

Winnie PY YIP

2002/06/03 05:57 PM

☐ Urgent

☐ Return Receipt

To: [REDACTED]

cc:

Subject: WKR Concept Plan Competition - Draft Jury Report

Dear Prof. Wu,

I have just faxed the letter to your office and now forward the draft report.

Regards,
LI Ho-kin



JuryReportDraft.doc



A#053002-PL(G)M5-西九龍填海規劃比賽評審團報告.doc

DRAFT

CONCEPT PLAN COMPETITION FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN INTEGRATED ARTS, CULTURAL AND ENTERTAINMENT DISTRICT AT THE WEST KOWLOON RECLAMATION, HONG KONG

REPORT OF THE JURY

INTRODUCTION

This document is the report of the Jury for the West Kowloon Reclamation Concept Plan Competition on the selection of the winning entries to the competition.

2. The Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (HKSARG) launched the West Kowloon Reclamation Concept Plan Competition on 6 April 2001 to invite conceptual proposals for the development of the 40-hectare waterfront site at the southern tip of the West Kowloon Reclamation in Hong Kong into an integrated arts, cultural and entertainment district. The Competition Document, containing full details of the general conditions of the competition and the competition brief, was given wide publicity.

3. The competition attracted 161 entries by the closing date of 29 September 2001 with 71 from Hong Kong and 90 from elsewhere. Entries dispatched by air on or before 26 September 2001 were accepted as meeting the closing date if they arrived after 29 September 2001, at the request of overseas entrants relying on delivery services disrupted after the terrorist attacks in the US. Two other entries from overseas with dispatch dates after 26 September 2001 arrived late and were not considered further. A detailed breakdown of the origin of the 161 entries at Annex 1 to this report.

4. The entries were assigned serial numbers by the competition organizer to maintain anonymity during the adjudication process.

ADJUDICATION CRITERIA

The Jury's broad assessment criteria

5. The Competition Document provides for the submitted

conceptual proposals to be adjudicated by a Jury, whose members are named at the end of this report, and for all submissions to be judged in accordance with the broad assessment criteria set out in the Document. The criteria are as follows –

(I) Planning and Design Merits

- (1) Ability to provide a compelling and plausible vision to shape the future use of the Scheme Area as an integrated arts, cultural and entertainment district.
- (2) Ability to translate waterfront and harbour presence into a development of distinguished identity.
- (3) Ability to optimize site potential and development opportunities.
- (4) Ability to adopt innovative and viable ideas and imaginative solutions to planning constraints.
- (5) Ability to achieve integration and connectivity with surroundings.
- (6) Ability to meet changing needs.
- (7) Ability to demonstrate broad feasibility in terms of traffic arrangements.

(II) Overall Benefits to Hong Kong

- (1) Meeting the overall objective of enhancing Hong Kong's position as Asia's premier centre of arts, culture and entertainment.
- (2) Bringing planning and urban design benefits to Hong Kong.
- (3) Meeting public aspirations and generating civic pride.

Technical Panel

6. The Competition Document provides for the Jury to be advised by a Technical Panel on the technical assessment of individual submissions. The composition of the Panel is set out in Annex 2 to this report.

7. The Technical Panel met on 9 October 2001 to decide on a

process for advising the Jury as to whether individual entries met the technical requirements set out in the Competition Brief and on 11, 12, 15 and 17 December 2001 to assess the 161 entries in accordance with the agreed process. The Chairman of the Panel attended the Jury meetings to present the Panel's findings, including its recommendations as to which entries should be disqualified for failing to meet the competition requirements in specific non-technical respects, but did not take part in the determination of the winning entries.

Consistency with Government policy objectives

8. The Competition Brief states that the proposals submitted should be in compliance with the policy objectives of the HKSAR Government in terms of promoting the development of the arts and culture and making available to the community a wide choice of arts and cultural facilities. The Home Affairs Bureau of the Government, which is responsible for arts and cultural policy, assessed the individual entries as to their broad consistency with the government's policy objectives in promoting the arts and culture. The Jury was informed of the findings.

Professional Advisor

9. The Professional Advisor to the competition, Mr Bill Lacy, FAIA, advised the organizer, the Technical Panel and the Jury on procedural matters and on compliance with competition rules and submission requirements. He attended the meetings of the Technical Panel in December 2001 and those of the Jury, but did not take part in the determination of the winning entries.

JURY PROCEEDINGS

Advance consideration of submissions

10. The 161 concept plan proposals, together with the advice of the Technical Panel, were dispatched to members of the Jury towards the end of January 2002 for their perusal in advance of the Jury meeting. Copies of the proposals were also available to the Jury throughout the adjudication sessions.

11. Participants were also required to submit a set of five boards, showing their urban design concept plan, their master layout plan, selected cross-sections, elevations and perspectives and a colour print of a model of their proposal, for presentation and display purposes: these were displayed

for members of the Jury to study individually and in detail on 24 February 2002, before the adjudication sessions, and throughout those sessions.

Jury meetings

12. The Jury met from 25 to 28 February 2002 at the City Hall in Hong Kong.

13. On 25 February, in response to enquiries from the local media about the Jury and its work, members attended a photo opportunity for the media and the Chairman answered reporters' questions. Members then began their deliberations in closed session, discussing, among other things, the advice tendered by the Technical Panel and the adjudication process. Members also viewed the West Kowloon Reclamation from vantage points in Sheung Wan and Kowloon commanding a full view of the competition site and the adjacent areas.

14. The Jury spent 26 and 27 February on the adjudication of entries and the morning of 28 February finalising its decisions and compiling its commentary on the entries that it had selected as the five winners.

ADJUDICATION OF ENTRIES

15. The Jury noted that it was tasked to award five prizes – the winner, the runner-up and three honourable mentions. Members agreed upon an elimination process for selecting the winning entries.

Selection of first prize winner

16. The first prize winner was selected in the following manner –

- (a) Each member of the Jury selected five entries as meriting further consideration as the winning entry, on a non-binding basis and without ranking them. Some 20 entries were selected and voted upon. After reviewing the votes cast, the Jury decided that the nine entries getting the most votes should be discussed further.
- (b) The nine entries concerned were each brought in front of the Jury in serial number order. Individual Jury members discussed specific aspects which they felt merited the Jury's consideration.

- (c) Members then each cast one vote on a non-binding basis to select a winner from the nine entries discussed. After reviewing the votes cast, the Jury decided to discuss further the three entries receiving the most votes.
- (d) After thorough discussion of all the three entries concerned, each Jury member cast a binding vote to select the winner of the first prize.

Selection of second prize winner

17. The second prize winner was selected in the following manner –
- (a) The eight entries remaining from the original group of nine considered for selection as the first prize winner were again displayed in turn. Each member was invited to select three entries from these eight. After reviewing the votes cast, the Jury decided that the five entries getting the most votes should be discussed further.
 - (b) Members then each cast a non-binding vote for one entry from the five selected entries. After reviewing the votes cast, the Jury decided to discuss the three entries receiving the most votes.
 - (c) Each of these three entries was placed before the Jury in turn for further detailed discussion, after which each member cast a binding vote to select the winner of the second prize.

Selection of honourable mentions

18. The three entries awarded Honourable Mentions (of equal standing) were selected in the following manner –
- (a) The Jury decided to award honourable mention prizes to entries presenting interesting alternative ways of tackling the competition site.
 - (b) The seven entries remaining from the group of eight considered for selection as the second prize winner were again displayed in turn. Members were invited to consider these seven entries and to nominate any other entry that they felt merited further consideration.

- (c) Members discussed all of the entries nominated and cast binding votes for the three entries to be awarded honourable mentions.

Disqualifications

19. During its consideration of the 161 submissions, the Jury, taking into account the recommendations of the Technical Panel and the Professional Advisor, as appropriate, disqualified a total of 13 entries for failing to meet the competition requirements in specific non-technical respects.

Anonymity of participants

20. The participants were anonymous to the Jury throughout the adjudication process. The Jury was informed of the identity of the winning entrants at noon on 28 February, after it had chosen the five prize winning entries and only three hours before the results of the competition were announced.

COMMENTARY BY THE JURY ON THE WINNING ENTRIES

21. The Chairman of the Jury announced the prize winners at a press conference attended by Jury members and the Professional Advisor, among many others, and broadcast live on the internet. He also summarised the Jury's commentary on the winning entries, which is reproduced in full below.

First Prize

22. The first prize winning entry is from a team led by **Foster and Partners** of the United Kingdom.

23. The Jury felt that this submission, more than any other, fulfilled the purpose of the competition to define a conceptual architectural plan to establish Hong Kong as a city of world-class arts and cultural activities. The signature feature of the design, a great canopy, "flows over the various spaces contained within the development" to create a unique landmark. The sinuously flowing form of the site contours and the canopy produce a memorable effect.

24. The master layout plan, even at this conceptual level, organizes the site to take full advantage of its prime waterfront location and its proximity to Kowloon Park and the Canton Road retail district. The primary components of the design include a cultural hub of auditoria,

museums, galleries and performance venues along with a dense collection of shops, bars and retail spaces. The combination of uses proposed lends a great vitality to the scheme, and a continuous promenade along the smooth curvature of the waterfront further enhances the development for cultural and commercial purposes.

25. In particular, the winning scheme has eight distinguishing aspects -

- (a) the singularity of image, offering coherent visual authority and something that will become immediately recognizable with Hong Kong and an icon around the world. The image is also progressive, well suited for Hong Kong in the 21st Century;
- (b) the horizontality of the scheme across the site that does not attempt to compete with but rather counterpoints the tall buildings behind;
- (c) the presence of a multiplicity of public-space opportunities at various scales;
- (d) the introduction of substantial green space into the heart of Hong Kong, both symbolically and as a real amenity for citizens;
- (e) the logical and imaginative deployment of programmatic elements and the inherent idea of drawing people through the commercial and entertainment portion of the complex to the arts and cultural centre beyond. The scheme also allows for a good balance between public and private interests and, in particular, the mix of arts facilities offered. One aspect of the project which gave rise to concern was the lagoon which struck the Jury as perhaps impractical. However, this concern would not negate the construction of a similar public space, including a water body disconnected from the harbour;
- (f) the skilful way in which integration can be achieved with surrounding neighbourhoods and complexes. The links to Kowloon Station and to Kowloon Park, in the east, are particularly good examples, as is the people mover supporting this linkage;
- (g) the viability of the scheme, which is technically straightforward, consisting of a large mall, two taller structures at either end of the site - one associated with the arts and cultural complex - and

a large roof that is well within the ambit of known technology and experience; and

- (h) the well-argued case in support of the scheme.

26. In conclusion, the Jury felt that this bold scheme is a clear and deserving winner of the competition. The great canopy would create an unmistakable landmark for Hong Kong. It would be a major tourist attraction. It would symbolize the community's vision of their city as a future centre of arts and culture, and realise that vision with great style.

Second Prize

27. The second prize winning entry is from a team led by **Mr Philip Y K Liao** of Hong Kong.

28. The Jury felt that this submission had immense energy and dynamism in its bold horizontal architectural forms and was well suited to the vibrant nature of Hong Kong. It has many interesting ideas. Imaginative contouring of the site produces a waterfront park and green oases within the landscape. The extensive use of water-pools, waterfalls and mists – as a landscape element - is prevalent throughout the master plan and culminates in a spinal waterway running the length of the scheme area, effectively bringing a part of Victoria Harbour onto the site.

29. In several aspects, the second prize-winning scheme has similar features to the winning submission, including a general feeling of horizontality, a multiplicity of environments and a coherent programmatic response. Although the expressive architectural language is different, the second place scheme does also offer a distinctive image with a progressive spirit. The well-articulated arts and cultural complex is notable, although, on balance, the scheme lacks the expressive authority of the winner and is less straightforward in accommodating some programmatic components.

Honourable Mentions

30. The entries selected for honourable mention (of equal standing) are as follows.

31. The first honourable mention is the "Jewel Scheme", from a team led by **Professor Minoru Takeyama** of Japan.

32. The Jury awarded an honorable mention to this entry for its elegant and well-balanced simplicity and the appropriate distinctions it draws

between cultural and commercial uses.

33. The second honourable mention is the "West End Scheme", from a joint team led by **Mr Alan Macdonald**, Urbis-LPT (Architects) Association, of Hong Kong.

34. The Jury awarded an honourable mention to this entry for the manner in which it provided a "fieldscape" of a fine grain of individual buildings, landscapes and public spaces. This feature is intended to create a vibrant congenial area of individual galleries and theatres on a par with the lively West End area of London.

35. The third honourable mention is the "New Leaf Scheme", from a team led by **Mr Rocco Sen Kee Yim** of Hong Kong.

36. The Jury awarded an honourable mention to this entry for its innovative design and the unifying feature of a circulation spine connecting and providing access to all the many activities on the site. This design also takes great advantage of a multi-level urban promenade along the waterfront. It also proposes an upbeat, media-oriented image and takes explicit advantage of the site's location and public outlook back towards central Hong Kong. All in all, it is a very lively and compelling solution.

Prizes

37. The winner of the first prize receives HK\$3 million, the winner of the second prize receives HK\$1.5 million and each of three winners awarded an honourable mention receives a prize of HK\$800,000. The Jury congratulates all of the winners for their outstanding efforts.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

38. The members of the Jury would like to express their appreciation to the HKSAR Government – and in particular the Secretary for Planning and Lands, **Mr John C Tsang** – for giving them this unique and remarkable opportunity to contribute in such a stimulating way to the planning and development of what will become an unmistakable architectural symbol for Hong Kong and an image recognized throughout the world. All members of the Jury look forward to following the project over the coming years and indeed to visiting the new arts and cultural district when today's vision has finally taken shape.

THE JURY

Chairman of the Jury:

The Lord Rothschild; GBE
Jury Member, The Pritzker Architecture Prize; Chairman of the Hermitage Development Trust, the Gilbert Collection Trust and the Heather Foundation for the Arts at Somerset House in London, England

Members of the Jury:

Mr C Nicholas Brooke, BBS, JP
Vice-Chairman,
Metro Planning Committee
Town Planning Board
Hong Kong

The Hon. Leung Chun-ying, GBS, JP
Convenor, Executive Council,
Hong Kong

Professor Chang Hsin-kang, JP
Chairman,
Culture and Heritage Commission,
Hong Kong

Mr Peter W Rogers
Director,
Stanhope plc,
London, England

The Hon. Mrs Selina Chow, JP
Chairman,
Hong Kong Tourism Board,
Hong Kong

Professor Peter G Rowe,
Dean,
Graduate School of Design,
Harvard University,
Cambridge,
Massachusetts, USA

Professor Peter F V Droege,
Professor of Urban Design,
Faculty of Architecture,
University of Sydney,
Australia

Professor Wu Liangyong,
Professor and Director,
Institute for Architectural and Urban
Studies,
School of Architecture,
Tsinghua University,
Beijing, People's Republic of China

Professor Lau Sau-shing, Patrick,
SBS
Professor of Architecture
The University of Hong Kong,
Hong Kong

香港西九龍填海區

綜合文娛藝術區發展計劃

概念規劃比賽

評審團報告

引言

本文件是西九龍填海區概念規劃比賽得獎作品的評審團評選報告。

2. 香港特別行政區政府（香港政府）舉辦的西九龍填海區概念規劃比賽於 2001 年 4 月 6 日展開，目的是徵求概念方案，把香港西九龍填海區南端 40 公頃的海旁用地發展為綜合文娛藝術區。比賽文件詳列比賽總則和比賽簡介，而主辦機構更為這份文件進行廣泛宣傳。

3. 在比賽截止當日，即 2001 年 9 月 29 日，主辦機構共接獲 161 份參賽作品，其中 71 份來自香港、90 份來自其他地區。美國遭受恐怖襲擊後，主辦機構應海外參賽者的要求，延長截止提交作品日期，作品如在 2001 年 9 月 26 日或之前以空郵投遞，但 2001 年 9 月 29 日之後才送抵主辦機構，亦會獲得接受。其中兩份於截止日期後送達的海外參賽作品，由於寄件日期為 2001 年 9 月 26 日之後，故不予考慮。上述 161 份參賽作品所屬的地區，詳載於本報告附件 1。

4. 主辦機構為所有參賽作品編上號碼，以便在評審過程中將參賽者的身分保密。

評審準則

評審團的概略性評審準則

5. 比賽文件訂明，所有參賽概念方案均須按照比賽文件所載的概略性評審準則，由評審團進行評審（委員名單載於本報告末段）。有關準則如下：

(I) 規劃及設計優點

- (1) 必須勾劃出一個具說服力、可行及富遠見的方案，以便日後把規劃區發展為綜合文娛藝術區時，作為參考。
- (2) 必須突出海濱及港口怡人的景色，使該區的發展具有別樹一幟的特色。
- (3) 必須充分發揮規劃區的潛質和發展空間。
- (4) 必須提供具創意且切實可行的規劃概念，並尋求富想像力的方法解決規劃上的限制。
- (5) 必須與四周環境保持和諧與連貫。
- (6) 必須能應付不斷轉變的需求。

(7) 必須訂出大致上切實可行的交通運輸安排。

(II) 對香港的整體利益

(1) 達到提升香港作為亞洲主要文娛藝術中心地位的規劃目標。

(2) 為香港帶來規劃和城市設計裨益。

(3) 滿足公眾期望，讓港人引以為榮。

技術評估委員會

6. 比賽文件訂明，評審團會由一個技術評估委員會協助，就每份參賽作品在技術方面的評價提供意見。委員會的成員組合載於本報告附件2。

7. 2001年10月9日，技術評估委員會開會決定有關程序，以便就每份參賽作品是否符合比賽簡介所載的技術要求，向評審團提供意見。委員會並於2001年12月11、12、15和17日舉行會議，按照議定程序，審核161份參賽作品。其後，委員會主席出席評審團會議，交代委員會的審核結果，並就那些在非技術具體要求方面，不符合參賽要求的作品，建議取消其參賽資格。委員會並沒有參與評選得獎作品。

符合政府施政方針

8. 比賽簡介訂明，參賽方案須符合香港政府在推廣和發展文化藝術方面的施政方針，讓市民在文化藝術設施方面有更多選擇。負責文化藝術政策的民政事務局曾經審核每份參賽作品，評定是否大致符合政府在推廣文化藝術方面的施政方針，並把審核結果告知評審團。

專業顧問

9. 這次比賽的專業顧問是美國建築師學會資深會員 Mr Bill Lacy，負責就比賽程序、參賽者有否遵守比賽規則，以及參賽作品是否符合規定等，向主辦機構、技術評估委員會及評審團提供意見。他曾出席技術評估委員會在 2001 年 12 月召開的會議，以及評審團的會議，但並無參與評選得獎作品。

評審程序

預先閱覽參賽作品

10. 在 2002 年 1 月底，161 份概念規劃方案連同技術評估委員會的意見書一併送交評審團成員，以便在召開評審團會議前預先閱覽。在評審會議中，主辦機構亦會向評審團提供概念方案複製本。

11. 參賽者必須提交一套 5 塊的展板，以展示城市設計概念圖；總綱發展藍圖；剖面圖及立視圖；透視圖；以及概念方案模型的彩色照片，供解說及展覽用。在 2002 年 2 月 24 日，以及評審會議召開前和會議進行期間，主辦機構均會展示這些展板，讓評審團成員逐

一仔細研究。

評審會議

12. 評審團由 2002 年 2 月 25 至 28 日在香港大會堂召開評審會議。

13. 鑑於本地傳媒要求了解評審團的成員及其工作，評審團成員遂在 2 月 25 日應邀出席記者會，讓傳媒拍照，並由主席回答記者的問題。會後，評審團便進行閉門會議，討論範圍包括技術評估委員會所提出的意見及評審程序等。此外，評審團亦到過上環及九龍多個瞭望位置，以觀察整個西九龍填海區及鄰近地區的情況。

14. 評審團在 2 月 26 及 27 日進行評審，繼而在 2 月 28 日早上定出結果，並就所選出的 5 個得獎作品撰寫評注。

評審作品

15. 評審團須為這項比賽選出 5 個得獎者 — 冠軍、亞軍及 3 個優異獎，各成員議定以淘汰方式評選。

挑選冠軍得獎者

16. 冠軍得獎者是按照以下方式選出的：

- (a) 首先，評審團成員須以非約束性的方式，各自選出 5 個值得考慮給予獎項的作品，但無須給予評分，再從中選出約 20 個作品，並進行投票。經點算後，評審團決定應進一步討論得票最多的 9 個作品。

(b) 入選的 9 個作品按編號次序逐一交評審團討論，成員逐一討論作品值得考慮的特色。

(c) 各成員再 1 人 1 票，以非約束性的方式，從入選的 9 個作品中投票選出得獎者。經點算後，評審團決定應進一步討論得票最多的 3 個作品。

(d) 評審團就這 3 個作品進行詳細討論後，各成員以約束性的方式投票，選出冠軍得獎者。

挑選亞軍得獎者

17. 亞軍得獎者是按照以下方式選出的：

(a) 從 9 個作品中選出冠軍得獎者後，餘下的 8 個作品再次逐一展示，評審團各成員須以 1 人 3 票方式進行投票。經點算後，評審團決定應進一步討論得票最多的 5 個作品。

(b) 各成員再 1 人 1 票，以非約束性的方式，從 5 個作品中投票選出 1 個作品。經點算後，評審團決定進一步討論得票最多的 3 個作品。

(c) 入選的 3 個作品逐一展示在評審團面前，以便進一步詳細討論。其後，各成員以約束性的方式投票，選出亞軍得獎者。

挑選優異獎得獎者

18. 獲頒優異獎的得獎者(排名不分先後)是按照以下方式選出的：

(a) 評審團決定把優異獎頒予在處理手法上別出心裁的作品。

(b) 從 8 個作品中選出亞軍得獎者後，餘下的 7 個作品再次逐一展示。評審團須考慮該 7 個作品，並提名值得再作考慮的任何其他作品。

(c) 各成員討論所有須予考慮的作品，並以約束性的方式投票，選出得獎的 3 個優異作品。

取消資格

19. 評審團在評審 161 份概念方案時，已適當地考慮技術評估委員會及專業顧問的建議，並取消了合共 13 份作品的比賽資格，原因是未能符合比賽的非技術要求。

參賽者身分保密

20. 在整個評審期間，參賽者身分是絕對保密的。評審團直到 2 月 28 日中午，即定出 5 個得獎作品後、比賽結果公布前 3 小時，才知悉得獎者的身分。

評審團對得獎作品的評語

21. 在互聯網同步直播的記者會上，評審團主席在評審團成員及專業顧問等眾多嘉賓之前，公布得獎者名單，並總結評審團對得獎作品的評語如下：

冠軍

22. 冠軍得獎者是英國 **Foster and Partners** 所領導的設計小組。

23. 評審團認為，這份參賽作品比其他作品優勝之處，在於更能符合比賽目的，亦即透過制定概念建築圖，推動香港成為一個世界級的藝術文化城市。設計的最大特色，是一個「流遍發展區內各個空間」的巨型天篷，構成一個別具風格的地標。整幅土地的輪廓蜿蜒曲折，與流水般的天篷互相輝映，令人一見難忘。

24. 即使只在概念設計階段，但觀其總綱發展藍圖，可見其布局設計已能夠充分利用發展區位於海旁最佳位置及鄰近九龍公園和廣東道零售區的優點。設計的主要部分包括一個設有演奏廳、博物館、展覽館和表演場地的文化中心，同區內遍設商店、酒吧和零售鋪位。把有關發展作綜合用途的建議，為這項計劃注入澎湃的活力。順着柔和的海岸曲線修建的長廊，連綿不斷，著實增加了發展文化設施及商業用途的機會。

25. 得獎的發展計劃有 8 項優勝之處：

- (a) 形象獨特，產生一個凝聚而有力的視覺效果，令舉世注目而成爲代表香港的標誌。這形象亦帶進取意味，與二十一世紀的香港相配合；
- (b) 計劃採用橫互發展用地的橫向設計，不與背後的高樓大廈爭鋒，卻與之互相襯托；
- (c) 提供公眾空間作多元化用途，規模不一；
- (d) 在香港的中心地帶加進許多綠化區，無論在象徵意義上或實質上，對市民來說都是賞心樂事；
- (e) 各種活動的分布合理而富於想象力，其設計意念，是吸引人們穿越發展區內的商業及娛樂部分，走到另一面的藝術文化中心。這計劃亦能適當兼顧公眾與個人的興趣，特別是，計劃把各種藝術設施滙集於一處。計劃內有一個環礁湖，這設計或有點不切實際而備受評審團關注。然而，這個環礁湖可由一個類似的公眾場地來取代，場地內可設置一個與海港分隔的水體；
- (f) 靈巧地把這地區與周圍一帶及附近的綜合建築物融合起來。連接東面的九龍站及九龍公園的通道，以及支援這通道系統的行人輸送設施，均是這方面的好例子；

(g) 計劃的可行性很高，各項目在技術上容易實行。這些項目包括一個大型商場，以及分別坐落於這幅土地兩端的兩幢較高的構築物－其一為一座藝術文化大樓，而另一構築物則是一個可憑現有技術和經驗建造的大型天篷；以及

(h) 計劃提出理據充分的資料來作支持。

26. 總括而言，評審團認為這項設計突出的計劃清楚明確，榮膺冠軍，是實至名歸的。巨型天篷將會是香港一個矚目的地標和主要的旅遊景點，標誌着香港展望發展為藝術和文化中心的理想，並會以其雄偉的風格，體現這個理想。

亞軍

27. 亞軍由香港廖宜康先生帶領的設計小組奪得。

28. 評審團認為，這項參賽作品採用的橫向建築設計突出醒目，精力充沛，生氣洋溢，與香港活力澎湃和動感之都的形象若合符節。設計內有許多有趣的構思。設計者利用土地輪廓營造出一個海濱公園與綠洲相映成趣的景致，想象力豐富。整個設計以「水」為美化景觀的元素，水池、瀑布、霧氣比比皆是，而設計的關鍵之處，是藉這些景物匯聚於一道穿越整個設計區的中央水道，把維多利亞港融入場館內。

29. 膺選亞軍的參賽作品在幾方面都可與冠軍作品媲美，包括總體的橫向觀感、豐富的環境設計和彼此呼應的規劃基調。儘管兩項作品所表達的建築語言不同，亞軍作品同樣具有生氣洋溢的特點。值得一提的是其文化藝術場館的設計別具心思，唯獨整體的感染及說

服力及不上冠軍作品，以及在鋪排某些基調組合時稍欠流暢。

優異獎

30. 優異獎得獎作品(排名不分先後)的介紹如下。

31. 第一份要介紹的優異獎得獎作品是「瑰寶設計」，由日本竹山實教授領導的設計小組獲得。

32. 這項參賽作品獲評審團評為優異，其優點是設計優雅，簡單而不失氣派，並能適當劃分文化和商業用途。

33. 第二份要介紹的優異獎得獎作品是「西區設計」，由香港麥艾倫先生領導的雅邦－栢濤聯合設計小組獲得。

34. 這項參賽作品獲評審團評為優異，其特色是利用個別建築物、園景和公眾地方的細緻線條交織成一個「遼闊的景觀」。這個設計的目的，是建立一個朝氣蓬勃而又舒適愜意的展覽館和劇院集中地，媲美充滿活力的倫敦西區。

35. 第三份要介紹的優異獎得獎作品是「綠色新猷」，由香港嚴迅奇先生領導的設計小組獲得。

36. 這項參賽作品獲評審團評為優異，其可取之處，在於設計創新，以及以一條循環中軸線連起場館內所有活動地點，方便市民穿梭於各地點之間。此外，這設計能夠盡量利用沿海旁興建的多層次景觀長廊，並塑造出一個既活潑又富影視藝術特質的形象，還能充分利用該處的地理位置及以港島中部作為其背景的好處。總言之，

這設計生氣勃勃，引人入勝。

獎項

37. 冠軍獎金港幣 300 萬元，亞軍獎金港幣 150 萬元，3 名優異獎各得獎金港幣 80 萬元。評審團衷心祝賀各得獎者能夠在眾多參賽者之中脫穎而出。

鳴謝

38. 評審團委員感謝香港政府，特別是規劃地政局局長曾俊華先生，給予這個難能可貴的機會，讓他們藉着這項極具啟發性的比賽，為這個將會揚名四海的香港建築標記，在規劃和發展方面作出貢獻。評審團所有委員都希望能夠見證這項計劃來年的推展工作，更期待可以親身感受今天的構想如何在這個新文娛藝術區體現出來。

評審團

評審團主席：

The Lord Rothschild, GBE

Jury Member, The Pritzker Architecture Prize; Chairman of the Hermitage Development Trust, the Gilbert Collection Trust and the Heather Foundation for the Arts at Somerset House in London, England (英國)

評審團成員：

Mr. C. Nicholas Brooke, BBS, JP

蒲祿祺先生

香港城市規劃委員會

都市規劃小組委員會副主席

梁振英議員, GBS, JP

香港行政會議召集人

張信剛教授, JP

香港文化委員會主席

Mr. Peter W. Rogers

Director,

Stanhope plc,

London, England (英國)

周梁淑怡議員, JP

香港旅遊發展局主席

Professor Peter G. Rowe

Dean,

Graduate School of Design,

Harvard University,

Cambridge,

Massachusetts, USA (美國)

Professor Peter F V Droege,
Professor of Urban Design,
Faculty of Architecture,
University of Sydney,
Australia (澳洲)

吳良鏞教授
清華大學建築學院教授
及建築與城市研究所所長

劉秀成教授, SBS
香港大學建築學系教授