

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(2)1189/11-12

Ref : CB2/PS/2/08

Paper for the House Committee

Background brief prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat

West Kowloon Reclamation Concept Plan Competition

Purpose

This paper provides background information on the West Kowloon Reclamation Concept Plan Competition ("the Competition") which was conducted in 2001. It also summarizes the deliberations of the relevant committees of the Legislative Council ("LegCo") on the Competition.

Background

2. In his 1999 Policy Address, the Chief Executive announced the plan to develop a major world-class performance venue on the West Kowloon Reclamation ("WKR") and hold an open competition to enlist the help of local and overseas professionals to create a new look for the Victoria Harbour, including the waterfront at WKR. On 6 April 2001, the Government launched the Competition to invite conceptual proposals for the development of a 40-hectare waterfront site at the southern tip of WKR into an integrated arts, cultural and entertainment district.

3. The Competition was organized by the former Planning and Lands Bureau ("the Organizer"). In launching the Competition, the Government issued in April 2001 the Competition Document containing the general conditions of the Competition, the Competition Brief and details of the site. The Competition Document also set out, among others, the composition of the Jury and the Technical Panel, ineligibility, assessment criteria and prizes for the winning entries.

Jury, Technical Panel and Professional Advisor

4. According to the Competition Document, "conceptual proposals submitted shall be adjudicated by a Jury made up of 10 members".¹ The membership of the Jury is in **Appendix I**.

5. The Jury was assisted by a Technical Panel consisting of 10 members chaired by the Director of Planning. The composition of the Panel is in **Appendix II**. According to the Competition Document, "the main role of the Technical Panel is to provide advice to the Jury on the technical assessments of individual submissions. The Chairman of the Technical Panel shall attend the meetings of the Jury to present the Panel's assessments, but he shall not take part in the return of the verdict of the Competition".²

6. The Organizer appointed Mr Bill Lacy as the Professional Advisor to the Competition. As stated in the Competition Document, "his main role is to provide advice on the organization and management of the Competition through the various stages, and on compliance with the Competition rules and submission requirements. He shall attend the meetings of the Technical Panel and the Jury".³

Assessment criteria

7. The Competition Document provided that "all submissions will be judged in accordance with the broad assessment criteria"⁴, "details of which shall be established by the Jury".⁴ These criteria are set out below

-

"(I) Planning and design merits

- (1) Ability to provide a compelling and plausible vision to shape the future use of the Scheme Area⁵ as an integrated arts, cultural and entertainment district;

¹ Paragraph 8 of the Competition Document.

² Paragraph 9 of the Competition Document.

³ Paragraph 10 of the Competition Document.

⁴ Paragraph 31 of, and Annex 2 to, the Competition Document.

⁵ As stated in the Executive Summary of the Competition Document, "Scheme Area" refers to a newly reclaimed site of 40 hectares at the southern tip of the West Kowloon Reclamation in Kowloon Peninsula, Hong Kong. It is in close proximity to Tsim Sha Tsui which is a vibrant tourist, shopping and entertainment district with a wide range of leisure, entertainment as well as arts and cultural facilities."

- (2) Ability to translate waterfront and harbour presence into development of distinguished identity;
- (3) Ability to optimize site potential and development opportunities;
- (4) Ability of adopting 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; and
- (7) Ability to demonstrate broad feasibility in traffic arrangements.

(II) Overall benefits to Hong Kong

- (1) Meeting the overall objective of enhancing Hong Kong's position as Asia's premiere centre of arts, culture and entertainment;
- (2) Bringing planning and urban design benefits to Hong Kong; and
- (3) Meeting public aspirations and generating civic pride. "4

Ineligibility

8. Paragraph 16 of the Competition Document provided that "[a]ll those likely to be in conflict of interest are excluded from the Competition including but not necessarily limited to the following -

- (i) Persons closely associated with the Competition and their immediate family members;
- (ii) Members of the Jury and the Technical Panel, and the Professional Advisor and their immediate family members;
- (iii) An employee, any person having an employment-type contract or at continuous and close professional association

or partnership with a member in category (i) and (ii) above;
or

- (iv) A company of which a member in category (i) and (ii) above is a director or major shareholder."

Competition results

9. The Competition attracted a total of 161 entries by the closing date of 29 September 2001, with 71 from Hong Kong and 90 from the Mainland, Macau and 28 other countries. On 28 February 2002, the Chairman of the Jury announced the results of the Competition as follows

-

- | | | |
|----------------------------|----|---|
| First prize winning entry | -- | A team led by Foster and Partners of the United Kingdom ("the Foster's Scheme") |
| Second prize winning entry | -- | A team led by Mr Philip Y K LIAO of Hong Kong |
| First honourable mention | -- | A team led by Professor Minoru Takeyama of Japan |
| Second honourable mention | -- | A joint team led by Mr Alan MacDonald, Urbis-LPT (Architects) Association, of Hong Kong |
| Third honourable mention | -- | A team led by Mr Rocco Sen Kee YIM |

10. According to the Competition Document, "the decisions of the Jury shall be final and cannot be appealed against".⁶ The Report of the Jury is in **Appendix III**.

Deliberations by committees

11. Issues relating to the Competition had been discussed by the Panel on Home Affairs ("HA Panel"), the Panel on Planning, Lands and Works ("the PLW Panel") and the Subcommittee on West Kowloon Cultural

⁶ Paragraph 32 of the Competition Document.

District Development ("the Subcommittee") appointed under the House Committee. The deliberations are highlighted in the ensuing paragraphs.

Linkage between the Competition and development right of WKR

12. In the context of discussing the Administration's plan to launch the Competition, the development right of WKR was a major concern of members. At the meeting of the HA Panel on 13 December 1999, members enquired whether there was any linkage between the Competition and the development right of WKR. According to the Administration, in view of the large size of the site, it might not be a fair arrangement for the winner of the Competition to be given the exclusive right of development of the whole site. Subject to the outcome of the Competition, the Administration would explore the best way of disposing of the development right of WKR.⁷

13. The PLW Panel received a briefing from the Administration on the progress of its plan to launch the Competition at the meeting on 9 March 2000. Some members suggested that to attract renowned designers and architects to join the Competition, the winner of the Competition should be given the development right. The Administration then advised that it would issue a detailed Competition Brief setting out the rules, requirements, assessment criteria and awards of the Competition, and participants would be aware that the winner would not be given the development right of WKR automatically.⁸

14. In the Executive Summary of the Competition Document issued in April 2001, it was stated that "there is no linkage between the Competition and the eventual development right of the Scheme Area".

15. In April 2002, the PLW Panel was informed by the Administration of the outcome of the Competition by way of an information paper.⁹ The information paper was noted by the PLW Panel at its meeting on 8 May 2002.

Disclosure of the Report of the Technical Panel

16. In April 2005, there was a press report stating that the Report of the Technical Panel had raised concern about the feasibility of the

⁷ LC Paper No. CB(2)1456/99-00.

⁸ LC Paper No. CB(1)1595/99-00.

⁹ LC Paper No. CB(1)1616/01-02.

implementation of some submissions, including the Foster's Scheme, which proposed large canopies covering all or parts of the WKR site, and the Technical Panel had not been in support of the Foster's Scheme. However, the canopy, a key feature of the Foster's Scheme, was included as a mandatory requirement in the Invitation for Proposals for the Development of the West Kowloon Cultural District ("IFP") launched in September 2003. The Subcommittee therefore scheduled a meeting to discuss the matter. Prior to the meeting, members requested the Administration to provide the Subcommittee with a copy of the Report of the Technical Panel.

17. The Administration advised in its paper to the Subcommittee¹⁰ that paragraph 33 of Section I of the Competition Document stipulated that "the assessment process will be carried out in strict confidence. The organizer shall not disclose the details of the assessment". Part 2.14(a) of the Code on Access to Information provided that information held for, or provided by a third party under an explicit or implicit understanding that it would not be further disclosed, might be disclosed with third party's consent. In the light of the Subcommittee's request and to allow the public to better understand the work of the Technical Panel, the Administration had considered, in consultation with its legal advisers, how the Report of the Technical Panel might be disclosed to the extent that the principle of confidentiality would not be breached. The Administration had followed the due process and obtained the consent of the Chairman and members of the Technical Panel to disclose the Report of the Technical Panel without its annex and the assessment forms. The Report of the Technical Panel provided by the Administration to the Subcommittee is in **Appendix IV**.

18. The Report of the Technical Panel was considered by the Subcommittee at its meeting on 22 April 2005. The concerns of members were on issues relating to IFP as recorded in the minutes of the Subcommittee's meeting.¹¹

19. A list of the relevant committee papers with their hyperlinks at LegCo's website is in **Appendix V**.

¹⁰ WKCD-118.

¹¹ LC Paper No. WKCD-157.

Relevant Council questions

20. Members have raised three questions at Council meetings concerning the Competition which mainly cover the following areas -

- (a) measures to encourage institutions, architects and planners to participate in the Competition; and
- (b) allegation of conflict of interests involving a prospective Chief Executive candidate .

A summary of the questions raised is provided in **Appendix VI**.

Council Business Division 2
Legislative Council Secretariat
23 February 2012

**Membership of the Jury of
the West Kowloon Reclamation Concept Plan Competition**

Chairman

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

Members

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

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

The Hon Mrs Selina CHOW, JP
Chairman, Hong Kong Tourism Board, Hong Kong

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

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

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

Mr Peter W. Rogers
Director, Stanhope Plc., London, England

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

Professor WU Liangyong
Professor and Director, Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies, School of Architecture, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China

Source: Competition Document of the West Kowloon Reclamation Concept Plan Competition issued by the former Planning and Lands Bureau

COMPOSITION OF THE TECHNICAL PANEL

Chairman : (1) Director of Planning

Members : Officials

- (2) Director of Architectural Services or his representative
- (3) Director of Leisure and Cultural Services or his representative

Non-officials

- (4) Mr. Leslie H.C. CHEN
Member, the Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
- (5) Ir. Professor CHOW Che-king
Member, the Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
- (6) Professor LAM Kin-che
Member, Advisory Council on the Environment
- (7) Mr. David C. LEE
Member, the Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
- (8) Professor LUI Chun-wan, Alex
Member, the Hong Kong Institute of Architects
- (9) Mr. TSAO Sing-yuen, Willy, BBS
Member, Hong Kong Arts Development Council
- (10) Mr. YIP Cho-tat, Stanley
Member, the Hong Kong Institute of Planners

*Source: Competition Document of the West Kowloon Reclamation Concept Plan Competition
issued by the former Planning and Lands Bureau*

**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

On 6 April 2001, the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (HKSARG) launched an international concept plan competition for the development of an integrated arts, cultural and entertainment district at the West Kowloon Reclamation in Hong Kong. The results of the competition were announced on 28 February 2002. This document is the report of the competition Jury on the selection of the winning entries.

THE COMPETITION SITE

2. The competition site, extending over 40 hectares, is at the southern tip of the West Kowloon Reclamation in Hong Kong, close to the Tsim Sha Tsui tourist and entertainment area and to major new commercial and residential development around Kowloon Station on the airport railway. It also faces the commercial and residential districts of Central, Sheung Wan and the Mid-levels across Victoria Harbour on Hong Kong Island. The prominent waterfront location provides an ideal setting for the development of landmark arts and cultural facilities. The competition was launched with the intention of taking maximum advantage of this unique opportunity to enhance Hong Kong as a city of arts, culture and entertainment and create a new look for Victoria Harbour.

ENTRIES TO THE COMPETITION

3. The Competition Document, containing full details of the site, the general conditions of the competition and the competition brief, was given wide publicity. 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 breakdown of the origin of the 161 entries at Annex I 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 was invited to vote for five entries meriting further consideration as the winning entry, on a non-binding basis and without ranking them. Some 20 entries

were selected in this way. After reviewing the votes cast, the Jury decided that the nine entries with 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. After discussion, five entries were nominated for further consideration.
 - (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 nominate any entry from among these seven, or any other entry, that they felt merited further consideration. After discussion, six entries were nominated.
- (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

Origin of the 161 entries to the competition

Place of origin	Entries received
Australia	5
Austria	3
Bulgaria	1
Canada	1
China (Mainland)	10
Colombia	1
Denmark	1
France	1
Germany	12
Hong Kong	71
India	3
Indonesia	2
Italy	2
Japan	6
Korea	1
Lebanon	1
Luxembourg	1
Macau	1
Malaysia	1
Monaco	1
Netherlands	2
New Zealand	1
Norway	1
Singapore	2
Sweden	2
Switzerland	1
Thailand	3
Turkey	2
UK	3
USA	18
Venezuela	1
Total	161

Composition of the Technical Panel

- Chairman : Mr Bosco Fung Chee-keung, JP
Director of Planning, HKSARG
- Members : Mr Pau Shiu-hung, JP
Director of Architectural Services, HKSARG
- Miss Choi Suk-kuen, JP,
representing the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services,
HKSARG
- Mr Leslie H Chen
Member, the Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
- Ir Professor Chow Che-king, OBE
Member, the Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
- Professor Lam Kin-che
Member, Advisory Council on the Environment
- Mr David C Lee, BBS, JP
Member, the Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
- Professor Lui Chun-wan, Alex
Member, the Hong Kong Institute of Architects
- Mr Tsao Sing-yuen, Willy, BBS
Member, Hong Kong Arts Development Council
- Mr Yip Cho-tat, Stanley
Member, the Hong Kong Institute of Planners

Source: LC Paper No. WKCD-119

De-classified on 18 April 2005

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

**WEST KOWLOON RECLAMATION
CONCEPT PLAN COMPETITION**

REPORT OF THE TECHNICAL PANEL

January 2002

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

REPORT OF THE TECHNICAL PANEL

INTRODUCTION

This document is the report of the Technical Panel (the Panel) established to advise the Jury for the West Kowloon Reclamation Concept Plan Competition on the technical assessment of individual entries to the competition.

BACKGROUND

2. The Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region 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. (Note: entries dispatched by air on or before 26 September 2001 were accepted as meeting the closing date if they arrived after 29 September, 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 arrived late and were not considered further.

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

ROLE, COMPOSITION AND MEETINGS OF THE TECHNICAL PANEL

5. The Competition Document states that the Jury will be assisted

by a Technical Panel consisting of ten members chaired by the Director of Planning and that the main role of the Panel is to provide advice to the Jury on the technical assessment of individual submissions. The Chairman of the Panel is required to attend the Jury meetings to present the Panel's assessments, but he may not take part in the return of the verdict of the competition. The composition of the Panel is set out in Annex I to the Competition Document.

6. The Panel met on 9 October 2001 to decide upon a process for the technical assessment of the entries and on 11, 12, 15 and 17 December 2001 to assess the 161 entries in accordance with the agreed process.

7. The Professional Advisor to the competition, Mr Bill Lacy, FAIA, advised the Organizer and the Panel on procedural matters and on compliance with competition rules and submission requirements. He visited Hong Kong to attend the December meetings of the Panel.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AND CONFIDENTIALITY

8. Before proceeding with its assessment work, the Panel considered the provision in the Competition Document that all those likely to be in conflict of interest should be excluded from the competition and discussed what more might be done to ensure compliance. The Panel agreed that members should declare whether, to the best of their knowledge, any party with which they were closely associated had entered the competition and, if so, the details of the matter. The Panel also accepted the need to maintain strict confidentiality throughout the assessment process.

9. The Organizer prepared a declaration form covering conflict of interest and confidentiality in consultation with the Professional Advisor and the Independent Commission Against Corruption and this was completed by all members of the Panel and the Professional Advisor.

10. The declarations made by members were discussed by the Panel immediately before commencing the technical assessment of entries and they were satisfied that, on the basis of the declarations, no conflict of interest arose for any member.

TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT OF ENTRIES

11. The following paragraphs describe how the Panel proceeded with the technical assessment of entries.

Technical appraisal by government departments

12. The Panel considered that it would be helpful if the government departments with a primary interest in the concept plan for the competition site - the Planning Department, the Architectural Services Department, the Leisure and Cultural Services Department, the Transport Department and the Environmental Protection Department - could first advise, in strict confidence, whether the individual entries had generally met the Competition Brief in relation to their respective areas of work and highlight any major technical shortcomings or particularly noteworthy aspects.

13. The departments concerned conducted this technical appraisal from mid October to mid November 2001. The aspects appraised corresponded to the requirements of the Competition Brief. Consolidated versions of the departmental appraisals were prepared by the Organizer and received by Panel members together with the entries.

14. The Panel decided that it would suffice to submit to the Jury its own technical assessments. The departmental appraisals, which make up four bulky volumes, are therefore not attached to this report. They will, however, be available at the Jury meeting for inspection.

Technical assessment and categorization of individual entries

15. The Organizer set up all of the entries in a single exhibition gallery, allowing individual members of the Panel to view and compare all of the entries together before beginning the group assessment of individual entries.

16. The Panel was mindful of its role to assist the Jury without infringing on that body's ultimate adjudication responsibility. At the same time, the Panel took into account the Jury's need to have access at all stages of their deliberations to the entire 161 entries. Therefore the Panel sought to organize the entries into manageable Categories, described below.

17. The Panel considered the entries in serial number order, assessing them from different technical perspectives and, taking into consideration the departmental appraisals and the advice of the Professional Advisor, categorized them according to whether they generally met the Competition Brief (Category 1), or failed to meet the Brief in important respects (Category 2), or should be recommended for disqualification (Category 3). The Panel discussed each entry with the relevant presentation boards set up in front of them and decided upon the appropriate category by

consensus or vote.

18. The Panel came to an early conclusion that a relatively high proportion of entries would generally meet the requirements of the Competition Brief and that it would assist the Jury if entries in Category 1 were sub-divided into those which were -

- (a) well presented, with innovative ideas and commendable design concepts (Category 1(a)); and
- (b) of average quality with some good features (Category 1(b)).

19. Some of the entries assessed as being of average quality with some good features were placed in this category despite some aspects of the entry being considered by some members of the Panel to border on failing to meet the Competition Brief. In these borderline cases, the Panel generally gave the participant the benefit of the doubt.

20. The Panel agreed that its assessments, in addition to categorizing the entry, should draw to the Jury's attention any particularly noteworthy aspects or major technical shortcomings. Minor shortcomings were disregarded on the basis that this is only the conceptual planning stage and minor problems can be worked out at the detailed planning and design stages.

Entries recommended for disqualification

21. The Professional Advisor advised the Panel that, after reviewing the entries, 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 in specific non-technical respects. The Panel endorsed the Professional Advisor's advice in respect of all 12 submissions as they assessed the individual entries concerned.

IMPORTANT TECHNICAL CONSIDERATIONS IDENTIFIED BY THE PANEL

22. During its discussions, the Panel identified a number of important technical considerations that, singly or in combination, most often determined the category into which an entry was placed. The Panel wishes to draw these points to the attention of the Jury. They are set out below.

Provision of arts and cultural facilities

23. 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.

24. The Panel noted that some submissions proposed large amphitheatres or 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 features

25. 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.

26. 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

27. 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.

28. 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

29. The Competition Brief requires submissions to exploit fully the

waterfront of the Scheme Area, the main section of which forms a straight coastline.

30. 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.

31. 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.

32. 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

33. 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.

34. 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

35. 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.

36. 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

37. 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.

38. 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.

ADVICE OF THE TECHNICAL PANEL

39. Having completed its technical assessment of the 161 entries, the Panel advises the Jury that -

- (a) 54 entries generally meet the requirements of the Competition Brief, of which 21 are considered to be well presented, with innovative ideas and commendable design concepts, and 33 to be of average quality with some good features. These comprise the entries placed in Categories 1(a) and 1(b), respectively;
- (b) 95 entries fail to meet the requirements of the Competition Brief in important respects. These comprise the entries placed in Category 2; and

- (c) 12 entries failed to abide by the rules, requirements or conditions set out in the Competition Document in important respects and are recommended for disqualification. These comprise the entries placed in Category 3.

40. A tabular summary of the Panel's categorization of the entries is at the **Annex** to this report. The summary includes the reasons for recommending disqualification in the cases concerned.

41. Forms containing the Panel's technical assessments of the 161 entries also form part of this report. They make up two volumes. Volume I contains the assessments in respect of the entries placed in Categories 1(a) and 1(b), in serial number order. Volume II contains the assessments in respect of the entries placed in Categories 2 and 3, also in serial number order.

January 2002

Source: LC Paper No. WKCD-120

資料來源：立法會 WKCD-120 號文件

**Relevant papers on
West Kowloon Reclamation Concept Plan Competition**

Committee	Date of meeting	Paper
Panel on Home Affairs	13.12.1999 (Item IV)	Agenda LC Paper No. CB(2)587/99-00(01) Minutes
Panel on Planning, Lands and Works	9.3.2000 (Item IV)	Agenda LC Paper No. CB(1)1103/99-00(03) Minutes
Panel on Planning, Lands and Works	8.5.2002	LC Paper No. CB(1)1616/01-02
Subcommittee on West Kowloon Cultural District Development	22.4.2005 (Item II(2))	Agenda LC Paper No. WKCD-118 LC Paper No. WCKD-119 LC Paper No. WKCD-120 Minutes

Council Business Division 2
Legislative Council Secretariat
 23 February 2012

Relevant Council questions raised by Members

Members have raised the following questions in Council relating to the West Kowloon Reclamation Concept Plan Competition ("Competition") -

Oral question raised by Hon Ambrose LAU Hon-chuen on encouraging qualified planners and architects to enter the Competition on 4 July 2001

2. Hon Ambrose LAU Hon-chuen enquired, among other things, about measures to encourage qualified local planners or architects to actively enter the Competition. The question and the reply are available at:

<http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr00-01/english/counmtg/hansard/010704fe.pdf>

(pages 56 to 64)

Written question raised by Hon LAU Ping-cheung on inviting individual institutions, architects or planners to participate in the Competition on 4 July 2001

3. Hon LAU Ping-cheung enquired, among other things, whether the Administration had taken the initiative to invite institutions, architects or planners to participate in the Competition. The question and the reply are available at:

<http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr00-01/english/counmtg/hansard/010704fe.pdf>

(pages 102 to 103)

Urgent oral question raised by Hon LEE Wing-tat on allegation of conflict of interests involving a Chief Executive candidate on 15 February 2012

4. Hon LEE Wing-tat enquired, among other things, whether the Administration would immediately make public information relating to the adjudication of the Competition and declaration of interests by the member of the Jury of the Competition who would stand in the Chief Executive Election, and measures to be taken by the Administration to ensure that the forthcoming Chief Executive Election would be conducted in a fair, impartial, and open manner. The question and the reply are available at:

<http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr11-12/chinese/hc/papers/hc0217cb2-1106-1-ec.pdf>