

West Kowloon Reclamation Concept Plan Competition

The Technical Panel

Minutes of the first meeting held at 2.30 p.m. on 9 October 2001
in 15/F conference room, North Point Government Offices,
333 Java Road, Hong Kong

Present :

Mr P C Chan, JP, Director of Planning (Ag.) (Chairman)
Mr Leslie H Chen
Professor Chow Che King
Professor Lam Kin Che
Mr David C Lee, BBS, JP
Professor Alex Lui Chun-wan
Mr Stanley C T Yip
Mr Pau Shiu-hung, JP, Director of Architectural Services
Mr Tony Ma, JP, Deputy Director (Culture) (Ag.),
representing Director of Leisure and Cultural Services

In Attendance :

Mrs. June Li, Assistant Director (Metroplan), Planning Department
Mr C K Li, Assistant Director (Special Duties), Planning Department
Miss Doreen Chan, Senior Town Planner (Special Duties)
Mr Eric Johnson, Principal Assistant Secretary (Special Duties), PLB
Miss Agnes Tang, Assistant Secretary (Planning) 5, PLB (Secretary)

Absent with apologies :

Mr Willie Tsao, BBS
Mr Bill Lacy, FAIA, Professional Advisor

Item 1 : Chairman's Introduction

The Chairman welcomed members to the meeting. He said that the competition had been organized to invite conceptual proposals for developing the West Kowloon Reclamation into an integrated arts, cultural and entertainment area and that the role of the Technical Panel was to provide technical advice to the Jury on the individual submissions, so as to facilitate the judging process.

Item 2 : Report on the number of submissions received

2. The Chairman invited Mr Johnson to report on the number of submissions received. Mr Johnson said that the entry deadline was noon on 29 September 2001, though entries dispatched by air on or before 26 September were accepted as meeting the deadline if they arrived after 29 September, provided that proof of the date of dispatch was available. The latter arrangement had been made at the request of some registrants from overseas who reported disruption to mail and delivery services following the terrorist attacks in the US and had been posted on the competition website and announced in a press release. Some 161 submissions had been accepted as meeting the deadline. Of these, 71 were from Hong Kong and 90 were from elsewhere. Most of the entries from overseas had come from China (10), Australia (5), Germany (12), Japan (6) and the USA (18). The remaining 39 entries had come from 25 other countries and territories. There were also two late entries from overseas (Australia and UK) postmarked after 26 September. These would probably have to be rejected, though the views of the Professional Advisor would be sought. Members noted the position.

Item 3 : Technical Assessment of Submissions (Technical Panel Paper 1)

3. The Chairman invited Mr Johnson to present the paper. Mr Johnson said that the paper set out proposed procedures for the technical assessment, by the Panel, of entries to the competition. The proposals had been drawn up, in consultation with the Professional Advisor, in the light of the request by the Chairman of the Jury for a method to be devised of ensuring that the Jury would be able to accomplish its task within the relatively short judging period.

4. He said that the proposed procedures could be divided into two steps. The first was that, before the Panel met in December 2001, the relevant government departments would do a technical appraisal of the submissions in strict confidence. These would be consolidated by the Planning Department into a single comprehensive appraisal for each submission, for issue to members with the submissions. The purpose of the appraisals was to assist members of the Panel to decide whether the submission met the competition brief and to identify technical shortcomings and/or merits. The proposed appraisal forms for use by the various departments were at Annex B to the paper.

5. He said that the second step was for the Panel to form its own assessment. This involved three tasks; assessing individual submissions from a technical perspective, grouping or categorizing them to facilitate the work of the Jury and recommending disqualification where appropriate. The proposed assessment form for use by the Panel was at Annex A to the paper. In completing the assessment form, members could refer to the consolidated version of the departmental appraisals (Annex C) that would be circulated to them, but were free to reach their own conclusions.

6. The Chairman invited Members to comment on the proposed procedural approach and the proposed forms.

7. Mr Pau asked for further clarification of the respective roles of the departments and the Technical Panel in the appraisal process. Mr Johnson said that departments with a particular interest in the concept plan would examine the submissions from their respective professional and technical perspectives. This would assist members to identify the technical failings and merits of each submission. The departmental views were for members' reference only and would not be binding on the Panel. The Panel could invite relevant departments to its meetings to clarify technical matters.
8. Professor Chow asked whether the Territory Development Department (TDD) could be added to the list of government departments appraising the submissions. Mr Johnson said that since the competition was concerned only with conceptual proposals at this stage, only the departments with a primary interest in the overall concept were involved at this stage. TDD and other works departments would have a significant input at the next planning stage, when the masterplan for the scheme area was being prepared. Mrs Li said that Plan 4 of the competition brief set out major infrastructural constraints that could not be changed. Lesser constraints that could be diverted or modified were left out so as to give participants a freer hand. After some discussion, members agreed that the experienced planners and architects in the appraising departments, taking reference from Plan 4, should be able to identify any potentially major civil engineering conflicts in a submission, but TDD or other works departments should be consulted by these departments on individual cases if they felt the need.
9. Commenting on the appraisal forms, Mr Pau said that he perceived the Technical Panel's role as being one of technical assessment only; any subjective assessment of the submissions should be left to the Jury. Professor Lui said that as the competition was an internationally important one, the Panel should take care not to be seen as exceeding its remit. It should confine its role to that of drawing the Jury's attention to those submissions which were not able to meet the technical requirements. The reference to "special technical merits" in the appraisal forms appeared to represent a form of rating of the submissions. Mr Chen agreed with this view. Mr Yip suggested that those aspects for appraisal on technical feasibility should be distinguished from those requiring some degree of value judgement.
10. Mr Lee said that many of the aspects for technical appraisal that were considered to contain a qualitative element could still be viewed as technical issues by an architect or a planner. Professor Lam said he was content with the appraisal forms as there was no rating at the end, those assessments were for the Technical Panel's reference only and would be of assistance to the Panel. Mr Ma said that his department would not have any difficulty in using the forms.
11. Mr Johnson said that, if all of the aspects for appraisal which contained a subjective element were removed from the forms, this would undermine the usefulness of the Technical Panel to the Jury, particularly in respect

of meeting the Jury Chairman's request that its task be made manageable. Both Mr Li and Mrs Li said that members of the Technical Panel would be providing input as experienced professionals in their respective fields and that a degree of qualitative assessment by the Panel itself would be unavoidable.

12. Summing up, the Chairman said that the technical assessment form at Annex A to the paper was meant to fully record the views of the Technical Panel, which might differ from those of the departments. The areas under appraisal by departments, in Annex B to the paper, were extracted from the competition brief and were meant to provide a checklist, for members' reference, on whether the submissions had covered the required ground. Since most members felt it necessary to distinguish the purely technical aspects from those requiring a degree of qualitative assessment and to minimize any perceptions that the merits of the submissions were being assessed, the appraisal forms should be modified to address these concerns.

13. In relation to the technical assessment form for use by the Panel (Annex A to the paper), members agreed that –

- (a) there should be three categories instead of the five proposed in the draft form;
- (b) the first two categories should cover whether the submission had met, or failed to meet, the requirements of the competition brief;
- (c) the third category should comprise the submissions recommended for disqualification for failure to abide by the rules, requirements or conditions set out in the competition brief; and
- (d) to assist the Jury further, the Panel should elaborate on any particularly noteworthy aspects or important shortcomings of the submission through remarks placed in the box at the end of the form. If the Panel disagreed with the departmental appraisal, this too should be recorded in the box.

14. In relation to the appraisal by departments (Annex B to the paper), members agreed that –

- (a) though all of the aspects for appraisal were drawn from the competition brief, some involved varying degrees of qualitative assessment. For some departments, therefore, the appraisal would not be a purely technical one and the title of the form should be amended to reflect this;
- (b) the aspects for appraisal requiring a degree of qualitative assessment should be identified in the appraisal forms;

- (c) the question of whether a submission had any "special technical merits" (column 4 of the draft form) should be left to the Jury, but departments should identify in the box at the end of the form any particularly noteworthy aspects for the attention of the Technical Panel; and
- (d) the number of columns to be ticked should be reduced to two, so that departments would decide for each aspect only whether the submission had generally met the requirements of the brief or failed to meet the requirements of the brief for reasons other than minor shortcomings;
- (e) the appraisal form to be completed by the Environmental Protection Department might require more than two columns, to meet the special requirements of the department; and
- (f) the justification for any finding that the submission failed to meet the brief in important respects should be stated in the box at the end of the form and might include a finding of insufficient or no information for an assessment to be made.

15. The Chairman requested that the assessment and appraisal forms be amended accordingly and circulated to Panel members for clearance and to the Professional Advisor for any further advice that he may have.

(Post meeting note : the amended assessment and appraisal forms are attached to these minutes as Annexes A and B for members' clearance. They have also been sent to the Professional Advisor in parallel.)

Item 4 : Dispatch of submissions and departmental appraisals to members and declarations of interest

16. The Chairman said that the 161 submissions, together with the consolidated departmental appraisal forms, would be dispatched to members by the end of November 2001. He said that all non-official members of the Panel were nominated by their respective professional institutes or advisory bodies in their personal capacities and that all of the submissions should be handled in strict confidence. The submissions would be collected from members by the organizer after the Technical Panel had completed its work.

17. The Chairman invited Mr Johnson to elaborate on the question of declarations of interest. Mr Johnson said that members would be aware of the provisions concerning ineligibility of certain persons, such as close relatives and employees, to enter the competition and maintaining anonymity throughout the assessment process. He said that the Bureau was looking into whether these provisions should be supplemented with declarations of interest by members and had sought the advice of the Professional Advisor on the approach to be adopted.

Members would be kept informed.

18. The Chairman reminded members to be aware of the competition rules on ineligibility and conflict of interest, notwithstanding that the onus of compliance was in most cases on the participant and that the competition organizer was responsible for verifying ineligibility. Mr Lee said that in order to avoid inadvertent conflict of interest, he had already reminded members of his staff by circular that, as employees of his firm, they were ineligible to participate in the competition. It was still possible, however, that someone whose participation would give rise to a potential conflict of interest might have participated without his knowing it, in breach of the competition rules. He suggested that members should declare whether they were aware of any conflict of interest. After some discussion, members agreed that the best way forward might be a general declaration of no conflict of interest even if a declaration of interest was not required.

Item 5 : Arrangements for the main series of Technical Panel meetings in December 2001

19. The Chairman said that the Technical Panel meetings for assessment of the submissions were planned for 11 to 18 December 2001 at the Hong Kong Central Library Exhibition Galleries 4 and 5. All of the submissions would be displayed and hopefully the Professional Advisor would be present to advise and assist members. He noted that not all members would be available for a number of meeting sessions. Miss Tang said that some members had expressed difficulty in being away from their office for long periods during office hours. If members were able to spare some time in the evening, the meeting venue at the Hong Kong Central Library could be reserved up to 10 p.m. for meetings if necessary. Noting this, the Chairman asked members to indicate to the Organizer their availability for evening sessions.

Item 6 : Any other business

20. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 5:30 p.m.

Planning and Lands Bureau
October 2001

West Kowloon Reclamation Concept Plan Competition

TECHNICAL PANEL ASSESSMENT

Submission Serial Number: 000

The Technical Panel advises the Jury that this submission:

- ☐ Generally meets the requirements of the Competition Brief. Particularly noteworthy aspects are elaborated overleaf.
- ☐ Fails to meet the requirements of the Competition Brief in important respects, as elaborated overleaf.
- ☐ Should be disqualified because the participant has not abided by the rules, requirements or conditions set out in the Competition Document in important respects, as elaborated overleaf.

The attached appraisal of the submission by government departments has been considered in reaching the above assessment.

Elaboration of the assessment overleaf and any other observations:

West Kowloon Reclamation Concept Plan Competition : Departmental Appraisal Form

Submission serial number :		For each aspect, tick one column and elaborate in the box at the end of the form, as appropriate	
		Column 1	Column 2
	Aspects for appraisal : The following aspects are relevant to the Jury's "Planning and Design Merits" assessment criteria (1), (2), (3), (4) and (6) and to its "Overall Benefits to Hong Kong" assessment criterion (2). <i>Appraisal by (* delete as necessary):</i> * <i>Architectural Services Department</i> [items 1a, h; 2 all; 3 all; 4 all] * <i>Leisure and Cultural Services Department</i> [items 1a-c; 2a, c-e, g] * <i>Planning Department</i> [items 1a, c-g; 2 all; 3 all; 4a-c] Q denotes aspects requiring a degree of qualitative assessment	Generally meets the requirements of the Competition Brief	Fails to meet the requirements of the Competition Brief for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • fails to meet the Brief in significant respects; or • presents significant technical difficulties; or • provides insufficient or no information
1	Development Concept and Facilities [Competition Brief (CB) paragraphs 23 to 28 refer]		
a Q	Presents innovative concepts for an integrated arts, cultural and entertainment district		
b	Includes a number of arts, cultural and entertainment facilities, with justifications		
c	Justifies how the proposed facilities complement both each other and existing facilities		
d	Indicates development intensity and scale of individual developments in the proposed arts, cultural and entertainment district		
e Q	Takes into consideration TPB's vision and goals for Victoria Harbour		
f Q	Balances social, economic and environmental needs in the proposed development		
g	Accepts as given the development constraints specified in Annex 4 to the Competition Document		
h	Assessment of broad order of development cost	(Item h: comment in Elaboration of Appraisal box)	

	Submission serial number :	For each aspect, tick one column and elaborate in the box at the end of the form, as appropriate	
		Column 1	Column 2
2	Land Uses and Activities [CB paragraphs 29 (i) to (vi) refer]		
a ^Q	Demonstrates a comprehensively planned and well integrated mix of different uses, particularly the arts and cultural facilities		
b ^Q	Demonstrates full exploitation of the panoramic harbour setting		
c ^Q	Demonstrates potential for attracting and generating multifarious uses		
d ^Q	Maximizes opportunities for attractive street-level activities		
e ^Q	Presents innovative design ideas to promote day and night usage		
f ^Q	Presents ideas to promote usage of facilities through marine-related functions		
g ^Q	Produces a balanced development with optimum utilization of the area and flexibility for future expansion and upgrading to meet changing needs		
3	Built Form [CB paragraphs 29 (vii) to (xi) refer]		
a ^Q	Achieves cohesive and harmonious built form with appropriate scale and mass		
b ^Q	Shows effective use of sea views through building disposition and height.		
c ^Q	Creates landmarks and focal points.		
d	Takes due account of Airport Railway Kowloon Station development		
e	Includes environmentally-friendly design and promotes environmentally-friendly ideas		
4	Open Space and Landscaping [CB paragraphs 29 (xii) to (xv) refer]		
a	Provides about 22 hectares of functional and attractive open space		
b	Provides a continuous waterfront promenade with easy access to other facilities, space for intensive human activities and lookout/vantage points		
c	Provides open spaces designed to cater for multi-user needs, including those of the handicapped, and integrated with the pedestrian network		
d ^Q	Provides a high quality landscape setting for the proposed developments		

Submission serial number:**Elaboration of appraisal (to include -**

- description of particularly noteworthy aspects, if any
- justification for any tick in Column 2
- comments by Architectural Services Department on the broad order of development cost)

West Kowloon Reclamation Concept Plan Competition : Departmental Appraisal Form

Submission serial number :		For each aspect, tick one column and elaborate in the box at the end of the form, as appropriate	
		Column 1	Column 2
Aspects for appraisal : The following aspects are relevant to the Jury's "Planning and Design Merits" assessment criterion (7). <i>Appraisal by (* delete as necessary):</i> * <i>Leisure and Cultural Services Department [items 5a, e, f]</i> * <i>Planning Department [all items]</i> * <i>Transport Department [all items]</i>		Generally meets the requirements of the Competition Brief	Fails to meet the requirements of the Competition Brief for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • fails to meet the Brief in significant respects; or • presents significant technical difficulties; or • provides insufficient or no information
5	Pedestrian Facilities and Traffic Circulation [Competition Brief paragraphs 29 (xvi) to (xxii) refer]		
a	Provides a comprehensive pedestrian circulation network & suitable linkages		
b	Minimizes interface between pedestrians and vehicles		
c	Provides dedicated pedestrian access to Airport Railway Kowloon Station and possible West Rail West Kowloon Station		
d	Explores pedestrian linkages to arts and cultural facilities in Tsim Sha Tsui		
e	Provides satisfactory vehicular circulation layout, including emergency access		
f	Provides adequate car parking and loading/unloading facilities		
g	Explores use of environmentally-friendly and cost-effective transport modes		
h	Explores use of water-based transportation facilities such as ferry piers and public landings		

Submission serial number:

Elaboration of appraisal
(to include -

- description of particularly noteworthy aspects, if any
- justification for any tick in Column 2)

West Kowloon Reclamation Concept Plan Competition : Departmental Appraisal Form

Submission serial number :		For each aspect, tick one column and elaborate in the box at the end of the form, as appropriate	
		Column 1	Column 2
	Aspects for appraisal : The following aspects are relevant to the Jury's "Planning and Design Merits" assessment criterion (5). <i>Appraisal by Planning Department</i>	Generally meets the requirements of the Competition Brief	Fails to meet the requirements of the Competition Brief for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • fails to meet the Brief in significant respects; or • presents significant technical difficulties; or • provides insufficient or no information
6	Interface with Surrounding Area		
	[Competition Brief paragraphs 29 (xxiii) to (xxiv) refer]		
a	Integrates and connects the scheme area with its surrounding area, in particular Kowloon Park and MTRC developments		
b	Explores decking over of WHC toll plaza area for open space		
c	Addresses the planning interface with the typhoon shelter and the public cargo working area to the north-west.		

Submission serial number:

Elaboration of appraisal

(to include -

- description of particularly noteworthy aspects, if any
- justification for any tick in Column 2)

West Kowloon Reclamation Concept Plan Competition : Departmental Appraisal Form

Submission serial number :		For each aspect, tick one column and elaborate in the box at the end of the form, as appropriate		
		Column 1	Column 2	Column 3
	Aspects for appraisal : The following aspects are relevant to the Jury's "Planning and Design Merits" assessment criterion (5). <i>Appraisal by Environmental Protection Department</i>	Generally meets the requirements of the Brief; based on the information available, appears to have no major environmental problems or incompatibility that cannot be resolved; statutory environmental compliance necessary in due course	Generally meets the requirements of the Brief; based on the information available, environmental viability or compatibility is uncertain and would require confirmation in subsequent studies; statutory environmental compliance necessary in due course	Fails to meet the requirements of the Brief in significant respects; based on the information available, likely to be impracticable from an environmental standpoint
7	Environmental Interface with Surrounding Area			
	[Competition Brief paragraphs 29 (i), (xi) and (xxi) refer]			
a	Addresses the environmental interface between any large-scale open-air performance venues or spaces and adjacent land uses			
b	Addresses the environmental interface with the surrounding area in relation to land use and traffic			

Submission serial number:

Elaboration of appraisal

(to include -

- description of particularly noteworthy aspects, if any
- justification for any tick in Columns 2 or 3)

West Kowloon Reclamation Concept Plan Competition : Sample of a Consolidated Technical Appraisal

	Submission serial number : 000				
		Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4
	Aspects for appraisal : <i>The following aspects are relevant to the Jury's "Planning and Design Merits" assessment criteria (2), (3), (4) and (6) and to its "Overall Benefits to Hong Kong" assessment criterion (2). Appraisal by:</i> <i>Architectural Services Department [items 1a, h; 2 all; 3 all; 4 all]</i> <i>Leisure and Cultural Services Department [items 1a-c; 2a, c-e, g]</i> <i>Planning Department [items 1a, c-g; 2 all; 3 all; 4a-c]</i>	Meets the technical requirements of the Competition Brief (CB) and is technically feasible and acceptable	As in Column 1, with minor shortfall(s)	Fails to meet the technical requirements in significant respects or presents significant technical difficulties	Demonstrates special technical merit in significant respects
1	Development Concept and Facilities [CB paragraphs 23 to 28 refer]				
a	Presents innovative concepts for an integrated arts, cultural and entertainment district	ASD, LCSD, PD			LCSD
b	Includes a number of arts, cultural and entertainment facilities, with justifications	LCSD			
c	Justifies how the proposed facilities complement both each other and existing facilities	LCSD, PD			
d	Indicates development intensity and scale of individual developments in the proposed arts, cultural and entertainment district		PD		
e	Takes into consideration TPB's vision and goals for Victoria Harbour		PD		
f	Balances social, economic and environmental needs in the proposed development		PD		
g	Accepts as given the development constraints specified in Annex 4 to the Competition Document	PD			
h	Assessment of broad order of development cost	(ASD comments in Elaboration of Technical Appraisal box)			
2	Land Uses and Activities [CB paragraphs 29 (i) to (vi) refer]				
a	Demonstrates a comprehensively planned and well integrated mix of different uses, particularly the arts and cultural facilities	ASD, LCSD, PD			
b	Demonstrates full exploitation of the panoramic harbour setting	ASD, PD			
c	Demonstrates potential for attracting and generating multifarious uses	ASD, LCSD, PD			

d	Maximizes opportunities for attractive street-level activities	ASD, LCSD, PD			
e	Presents innovative design ideas to promote day and night usage	ASD	LCSD, PD		
f	Presents ideas to promote usage of facilities through marine-related functions			ASD, PD	
g	Produces a balanced development with optimum utilization of the area and flexibility for future expansion and upgrading to meet changing needs	ASD, LCSD, PD			
3	Built Form [CB paragraphs 29 (vii) to (xi) refer]				
a	Achieves cohesive and harmonious built form with appropriate scale and mass		PD	ASD	
b	Shows effective use of sea views through building disposition and height.	ASD, PD			
c	Creates landmarks and focal points.	ASD, PD			
d	Takes due account of Airport Railway Kowloon Station development	ASD, PD			
e	Includes environmentally-friendly design and promotes environmentally-friendly ideas	PD	ASD		
4	Open Space and Landscaping [CB paragraphs 29 (xii) to (xv) refer]				
a	Provides about 22 hectares of functional and attractive open space			ASD, PD	
b	Provides a continuous waterfront promenade with easy access to other facilities, space for intensive human activities and lookout/vantage points	ASD, PD			
c	Provides open spaces designed to cater for multi-user needs, including those of the handicapped, and integrated with the pedestrian network	ASD, PD			
d	Provides a high quality landscape setting for the proposed developments	ASD			ASD
<i>The following aspects are relevant to the Jury's "Planning and Design Merits" assessment criterion (7). Appraisal by:</i> <i>Leisure and Cultural Services Department [items 5a, e, f]</i> <i>Planning Department [all items]</i> <i>Transport Department [all items]</i>					
5	Pedestrian Facilities and Traffic Circulation [CB paragraphs 29 (xvi) to (xxii) refer]				
a	Provides a comprehensive pedestrian circulation network & suitable linkages	LCSD, PD, TD			
b	Minimizes interface between pedestrians and vehicles	PD, TD			

c	Provides dedicated pedestrian access to Airport Railway Kowloon Station and possible West Rail West Kowloon Station	PD, TD			
d	Explores pedestrian linkages to arts and cultural facilities in Tsim Sha Tsui	PD, TD			
e	Provides satisfactory vehicular circulation layout, including emergency access	PD, TD	LCSD		
f	Provides adequate car parking and loading/unloading facilities	LCSD, PD, TD			
g	Explores use of environmentally-friendly and cost-effective transport modes	PD, TD			TD
h	Explores use of water-based transportation facilities such as ferry piers and public landings		PD, TD		
	<i>The following aspects are relevant to the Jury's "Planning and Design Merits" assessment criterion (5). Appraisal by Planning Department</i>				
6	Interface with Surrounding Area				
	[CB paragraphs 29 (xxiii) to (xxiv) refer]				
a	Integrates and connects the scheme area with its surrounding area, in particular Kowloon Park and MTRC developments	PD			
b	Explores decking over of WHC toll plaza area for open space		PD		
c	Addresses the planning interface with the typhoon shelter and the public cargo working area to the north-west.	PD			

		Column 1 : Meets the technical requirements of the Competition Brief (CB); based on the information available, appears to have no major environmental problems or incompatibility that cannot be resolved; compliance with statutory environmental requirements necessary in due course			
			Column 2 : Meets the technical requirements of the Competition Brief (CB); based on the information available, environmental viability or compatibility is uncertain and would require confirmation in subsequent studies; compliance with statutory environmental requirements necessary in due course		
				Column 3 : Fails to meet the technical requirements in significant respects; based on the information available at this stage, is likely to be impracticable from an environmental standpoint	
	<i>The following aspects are relevant to the Jury's "Planning and Design Merits" assessment criterion (5). Appraisal by Environmental Protection Department</i>			Column 4 : Demonstrates special technical merit in significant respects	
7	Environmental Interface with Surrounding Area				
	[CB paragraphs 29 (i), (xi) and (xxi) refer]				
a	Addresses the environmental interface between any large-scale open-air performance venues or spaces and adjacent land uses	EPD			
b	Addresses the environmental interface with the surrounding area in relation to land use and traffic		EPD		

Submission serial number : **000**

Elaboration of technical appraisal

To contain –

Comments from ASD: [Verbatim comments, including those on broad order of development cost]

Comments from LCSD: [Verbatim comments]

Comments from PD: [Verbatim comments]

Comments from TD: [Verbatim comments]

Comments from EPD: [Verbatim comments]

PD summary of consensus views and contentious divergent views:

CONFIDENTIAL

West Kowloon Reclamation Concept Plan Competition

The Technical Panel

Minutes of the meeting held at 2.30 p.m. on 11 December 2001
in the Exhibition Gallery, Hong Kong Central Library
66 Causeway Road, Causeway Bay, Hong Kong

Present :

Mr Bosco Fung Chee-keung, JP, Director of Planning (Chairman)
Mr Leslie H Chen
Professor Chow Che-king, OBE
Professor Lam Kin-che
Mr David C Lee, BBS, JP
Professor Alex Lui Chun-wan
Mr Willy Tsao Sing-yuen, BBS
Mr Stanley C T Yip
Mr Pau Shiu-hung, JP, Director of Architectural Services
Miss Choi Suk-kuen, JP, Deputy Director (Culture),
representing Director of Leisure and Cultural Services

In Attendance :

Mr Bill Lacy, FAIA, Professional Advisor
Mr C K Li, Assistant Director (Special Duties), Planning Department
Ms Doreen Chan, Senior Town Planner (Special Duties)
Mr Yuen Lup-fun, Chief Manager (Cultural Presentations), LCSD
Mr Eric Johnson, Principal Assistant Secretary (Special Duties), PLB
Miss Agnes Tang, Assistant Secretary (Planning) 5, PLB (Secretary)

Item 1 : Introductions

The Chairman welcomed Mr Bill Lacy, Professional Advisor to the Competition, to the meeting and introduced members of the Technical Panel.

Item 2 : Confirmation of the minutes of the meeting held on 9 October 2001

2. The draft minutes of the meeting held on 9 October 2001 were confirmed.

Item 3 : Matters arising from the minutes

Conflict of interest declarations

3. Mr Johnson reported that after consulting Mr Lacy and the ICAC, a declaration form had been finalized and issued to Panel members and the Professional Advisor. All concerned had signed the forms. The declarations were straightforward except for one in which the member concerned had declared to the effect that a company with which he had an employment type contract or close professional association or partnership had entered the competition.
4. Professor Lui said that he had made such a declaration as he was aware that one company for which he had occasionally provided consultancy service had participated in the competition, but he himself had not participated in the entrant's project and did not know which of the submissions was from that company. Members noted this declaration and were satisfied that no conflict of interest arose.

Item 4 : Working procedures for review of submissions

5. The Chairman said that the submissions were to be reviewed in meetings taking place from 12 to 18 December 2001. It was the Panel's task to undertake a technical assessment of the submissions and assist the Jury by setting out key points on the strengths and weaknesses of the submissions. As there were 161 submissions to be reviewed within a limited time, it was important that the Panel should first agree on a mode of operation.
6. After some discussion, members agreed upon the following procedures for the assessment of submissions:-
- (a) The submissions would be assessed in serial number order, starting from 001, and about 30 submissions would be assessed in each session.
 - (b) In addition to being immediately available for viewing that afternoon, the entrants' presentation boards in the exhibition gallery adjacent to the meeting room would be available for viewing half an hour before each session to afford members time for close examination of the submissions to be discussed in that session.
 - (c) The presentation boards for the submission concerned would be set up in turn before members as each submission was discussed.
 - (d) As a starting point for discussion, Mr C K Li would briefly introduce each submission, using the consolidated departmental appraisal as a reference and highlighting the main arts and cultural facilities proposed, other noteworthy aspects and major shortcomings.

- (e) The Chairman would invite discussion, after which members would categorize the submission concerned as either generally meeting the requirements of the Competition Brief or failing to do so in important respects. Members would reach a decision by consensus or by vote, with specific concerns being recorded in the assessment form. (Post meeting note: in the first assessment session, members came to an early conclusion that a relatively high proportion of entries would generally meet the Brief and that it would assist the Jury if this category were sub-divided into those of better overall quality and those of lesser overall quality. Members also agreed that the descriptions of the sub-categories would be revisited on completion of the assessment of all the 161 entries.)
- (f) Members who were unable to attend a particular session could pass written comments to the secretariat, who would bring them to the attention of the meeting at the appropriate juncture.
- (g) The secretariat would record members' assessments on the technical assessment forms and circulate them to members as drafts for comments.

7. The Chairman said that the consolidated departmental appraisals circulated to members with the submissions were intended primarily as a reference for the Panel. He suggested and members agreed that, as the departmental appraisals comprised four volumes and could well over-burden the Jury, they should not form part of the Panel's report. They should however be made available for the Jury's inspection on request.

8. As regards departments' contributions to the work of the Panel, the Chairman noted that the Directors of the Planning Department, the Architectural Services Department and the Leisure and Cultural Services Department or their representatives were already members of the Panel. The Environmental Protection Department and the Transport Department had appraised some aspects of the submissions and they could be invited to attend the Panel if members required additional input from them. The Territory Development Department had also been consulted during the appraisal process as needed.

9. Mr Pau asked whether information about the Panel's assessment of the submissions was privy to the Jury or would be open to third party enquiries. The Chairman said that the assessments were confidential and for the Jury only. As set out clearly in the Competition Brief, the Organizer would not explain to individual entrants why their scheme had not won a prize.

Item 5 : Arrangements for submission of the Panel's assessments to the Jury, including preparation of the Panel's covering report and grouping of submissions.

10. The Chairman said that a Technical Panel Report would be presented to the Jury. This would consist of a covering report summarizing the procedures and processes undertaken by the Panel, its general findings and observations, as well as the technical assessment for each of the 161 submissions, grouped according to the categories in the assessment form. There would also be a policy assessment of the submissions undertaken jointly by the Home Affairs Bureau and the Leisure and Cultural Services Department. This would however be taken forward by the Organizer separately as it was outside the purview of the Panel.

11. Miss Choi asked whether the Home Affairs Bureau could have access to the Technical Panel's findings for the purpose of completing the policy appraisal. Mr Johnson said that no provision had been made for this but it could be arranged. Mr Pau asked whether the Leisure and Cultural Services Department could undertake this policy assessment on behalf of the Home Affairs Bureau. Miss Choi said that the Home Affairs Bureau looked after a larger cultural portfolio, part of which, e.g., the Culture and Heritage Commission, was outside of the purview of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department. The Chairman said that the Panel's assessment of the submissions should be made available to the Home Affairs Bureau in confidence, as policy needed a context in which to develop and the Bureau had a duty to see to it that the project would work.

12. As regards the timetable for finalizing the Technical Panel Report, the Chairman said that, as the Jury would meet from 25 to 28 February 2002, the Panel's report should be completed by mid January 2002. The draft full report would be circulated to members for comments and, if necessary, be discussed at a further meeting, before circulation to the Jury.

Item 6 : Report of the Professional Advisor on the review of submissions with discrepancies related to registration and other formalities

13. Mr Lacy said that, after reviewing the submissions, he considered that those numbered 008, 017, 038, 094, 100, 104, 106, 111, 118, 126, 130 and 141 (a total of 12) should be recommended for disqualification for failing to meet the competition requirements for the reasons specified at the Annex. (Post meeting note: members endorsed the Professional Advisor's advice in respect of all 12 submissions after assessing the individual entries concerned in subsequent meetings.)

14. Mr Johnson said that the Planning and Lands Bureau had double-checked all registration particulars and examined the list of entrants to check for entries by similarly named individuals or companies. As a result, a number of cases requiring clarification had been followed up in writing with the registrants concerned. These cases had been considered by Mr Lacy in the light of

the further information obtained from the registrants and almost all had been cleared up. Two cases remained unresolved and were being pursued. (Post meeting note ; these cases were cleared up on 18 and 19 December 2001.)

Item 7 : Any other business

15. It was agreed that a schedule of meetings of the Panel with the serial numbers of the submissions to be assessed in each session should be tabled for members' reference.

16. There being no further business, the meeting ended at 4:30 p.m.

Planning and Lands Bureau
January 2002

West Kowloon Reclamation Concept Plan Competition

Entries Recommended for Disqualification

Serial no.	Reason for disqualification
008	No Urban Design Concept Plan or perspective drawings, Concept Plan Proposal not presented in A3 size
017	No Urban Design Concept Plan or Master Layout Plan
038	No Urban Design Concept Plan, cross sections/elevations or perspective drawings
094	Only two presentation boards instead of the required five
100	No Urban Design Concept Plan or Master Layout Plan
104	Concept Plan Proposal not presented in A3 size
106	No Urban Design Concept Plan or Master Layout Plan
111	No Urban Design Concept Plan or perspective drawings
118	No Urban Design Concept Plan, Master Layout Plan or cross-sections
126	No Urban Design Concept Plan or Master Layout Plan
130	Only two presentation boards instead of the required five; also no identification provided
141	No Development Statement, Master Layout Plan or cross-sections.
Total	
12	

CONFIDENTIAL

West Kowloon Reclamation Concept Plan Competition

The Technical Panel

Minutes of the meeting held at 2.30 p.m. on 17 December 2001
in the Exhibition Gallery, Hong Kong Central Library
66 Causeway Road, Causeway Bay, Hong Kong
(Concluding Session)

Present :

Mr Bosco Fung Chee-keung, JP, Director of Planning (Chairman)
Mr Leslie H Chen
Professor Chow Che-king, OBE
Professor Lam Kin-che
Mr David C Lee, BBS, JP
Professor Alex Lui Chun-wan
Mr Willy Tsao Sing-yuen, BBS
Mr Pau Shiu-hung, JP, Director of Architectural Services
Miss Choi Suk-kuen, JP, Deputy Director (Culture),
representing Director of Leisure and Cultural Services

In Attendance :

Mr Bill Lacy, FAIA, Professional Advisor
Mr C K Li, Assistant Director (Special Duties), Planning Department
Ms Doreen Chan, Senior Town Planner (Special Duties)
Mr Yuen Lup-fun, Chief Manager (Cultural Presentations), LCSD
Mr Eric Johnson, Principal Assistant Secretary (Special Duties), PLB
Miss Agnes Tang, Assistant Secretary (Planning) 5, PLB (Secretary)

Absent with apologies :

Mr Stanley C T Yip

Item 1 : Summing Up of the Technical Panel's Deliberations

Members completed their assessment of the 161 submissions and noted that the outcome was as follows:-

- (a) 54 submissions generally met the Competition Brief, of which 21 were of better overall quality and 33 were of lesser overall quality.

(Post meeting note: after further consultation with Mr Lacy, it is proposed that these sub-categories should be defined respectively as, "well presented, with innovative ideas and commendable design concepts" and "of average quality with some good features".);

- (b) 95 submissions failed to meet the requirements of the Competition Brief in important respects; and
- (c) 12 submissions failed to abide by the rules, requirements or conditions set out in the Competition Document in important respects and would be recommended for disqualification.

2. Professor Chow suggested that the Panel should re-examine submissions proposing canals or major modifications to the existing seawall, so as to ensure that they had been assessed in a consistent manner. Members reviewed five submissions with these features (nos. 054, 057, 058, 070 and 129) and were satisfied with the Panel's original assessments.

3. At the suggestion of Mr Pau, members reviewed submission no. 094, which had been recommended for disqualification because it had only two, rather than the required five, presentation boards. Mr Pau said that, while he agreed that the submission should be disqualified, the conceptual proposals that it contained were interesting and innovative, particularly the ideas for linking the cultural facilities in the Scheme Area with existing cultural facilities in Tsim Sha Tsui. Mr Lacy reaffirmed that the submission was incomplete in important respects and had therefore failed to meet the competition requirements. The Chairman said that Mr Pau's observation should nonetheless be mentioned in the Panel's assessment of the submission and brought to the attention of the Jury.

4. Professor Lam said that, on the question of connectivity with the adjacent areas, some proposals had either ignored or resited the fire station at the end of Austin Road. Members noted that the existing location of the fire station was not an absolute constraint but any proposal for its relocation without justification or reprovisioning should be pointed out.

5. Mr Lee said that many submissions proposed a large canopy of one form or another. Aside from the question of engineering feasibility and possible problems over maintenance and management responsibility, such schemes could be difficult to implement considering the government's usual practice of selling development land in relatively small lots. Mr Lam said that whereas mega-structures could be difficult to implement, this would not necessarily be the case with the large decks and podiums proposed in a number of the submissions. After some discussion, the Chairman suggested, and it was agreed that, whilst the Panel should advise the Jury as to whether a scheme presented construction or other implementation problems, the presence of such problems should not automatically constitute failure to meet the Brief or rule out consideration by the Jury, as scope would exist, when taking forward the winning concepts, for consideration of

modifications to overcome or circumvent technical difficulties or constraints.

6. The Chairman summed up the main considerations addressed by the Panel during its assessment of the entries as covering –

- Provision of arts and cultural facilities
- Landmark and design features
- Extension of the Scheme Area through additional reclamation
- Modification and integrity of the existing sea-wall
- Construction over rail and road tunnel reserves
- Linkage with adjoining areas
- Feasibility of implementation
- Borderline cases

He said that the Panel's approach to these issues should be written up for inclusion in its report to the Jury. (Post-meeting note: a draft is at the Annex to these minutes.)

Item 2 : Other Business

Possible further meeting

7. The Chairman said that after a draft Technical Panel Report was prepared, members might be required to finalize it at a meeting in mid January. (Post-meeting note: members have been asked to reserve the afternoon of 15 January for a possible meeting.)

Collection of documents from members

8. The Chairman said that arrangements would be made to collect the 161 submissions and the departmental appraisals from members after the Panel's report had been finalised.

Competition Record

9. The Chairman said that consideration was being given to publishing a Competition Record in due course. Members supported the idea. The secretariat would consider how to take the matter forward.

10. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 5:00 p.m.

West Kowloon Reclamation Concept Plan Competition

Considerations addressed by the Technical Panel during its assessment of the entries

Provision of arts and cultural facilities

The Panel kept in view that the objective of the competition was to invite conceptual proposals for the development of an integrated arts, cultural and entertainment district and examined submissions critically in this respect.

2. The Panel noted that some submissions proposed large amphitheatres / sports stadia or over-emphasized commercial and residential development, while making no provision for, or providing insufficient information on, proposed arts and cultural facilities. The Panel classified such submissions as having failed to meet the Competition Brief.

Landmark and design features

3. The Competition Brief encourages conceptual designs creating landmarks and many of the submissions proposed such features, often as arts and cultural facilities, though not always to an appropriate scale. The assessment of landmark and design features involved a degree of subjectivity and the Panel could not always reach consensus. In addition, some submissions containing striking landmark features were considered by some members of the Panel to be of only average quality overall.

4. The Panel took the view that a submission that contained a striking landmark feature of appropriate scale, even though it only generally met the Brief to an average standard, should be categorized as displaying innovative ideas and commendable design concepts, rather than as being of average quality with some good features. This would allow such submissions to be considered by the Jury on the same level as submissions having a more consistent standard of innovative and commendable features.

Extension of the Scheme Area through additional reclamation

5. Whilst the Competition Brief permits proposals extending beyond the Scheme Area, it also points out that in the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (enacted in June 1997) there is a presumption against reclamation in the Harbour.

6. The Panel considered that submissions proposing extensive additional reclamation were inconsistent with the purpose of the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance and classified them as having failed to meet the Competition Brief.

Modification and integrity of the existing sea-wall

7. The Competition Brief requires submissions to exploit fully the waterfront of the Scheme Area, the main section of which forms a straight coastline.

8. Many submissions presented design concepts involving modifications to the existing sea-wall, particularly the straight section. The Panel considered that, whereas minor modifications to the sea-wall were possible with sufficient justification and should therefore not be ruled out, major modifications to create a substantially different coastline would be prohibitively expensive and possibly conflict with the presumption against further reclamation in the Harbour. It also considered that major modifications to create navigable water-ways within the reclamation, as proposed in some submissions, would negate part of the considerable effort and expense that had gone into forming the reclamation. The Panel considered therefore that submissions proposing major modifications to the sea-wall should be classified as having failed to meet the Competition Brief. The Panel noted that many submissions proposed commendable design concepts which did not include major modifications to the sea-wall.

9. The Panel considered that water features or shallow waterways for pleasure-boating that were contained by the existing sea-wall were acceptable as design features.

10. The Panel considered that submissions proposing a large mound next to the sea-wall as a main feature had serious technical shortcomings, as the sea-wall would collapse under the pressure exerted by the mound. Such submissions were assessed as having failed to meet the Competition Brief.

Construction over rail and road tunnel reserves

11. The Competition Brief specifies that the Airport Railway and Western Harbour (Road) Crossing alignments and their associated underground facilities and ventilation buildings form existing constraints which must be taken as given and taken into account at the conceptual proposal stage. It also provides that the possibility of decking over the Western Harbour Crossing Toll Plaza area for open space use should be explored.

12. The Panel noted that many submissions proposed substantial

structures on top of, or partly over, the tunnel reserves. Where the structure was directly over one or both of the tunnel reserves and it appeared that the conceptual design lacked scope for it to be relocated easily, the Panel assessed the submission concerned as having failed to meet the Competition Brief. Where the structure encroached partly onto a tunnel reserve, the Panel generally took a more flexible view on the basis that scope would exist for modifications at later design stages.

Linkage with adjoining areas

13. The Panel noted that many submissions emphasized links between the Scheme Area and adjoining districts, including Kowloon Park and the existing cultural facilities in Tsim Sha Tsui.

14. Some submissions, including one recommended for disqualification, proposed monorail systems linking different areas and facilities. The Panel considered that the submission recommended for disqualification (no. 094) presented a conceptual design for such a system which should be drawn to the attention of the Jury.

Feasibility of implementation

15. The Panel observed that some of the conceptual proposals could be difficult to implement in practice. For example, several submissions proposed large canopies covering all or substantial parts of the Scheme Area. The construction of such structures and of buildings within them might be feasible, but the ownership, management and maintenance of the canopy could well present problems.

16. The Panel considered that doubts over the feasibility of implementing a conceptual proposal should not equate to failure to meet the Competition Brief, but were relevant to the technical assessment of entries. Such doubts should be recorded in the assessment form for the individual submission concerned.

Borderline cases

17. Some of the submissions assessed by the Panel as being of average quality with some good features were placed in this category despite some aspects of the submission being considered by some members of the Panel to border on failing to meet the Competition Brief. The Panel generally gave the submission the benefit of the doubt.