals  
on Planning for the New Central Harbourfront**

<b>I. General comments on planning and design</b>		
<b>Organization/individual</b>	<b>Views</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
The Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The planning for the harbourfront should be on how to enhance its vibrancy and accessibility.</li>   <li>• The Association is supportive, in principle, of the revised design concepts and planning proposals.</li>   <li>• The Harbour Planning Guidelines (HPG) formulated by the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee should serve as the strategic guidelines for the planning around Victoria Harbour.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed. The urban design vision of the new Central harbourfront is to create a vibrant, green, accessible and sustainable new Central harbourfront.</li>   <li>• Noted.</li>   <li>• The Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (UDS) has made reference to the Harbour Planning Guidelines (HPG) in deriving at the overall urban design framework and landscape strategy for the new Central harbourfront.</li> </ul>

<b>I. General comments on planning and design</b>		
<b>Organization/individual</b>	<b>Views</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
Hong Kong Urban Design Alliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a lack of proper engagement with the public and professional bodies. Critical comments, constructive criticisms and proposals put forward by professional bodies and experts seem to have been ignored completely by the Government. The consultation has produced virtually perhaps only two amendments to the original option(s).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extensive public engagement had been carried out in two stages during the study process with Stage 1 Public Engagement from May 2007 to June 2007 and Stage 2 Public Engagement from April 2008 to July 2008. Public views were widely canvassed through a full range of public engagement activities including exhibitions, focus group workshops, community engagement forums, comment cards, interviews and telephone polls. Following the Stage 2 Public Engagement, the Administration continued to engage the Task Group on Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (TGUDS) of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC) which organised a Consolidation Forum to invite further public views and presentation of alternative proposals in February 2009. After the Consolidation Forum, TGUDS held a few more meetings to study the design options and finally put forth its recommendations to HEC in August 2009. Except for the location of</li> </ul>

<b>I. General comments on planning and design</b>		
<b>Organization/individual</b>	<b>Views</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The aspirations set out in the foreword of the public engagement document are ambiguous.</li> <li>• The Government has transferred the debate over the urban design as a whole, and its workability, to a somewhat minor issue of whether Queen's Pier should be re-assembled in-situ, over which there has been substantial disagreement.</li> <li>• The Government's plan represents a collection</li> </ul>	<p>reassembling the Queen's Pier (QP), all of the recommendations put forth by TGUDS have been adopted by the Administration and the design concepts amended where appropriate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is clearly set out in the foreword of the public engagement document that the public aspirations are to create a vibrant harbourfront with lower development intensity, good pedestrian connectivity, a lot of green and quality open space, sustainable design and respect for heritage. The urban design framework was refined and the planning and design concepts for the key sites were formulated to meet the public aspirations.</li> <li>• The overall urban design framework for the new Central harbourfront and the design concepts of the eight key sites had been thoroughly considered and comprehensively presented to the public.</li> </ul>

<b>I. General comments on planning and design</b>		
<b>Organization/individual</b>	<b>Views</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
	<p>of independent buildings and spaces that add up to neither coherency nor definition. It is only an amalgam of "strategy zones" with fanciful descriptions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poorly defined plazas, amphitheatre, outdoor theatre etc. are abstract elements set within empty space and do not form nodal attractions that will enhance vitality or unify the development as claimed.</li> <li>• Disagrees that the Government's proposal projects a distinctive identity, creates an attractive and vibrant harbourfront, ensures a sustainable design, creates a harmonious visual and physical relationship, or respects the cultural and historical context.</li> <li>• The four "principal design corridors" will not achieve what is claimed for them.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The urban design framework for the new Central harbourfront is composed of principal design corridors and precincts to provide a coherent and legible structure of uses, open space and connectivity. Each design corridor and precinct has its own character, while promoting a distinctive identity for the harbourfront and Central Business District (CBD) as a whole.</li> <li>• Nodal attractions echoing the theme of individual design corridors and precincts have been added to the 8 key sites to enhance the vitality and identity of different parts of the harbourfront.</li> <li>• The urban design framework and revised design concepts to achieve the planning and design objectives are generally accepted by the public. Planning and design objectives will be incorporated into the planning and design brief to guide future development of the key sites.</li> </ul>

<b>I. General comments on planning and design</b>		
<b>Organization/individual</b>	<b>Views</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An excessive amount of ground level space is dedicated to vehicular transport. The overall ground level environment is almost completely devoid of place-making characteristics, or the capacity of the proposed fabric to evolve as such.</li> <li>The pedestrian framework is very coarse grained, mainly linking spaces rather than activity nodes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ground level space has been maximized while balancing the need for accessibility to the harbourfront. As per the recommendation of TGUDS, the Public Transport Interchange (PTI) originally planned in Site 2 will be deleted to allow more ground level space and street level activities. On the other hand, sufficient transport facilities in the form of bus and taxi lay-bys will be provided. This recommendation has been reviewed by Transport Department and is considered feasible. Basement car parking can also be adopted in future development in the harbourfront. The design of the proposed landscaped deck in Site 3 has also been refined to improve the ground level environment.</li> <li>The pedestrian framework has linked up major activity nodes including the civic node at Sites 1 and 2, the proposed commercial development at Site 5, the Tamar development to the harbourfront,</li> </ul>

<b>I. General comments on planning and design</b>		
<b>Organization/individual</b>	<b>Views</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Alliance's scheme has precisely the same amount of built gross floor area and public open space as the Government's scheme, but is distributed in a more people-friendly and "place-making" way.</li> </ul>	<p>and the various nodes and spaces in the arts and cultural precinct near Wan Chai North.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Alliance's proposals had been thoroughly reviewed by the study team (i.e. relevant government departments and the Study Consultants) and considered by the TGUDS. The design merits contained in the Alliance's proposal had been taken into account in refining the planning and design concepts for the 8 key sites and the illustrative Master Layout Plan (MLP).</li> </ul>
Democratic Party	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Administration should re-examine Hong Kong's overall development strategy and redistribute the focus of the economic activities from Central and Wan Chai to other districts. The development density in Central and Wan Chai is already too high, constructing further hotel and office developments in the two districts will deteriorate the situation.</li> <li>The new Central harbourfront should be planned as a green and leisure area for public</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Compared with the Gross Floor Area (GFA) assumptions for the Central Reclamation area, the GFA of the latest design of the new Central harbourfront including all planned developments (including the Tamar Complex) is 50% less.</li> <li>Some 17 hectares (ha) of land in the new Central harbourfront under the</li> </ul>

<b>I. General comments on planning and design</b>		
<b>Organization/individual</b>	<b>Views</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
	<p>enjoyment. Returning the harbour to the people should be the one and only way in planning for the area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Administration should devote more efforts in addressing the concerns of Central residents on Central's open space provision and overall development.</li> </ul>	<p>UDS will be used for open space for public enjoyment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Central and Western District Council (DC) has been consulted on the UDS and the concerns raised by Members have been duly taken care of.</li> </ul>
Designing Hong Kong Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enquiry on why the site boundaries of Sites 3, 4, 6 and 7 remain unchanged despite many calls for changes.</li> <li>• Enquiry on whether the "Green Carpet" and waterfront event plaza will be designed for various ceremonies and, if so, the services and infrastructure to be included to host events efficiently.</li> <li>• Enquiry on where the Golden Bauhinia will be placed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The boundaries of the sites are indicative in nature and generally follow the zoning boundaries of the approved Central District (Extension) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). They are subject to review when the planning/design briefs for individual sites are prepared.</li> <li>• The "Green Carpet" and waterfront event plaza are designed for a variety of activities. Detailed provision of services and infrastructures will be worked out at a later stage.</li> <li>• At present, there is no plan to relocate the Golden Bauhinia Statue.</li> </ul>

<b>I. General comments on planning and design</b>		
<b>Organization/individual</b>	<b>Views</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enquiry on the detailed plans for the site currently occupied by Hong Kong Red Cross.</li> <li>• Expresses concern on the extent of the public rights on the "podium" and how they can be ensured.</li> <li>• Enquiry on the time line for the next steps.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relocation of the Red Cross Headquarters is being explored. This site, together with the Water Supply Department's Harcourt Road Fresh Water Pumping Station site, may be used for office development to meet the future demand for Grade A offices under the 2030 study, in the extended CBD.</li> <li>• The proposed landscaped decks in Sites 1, 2 and 3 are intended to be open to public. This requirement will be set out in the relevant planning/design briefs to guide future development of the sites. It can also be incorporated into the lease conditions.</li> <li>• As one of the 8 initiatives of "Conserving Central", Sites 1 and 2 will be developed through public-private partnership approach. An Expression of Interest exercise will be carried out and the development parameters are being worked out.</li> </ul>

<b>I. General comments on planning and design</b>		
<b>Organization/individual</b>	<b>Views</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
Public Affairs Committee, The Hong Kong Institute of Planners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Query on how the revised plan can be said to have justly reflected the views of the wider community. The Master Layout Plan is less than visionary and proactive to capitalize on opportunities for innovative facilities and design. A comprehensive landscape master plan is also required because the current planning and design of the open space lack coherence and connectivity.</li> <li>• Urges the Government to further refine the plans and conduct another public engagement exercise on the draft final Master Layout Plan, a comprehensive landscape master plan, and the relevant draft planning and design briefs before submission to the Town Planning Board.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The public views and the initial responses are summarized in the Report on Findings of the Stage 2 Public Engagement and Initial Design Responses prepared by an independent consultant, the Public Policy Research Institute of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University. The planning and design proposals and MLP have been revised to take into account the public views received and the recommendations of the TGUDS.</li> <li>• A Landscape Strategy Plan is under preparation by the Planning Department. Inputs from the Greening, Landscape and Tree Management Section of the Development Bureau will be sought.</li> <li>• Public views and suggestions on the urban design concept and proposals for the new Central harbourfront have been duly considered. The Administration will move on to implementation so that the new Central harbourfront can be</li> </ul>

<b>I. General comments on planning and design</b>		
<b>Organization/individual</b>	<b>Views</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The location and building bulk of the ventilation buildings (B2), ventilation shafts (B8) and electricity supply stations (B10) should be reviewed because the proposed structures will create adverse visual impact.</li> <li>It is not clear how La Ramblas (A21) will function.</li> </ul>	<p>enjoyed by the public as soon as possible. The HEC supports early implementation of the project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The outcome of the Stage 2 Public Engagement and the revised MLP was presented to the Town Planning Board (TPB) on 13 November 2009.</li> <li>The ventilation building and ventilation shafts are parts of the Central-Wan Chai Bypass (CWB) and Airport Railway Extended Overrun Tunnels (AREOT) projects which were gazetted under the Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance and Railways Ordinance in July 2007 and September 2001 respectively. The exterior design of the ventilation building and the electricity supply buildings would blend in with the surroundings as much as possible.</li> <li>The street character of the Road D11 area will be enhanced as a vibrant and key connector street for the arts and</li> </ul>

<b>I. General comments on planning and design</b>		
<b>Organization/individual</b>	<b>Views</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Trees should be planted along the waterfront at appropriate locations.</li> </ul>	<p>cultural precinct. The central median will be widened with the introduction of shaded planting and sufficient space for street activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. The details will be reviewed in the Landscape Strategy Plan.</li> </ul>
Hong Kong Urban Design Alliance Hong Kong Institute of Real Estate Administrators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outline Zoning Plans should not be used as the basis for planning for the new Central harbourfront. Planning should not be constrained by any artificial boundaries.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As requested by TPB in August 2005, the UDS was commissioned to refine, in conformity with the relevant OZPs, the existing urban design framework and prepare planning/design briefs for the 8 key sites in the new Central harbourfront. The illustrative design concept for the new Central harbourfront demonstrates that an integrated and harmonious waterfront setting is achievable within the land use framework and development parameters of the OZPs.</li> </ul>
Association of Engineering Professionals in Society Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcomes the result of the Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront and the revised Master Layout Plan. With the exception of the location for re-assembling</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>

<b>I. General comments on planning and design</b>		
<b>Organization/individual</b>	<b>Views</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
	<p>Queen's Pier, a genuine consensus has been reached amongst the concerned stakeholders on the design concepts and most of the proposed land uses.</p>	
Central and Western District Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many members of the Central and Western District Council do not object to commercial developments at the new Central harbourfront, but object to hotel and office developments, because basic commercial elements and cultural activities can attract visitors.</li> <li>• Some members of the Central and Western District Council suggest that there should be covered walkways on the waterfront promenade; and cultural performance venues, orchid galleries and exhibition galleries for displaying Hong Kong reunification souvenirs on the new Central harbourfront.</li> <li>• The Central and Western District Council has passed the following motions:</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed office and hotel developments at Sites 1 and 2 which are of special concern to the Central and Western DC have been deleted and replaced by a civic node featuring a mixed use precinct with a substantial reduction of development intensity. The reduction in commercial GFA at Sites 1 and 2 will be fully re-provided at Site 5.</li> <li>• Noted. The detailed facilities within the waterfront promenade will be further studied at the implementation stage.</li> </ul>

<b>I. General comments on planning and design</b>		
<b>Organization/individual</b>	<b>Views</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
	<p>(1) This Council supports that the government should construct an easily accessible and vibrant New Central Waterfront as soon as possible. To achieve the objective of "a harbour for the people, a harbour of life", the design should be compatible with the water front environment, development density should be reduced, greening should be extensive while public space and facilities should be enhanced.</p> <p>(2) This Council requests that the Central-Wan Chai Bypass should be built in separate phases. The Central section should be built first to relieve the traffic congestion in Central and to facilitate the development of the public space and waterfront promenade in the new Central reclamation area.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The design objectives have been duly taken care of in refining and revising the design concepts of the harbourfront and the key sites.</li> <li>• Assessment of the traffic implications has shown that there would not be much traffic benefit on the early partial opening of the CWB. Instead, there would be other implications for the local traffic in Wan Chai area and the overall programme of the CWB project.</li> </ul>
Society for Protection of the Harbour	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Government's new plan represents an improvement over the previous one but it still does not address the concerns of the Society on implementing substantial high-rise office and commercial developments in the area and raising revenue from the sale of land obtained through reclamation. The new plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There will not be any high-rise office and commercial developments in the area except for a medium-rise development in Site 5, which is a consequential transfer of commercial GFA from Sites 1 and 2 to Site 5, as</li> </ul>

<b>I. General comments on planning and design</b>		
<b>Organization/individual</b>	<b>Views</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
	<p>disregards and/or contravenes the "over-riding public need" requirement, policy and vision statements as well as planning principles, standards and guidelines.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Government has not given sufficient information, such as planning parameters of the key sites and environmental and traffic impact assessment reports, to the public.</li> </ul>	<p>recommended by HEC. Noting that there is no specific designated Government, Institution and Community (G/IC) use for Site 5, the HEC recommended the consequential transfer of commercial GFA from Sites 1 and 2 to Site 5, which is a pragmatic approach to substantially lower development intensity in Sites 1 and 2 on the one hand, and ensuring a steady support of more Grade A offices to meet the needs of Hong Kong's sustainable economic development. Revenue maximisation is not a consideration. The development in Site 5 will not exceed the maximum building height restriction in the approved OZP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Central Reclamation Phase III (CRIII) is needed to provide land to meet the overriding public need for essential transport infrastructure, including the CWB and AREOT. The overriding public need for reclaiming land for these infrastructures has been established and met.</li> </ul>

<b>I. General comments on planning and design</b>		
<b>Organization/individual</b>	<b>Views</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The design proposals under UDS have taken into account the HPG, TPB's vision statement for Victoria Harbour and the Urban Design Guidelines in the Hong Kong Planning Standard and Guidelines.</li> <li>• Design concept and basic parameters have been recommended for the key sites. Detailed development parameters are to be worked out and specified in the planning and design briefs for the key sites which are under preparation. Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) and Environment Impact Assessment (EIA) had been conducted in relation to the CRIII project.</li> </ul>

<b>II. General comments on transport and connectivity</b>		
<b>Organization/individual</b>	<b>Views</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
Mr David LAI, Wan Chai District Council member	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The public should have easy access to the waterfront promenade by public and private transportation and pedestrian pathways. There should be underground parking spaces for both private cars and tour coaches. Mass transit railway, bus and taxi stations should be right next to the promenade for easy public access.</li> <li>• Charging stations for electric cars and Zip car stations should be available next to the promenade.</li> <li>• Some drop-off and lay-by along the P2/3 Road as well as access to parking lot/structure should be part of the design of any road access to the promenade.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. The design concept and development proposals in the UDS follow the same objectives.</li> <li>• Provision for environmentally friendly transport modes such as electric cars will be considered at the implementation stage, subject to detailed assessment and design.</li> <li>• To facilitate public access to the promenade, appropriate lay-bys would be provided along Road P2.</li> </ul>
Mr CHOW, a member of the public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Road P2 should be covered by landscaped decks as far as possible to make the harbourfront greener and facilitate public access to and from the harbourfront.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A wide landscaped deck will be provided at the Tamar development as an extension of the "Green Carpet" to the waterfront promenade. A number of at-grade crossings and footbridges will also be provided along Road P2.</li> </ul>

<b>II. General comments on transport and connectivity</b>		
<b>Organization/individual</b>	<b>Views</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
Central and Western District Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some members of the Central and Western District Council suggest that subways or footbridges in the north-south direction should be constructed and the waterfront promenade should be extended to the Central Government Pier under a unified style.</li> <li>Many members of the Central and Western District Council suggest that transport facilities for Queen's Pier should be enhanced and the new Central harbourfront should be served by environmentally-friendly vehicles. Citizens should have direct access to the new Central harbourfront and the Central Government Complex at Tamar from Mass Transit Railway stations. Moving travelators connecting the business centre with the new Central harbourfront are indispensable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Landscaped decks at Sites 1 to 3 and at the Tamar development will provide pedestrian connection from the major developments in the hinterland in the south to the waterfront in the north. There will also be footbridges in the north-south direction at different locations in the new harbourfront. The waterfront promenade in front of the Central Piers is proposed to be enhanced as part of the Pierside Corridor and linked with the future waterfront promenade all the way up to Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre.</li> <li>Provision for environmentally friendly transport modes such as electric cars will be considered at the implementation stage, subject to detailed assessment and design. Access to the harbourfront from MTR stations and possible provision of travelator link with development have been catered for in the UDS.</li> </ul>

<b>II. General comments on transport and connectivity</b>		
<b>Organization/individual</b>	<b>Views</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
Democratic Party	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Government facilities which hinder the construction of a continuous waterfront promenade extending from the Central Piers to Shun Tak Centre should be relocated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The utility buildings, such as vent shafts for pump houses and ventilation buildings, form an essential part of the waterfront facilities. The road infrastructures located at the waterfront areas are also required for operational reasons. We will continue to liaise with relevant departments and parties to improve the connectivity at the harbourfront. Special design and landscape treatment will also be considered to minimize the possible visual impact and make the utility buildings blend in with the surrounding context.</li> </ul>
Designing Hong Kong Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enquiry on the development control mechanisms put in place to ensure that traffic along the harbourfront will forever be contained, and that a sustainable reserve capacity is ensured for the road network.</li> <li>Enquiry on the target minimum reserve</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The development intensity in the new Central harbourfront will be controlled by the planning and design briefs for the key sites. The CWB and the planned road network in the vicinity of the Central Reclamation will be sufficient to cope with the additional traffic flow anticipated to be brought by the new development in the future.</li> <li>The TIA findings show that the existing</li> </ul>

<b>II. General comments on transport and connectivity</b>		
<b>Organization/individual</b>	<b>Views</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
	<p>capacity for junctions in the waterfront road network.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enquiry on whether there has been any reduction in the amount of land occupied by transport infrastructure other than the removal of the public transport interchange.</li> <li>• Enquiry on the whether there is any review of the design and engineering of the transport infrastructure and of the target service levels for passengers for connectivity and transfer between transport services within Central.</li> <li>• Expresses concern about the connectivity between the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre and the Central Ferry Piers and Mass Transit Railway Airport Express Station.</li> <li>• Enquiry on whether there will be continuous connectivity for cycling along the entire length of the waterfront.</li> <li>• Enquiry on the timing for the construction of the tunnel for the airport express over-run and</li> </ul>	<p>and new junctions in the waterfront road network with the CWB would operate with surplus capacity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The scope of works for the roads under CRIII and CWB projects is determined according to the gazetted plans.</li> <li>• The TIA findings reveal that, with the CWB in place, the waterfront road network at Central reclamation areas would operate with surplus capacity.</li> <li>• A comprehensive Pedestrian Network Plan will be prepared under UDS.</li> <li>• A cycle track is proposed within the Central waterfront promenade.</li> <li>• According to the current patronage assessment, there is no urgency for</li> </ul>

<b>II. General comments on transport and connectivity</b>		
<b>Organization/individual</b>	<b>Views</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
	northern island line tunnel.	constructing the North Island Line at this stage. The development programme will be reviewed .
Public Affairs Committee, The Hong Kong Institute of Planners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It would be better for the footbridge at Hutchison House to be connected to the elevated walkway system along the eastern side of City Hall.</li> <li>• The overall functional connectivity from east to west is still quite fragmented.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The detailed design of the elevated walkway system is outside the scope of the UDS.</li> <li>• The waterfront promenade will serve as a major east-west pedestrian link.</li> </ul>

<b>III. Sites 1, 2 and 5</b>		
<b>Organization/individual</b>	<b>Views</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
Hong Kong Institute of Real Estate Administrators  Association of Engineering Professionals in Society Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports redistributing the gross floor area of Sites 1 and 2 to Site 5.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
Hong Kong Urban Design Alliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Alliance is pleased to see that the majority of the gross floor area of Sites 1 and 2 will be redistributed to an alternative site, but considers that the remaining structures are still unsatisfactory. The Administration should abandon the two sites for development altogether, concentrate on open space and gathering areas at ground level and add distinctive image to the ferry piers as a "gateway from the harbour" with additional developments.</li> <li>The ventilation building near Sites 1 and 2 is likely to have significant impacts, such as harmful environmental impacts, and it would significantly affect public use and enjoyment of the waterfront.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Under the revised design concept for Sites 1 and 2, a large landscaped deck connecting the CBD to the Central Piers No. 4 to 6 with a central plaza for festive events is proposed. The landscaped deck will be designed as a major public open space for greenery, leisure and festive events.</li> <li>The impacts of the ventilation building are covered in the EIA report for CWB. The report concludes that no insurmountable adverse environmental impact is expected.</li> </ul>

<b>III. Sites 1, 2 and 5</b>		
<b>Organization/individual</b>	<b>Views</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
Mr CHOW, a member of the public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not object to rezoning Site 5 for office and hotel uses, but gross floor area and building height restrictions should be strictly observed.</li> <li>As the land premium of the existing site of Harbour Building should be higher than that of Site 5, the Administration can consider reprovisioning Harbour Building on Site 5 so that the original site of Harbour Building can be used for office and hotel developments.</li> <li>Suggests providing a public transport interchange on the ground level of the developments on Site 5 to compensate for the one originally proposed on Sites 1 and 2 and facilitate the public in commuting to and from the Tamar area using public transport. The effects on public transport services of not providing a public transport interchange on Sites 1 and 2 should be minimized as far as possible through measures such as providing sufficient bus stops in the area.</li> <li>The design of the developments on Sites 1 and 2 can dovetail with those on Site 3 so that they can blend in with one another.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. The Site 5 development will not exceed the building height restriction in the approved OZP.</li> <li>Site 5 is proposed for commercial development. The Administration will examine the feasibility of relocating Harbour Building to other sites in the long run.</li> <li>Despite the deletion of the original PTI planned in Site 2, adequate public transport facilities (including lay-bys) will be provided in front of the ferry piers and in the adjacent areas in the new Central harbourfront. Provision of a PTI at Site 5 is considered not necessary.</li> <li>A coherent design concept has been adopted for Sites 1 to 3.</li> </ul>

<b>III. Sites 1, 2 and 5</b>		
<b>Organization/individual</b>	<b>Views</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
Hong Kong Institute of Real Estate Administrators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed low-rise blocks on Sites 1 and 2 should be "melted down" to merge with the overall design of the landscaped deck and the enhanced Central Piers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites 1 and 2 are intended to be a low-rise mixed-use precinct featuring a civic icon of quality design with the provision of a variety of nodal attractions for civic, commercial and G/IC uses.</li> </ul>
Designing Hong Kong Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the reduction in gross floor area of Sites 1 and 2 but queries why the recommended gross floor area is appropriate.</li> <li>Supports a change in use for Site 5 but queries the rationale for determining the proposed gross floor area.</li> <li>Enquiry on whether the pier promenade will retain its open character and the plans for activating the pier promenade.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal has taken account of the proposed GFA needed for exhibition, gallery, theatre, civic, community, retail, dining and entertainment uses, etc. to form a vibrant activity node.</li> <li>The proposed GFA will remain the same as that for the previously proposed G/IC use.</li> <li>The pier promenade will be retained as public open space and enhanced as part of the Pierside Corridor.</li> </ul>
陳國釗 Mr Kenneth LO Ms Barbara CHAN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should retain the existing bus terminus on Site 2 and enhance transport connectivity with the Central Piers.</li> <li>Mr Kenneth LO also suggests that bus stops</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The deletion of the PTI originally planned for Site 2 is to allow more ground level space and street level activities. A comprehensive review on the public transport facilities in the</li> </ul>

<b>III. Sites 1, 2 and 5</b>		
<b>Organization/individual</b>	<b>Views</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
Mr Nicholas HUI Ms Janice FUNG CHENG Sin-ting Two members of the public	should be provided on the ground level of the new developments on Site 2 if the developments are indeed implemented.	study area has been carried out. Adequate public transport facilities (including lay-bys) will be provided in front of the ferry piers and in the adjacent areas in the new Central harbourfront.
Civic Party New Territories West Branch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that the existing bus terminus on Site 2 be relocated to the location between Central Piers 7 and 8 when implementing the developments on Site 2. The ground floor of the new developments on Site 2 should be reserved for a public transport interchange. The location between Central Piers 7 and 8 should thereafter be used as open space. Footbridges should be constructed to connect Central Piers 4 to 6 with the new public transport interchange.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate transport facilities (including lay-bys) will be provided in front of the ferry piers and in the adjacent areas in the new Central harbourfront.</li> <li>• The area outside Central Piers 7 and 8 will become part of the future waterfront promenade.</li> </ul>
A member of the public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Islands District Council and residents of out-lying islands have not been consulted on the scrapping of the proposed public transport interchange on Site 2, which will affect residents of out-lying islands and transport</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate transport facilities (including lay-bys) will be provided in front of the ferry piers and in the adjacent areas in the new Central harbourfront.</li> </ul>

<b>III. Sites 1, 2 and 5</b>		
<b>Organization/individual</b>	<b>Views</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
	accessibility to the Central harbourfront.	
Mr YU Hon-kwan, Islands District Council member	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggests that facilities such as tourism centres and exhibition halls for promoting the sceneries and traditional festivals of out-lying islands be provided on Sites 1 and 2.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites 1 and 2 are proposed to be developed as a civic node to include various uses such as exhibition, gallery, tourism, retail and G/IC.</li> </ul>

<b>IV. Site 3</b>		
<b>Organization/individual</b>	<b>Views</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
Hong Kong Institute of Real Estate Administrators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The landscaped deck on Site 3 should not change abruptly into a footbridge and the feasibility of extending it to Star Ferry Pier to merge with the landscaped deck on Sites 1 and 2 should be explored.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The landscaped deck will provide not only pedestrian link to Star Ferry Piers but also quality public open space connecting to the pier area and the adjacent sites including the proposed landscaped deck at Sites 1 and 2.</li> </ul>
Democratic Party	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Administration should be especially prudent in the layout of the developments on Site 3 and consider reducing the height of waterfront developments thereon so that they will not block the Star Ferry Pier.</li> <li>Welcomes re-assembling the clock tower of the old Star Ferry Pier in-situ.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed maximum building heights at Site 3 ranges from 30mPD to 50mPD in a descending order towards the harbour. A clear visual corridor has been along the Statue Square and Pedder Street/Man Yiu Street.</li> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
Mr CHOW, a member of the public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The architectural design of the exhibition gallery adjoining the re-assembled clock tower of the old Star Ferry Pier should resemble that of the old Star Ferry Pier.</li> <li>Site 3 should be equipped with underground moving travelators to facilitate citizens</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The future design of the exhibition gallery will be integrated with the old Star Ferry Clock Tower and the surrounding context. It will be further considered at the detailed design stage.</li> <li>The provision of underground travelators has been reviewed and is</li> </ul>

<b>IV. Site 3</b>		
<b>Organization/individual</b>	<b>Views</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
	<p>commuting between the Mass Transit Railway Central Station and the Central Piers.</p>	<p>constrained by underground road infrastructures and utility services. However, an underground connection with MTR Central Station is considered feasible subject to detailed design.</p>
<p>Designing Hong Kong Limited</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enquiry on how Site 3 will be divided into smaller sales sites to ensure a competitive environment.</li> <li>• Expresses concern on the quality of the pedestrian and street level environment on Site 3.</li> <li>• Enquiry on whether the original clock of the old Star Ferry Pier clock tower will be made to chime again in the original location.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From a planning perspective, a comprehensive development approach would ensure that a good mix of land uses and public amenities will be provided through integrated planning and design and well-coordinated management.</li> <li>• The design of the proposed development at Site 3 has been enhanced to provide better quality street level and pedestrian environment along Man Yiu Street, Connaught Place and Road P2. At-grade open space with shop frontages will be provided next to the landscaped deck.</li> <li>• The old Star Ferry Clock Tower will be reconstructed at its original location with a new gallery for exhibiting the salvaged items of the old Clock Tower.</li> </ul>

<b>V. Site 4</b>		
<b>Organization/individual</b>	<b>Views</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
Hong Kong Institute of Real Estate Administrators  Designing Hong Kong Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The courtyards on Site 4 should face the harbour instead of Road P2.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The courtyards may act as a landscape and visual buffer as viewed from the City Hall while creating a more open and attractive harbourfront environment. The courtyards will be subject to detailed design during the implementation stage.</li> </ul>
Designing Hong Kong Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Query on why Site 4 is not broken up to create a more vibrant and diverse experience.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed development at Site 4 will comprise three separate two-storey blocks for waterfront-related commercial and leisure uses set against a series of courtyard spaces.</li> </ul>

<b>VI. Site 6</b>		
<b>Organization/individual</b>	<b>Views</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
Hong Kong Institute of Real Estate Administrators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The open spaces on Site 6 should not be left out from the overall design and sheltered pedestrian routes between popular destinations should be provided and integrated into the overall landscape design.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An integrated pedestrian walkway system including covered footbridges has been devised to connect the hinterland with the waterfront at Site 6 through the proposed public open space and the facilities in the arts and cultural precinct.</li> </ul>
Designing Hong Kong Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enquiry on why Site 6 is not expanded towards the Wan Chai direction.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site 6 is primarily planned for waterfront-related commercial and leisure uses on the water edge. Extension of arts facilities and district open space are planned to the south of Site 6.</li> </ul>

<b>VII. Site 7</b>		
<b>Organization/individual</b>	<b>Views</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
Hong Kong Institute of Real Estate Administrators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be a continuous sheltered pedestrian walkway from the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre to Star Ferry, which should be lined with diverse retail, dining, cultural and other facilities and cross-linked with harbourfront facilities and major developments.</li> <li>• There should be a slip road along Road P2 to allow public transport to carry passengers into and out of the waterfront promenade area at convenient locations.</li> <li>• Accessibility, not only on foot but also by light public transport and private cars, is the key because of the large size of the site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The provision of a sheltered pedestrian walkway within the future waterfront promenade to connect the various attraction nodes will be looked into during the detailed design stage.</li> <li>• To facilitate public access to the promenade, appropriate lay-bys would be provided along Road P2.</li> <li>• Car parking facilities have been planned and provision for environmentally friendly transport modes will be considered at the implementation stage, subject to detailed assessment and design.</li> </ul>
Hong Kong Urban Design Alliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A large part of the core harbourfront area is sterilized by the little used People's Liberation Army Berth.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The design of the People's Liberation Army (PLA) berth will be integrated with the waterfront promenade. The PLA berth will be open for public access when it is not in military use.</li> </ul>

<b>VII. Site 7</b>		
<b>Organization/individual</b>	<b>Views</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
Designing Hong Kong Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enquiry on the locations of landing facilities for water taxis and other forms of marine transport along the waterfront.</li> <li>• Enquiry on why Site 7 is not broken up to create a more vibrant and diverse experience.</li> <li>• Enquiry on why a viewing platform (A11), which will block the view of the harbour, is proposed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landing facilities will be provided at Piers 9 and 10, the future reassembled QP and at Site 6 along the waterfront promenade.</li> <li>• A comprehensive development approach through integrated planning and design would ensure that there would be a good mix of facilities, public amenities and visitor experience provided and well-coordinated management.</li> <li>• The viewing platform will take advantage of the level of an existing pump house and will not obstruct the view of the harbour.</li> </ul>
Designing Hong Kong Limited  Public Affairs Committee, The Hong Kong Institute of Planners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern about the sterilization effect of the People's Liberation Army Berth on the waterfront promenade.</li> <li>• Designing Hong Kong Limited also enquires about the outline of the parade ground, the details of the dining and restaurant facilities,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The design of the PLA berth will be integrated with the waterfront promenade. The PLA berth will be open for public access when it is not in military use.</li> <li>• The waterfront promenade and relevant key sites will have ample scope of such facilities. The details will be worked</li> </ul>

<b>VII. Site 7</b>		
<b>Organization/individual</b>	<b>Views</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
	and the area to be fitted out for outdoor music, performances and events.	out during the detailed design and/or implementation stage.
Mr CHOW, a member of the public  Designing Hong Kong Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be tram track reserve on Site 7.</li> <li>• Designing Hong Kong Limited also asks whether the Administration will consider a shared space for tram and pedestrians.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The feasibility of providing a tramline reserve has been duly considered by concerned departments. Extending the existing tramline system to the waterfront for public transportation purpose will cause disruption to road traffic at the intersection points. Provision for environmentally friendly transport modes will be considered at the implementation stage, subject to detailed assessment and design.</li> </ul>
Hong Kong Institute of Real Estate Administrators  Mr CHOW, a member of the public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports constructing a cycle track on the waterfront promenade on Site 7.</li> <li>• Mr CHOW also considers that the cycle track can be extended to peripheral areas in the long run.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• The extension of cycle track to the adjacent area will be subject to further investigation.</li> </ul>

<b>VIII. Site 8</b>		
<b>Organization/individual</b>	<b>Views</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
Hong Kong Institute of Real Estate Administrators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports re-assembling Queen's Pier on Site 8 but seeks clarification on whether the pier can still serve its original purpose as a boat/yacht landing point.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Marine Department confirms that pleasure crafts and launches can be safely berthed/unberthed at the landing steps of the reassembled QP.</li> </ul>
Association of Engineering Professionals in Society Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Association has suggested that Queen's Pier be re-assembled by the harbourfront and it welcomes the Administration's decision to do so.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
Central and Western District Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Central and Western District Council has passed the following motion: "This Council supports that the Queen's Pier should be reassembled along the harbour front of Central to resume its pier functions for public use." However, some members of the Central and Western District Council insist on re-assembling Queen's Pier in-situ.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
Democratic Party	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disappointed that Queen's Pier will not be re-assembled in-situ. Re-assembling Queen's Pier in-situ will allow City Hall, Edinburgh Place and Queen's Pier to remain on the same axis and enshrine their historic significance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Majority of the public comments received during the Stage 2 Public Engagement were in favour reassembling QP by the harbour to revive the pier function. There was also clear support from the DCs in that</li> </ul>

VIII. Site 8		
Organization/individual	Views	Administration's response
		<p>16 out of 18 DCs consulted (including the Central and Western DC where the new Central harbourfront is located) have passed motions in support of reassembling QP by the harbour to revive its pier function for public use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Memorial elements will be added at the original site of QP to commemorate the historical significance of QP.</li> </ul>
Designing Hong Kong Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports re-assembling Queen's Pier in-situ and enquiry on the rationale of adopting the more costly option of re-assembling it between Piers 9 and 10.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If QP were reassembled at its original location, Road P2 would need to be realigned. Additional time and cost will be incurred, and inconvenience will be caused to the public.</li> </ul>
Public Affairs Committee, The Hong Kong Institute of Planners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has no objection to the Government's proposals, except for not re-assembling Queen's Pier in-situ.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Majority of the public comments received during the Stage 2 Public Engagement were in favour of reassembling QP by the harbour to revive the pier function. There was also clear support from the DCs in that 16 out of 18 DCs consulted (including the Central and Western DC where the new Central harbourfront is located)</li> </ul>

<b>VIII. Site 8</b>		
<b>Organization/individual</b>	<b>Views</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
		have passed motions in support of reassembling QP by the harbour to revive its pier function for public use.

**Planning and Lands Branch  
Development Bureau  
January 2010**