



圖例  
NOTATION

ZONES		地帶
COMMERCIAL	C	商業
COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT AREA	CDA	綜合發展區
GOVERNMENT, INSTITUTION OR COMMUNITY	GIC	政府、機構或社區
OPEN SPACE	O	休憩用地
OTHER SPECIFIED USES	OU	其他指定用途
COMMUNICATIONS		交通
RAILWAY AND STATION (UNDERGROUND)		鐵路及車站 (地下)
MAJOR ROAD AND JUNCTION		主要道路及路口
ELEVATED ROAD		高架道路
RAILWAY RESERVE		鐵路專用範圍
MISCELLANEOUS		其他
BOUNDARY OF PLANNING SCHEME		規劃範圍界線
MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT (IN METRES ABOVE PRINCIPAL DATUM)		最高建築物高度 (在主水平基準上若干米)
PETROL FILLING STATION	P F S	加油站

土地用途及面積一覽表  
SCHEDULE OF USES AND AREAS

USES	大約面積及百分比 APPROXIMATE AREA & %		用途
	公頃 HECTARES	% 百分比	
COMMERCIAL	3.23	5.85	商業
COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT AREA	1.65	2.99	綜合發展區
GOVERNMENT, INSTITUTION OR COMMUNITY	7.97	14.45	政府、機構或社區
OPEN SPACE	8.75	15.86	休憩用地
OTHER SPECIFIED USES	17.19	31.16	其他指定用途
MAJOR ROAD ETC.	16.38	29.69	主要道路等
TOTAL PLANNING SCHEME AREA	55.17	100.00	規劃範圍總面積

夾附的《註釋》屬這份圖則的一部分。  
現經修訂並按照城市規劃條例第5條展示。  
THE ATTACHED NOTES ALSO FORM PART OF THIS PLAN  
AND HAVE BEEN AMENDED FOR EXHIBITION UNDER  
SECTION 5 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE

核准圖編號 S/H25/4 的修訂  
AMENDMENT TO APPROVED PLAN No. S/H25/4

AMENDMENT EXHIBITED UNDER SECTION 5  
OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE

按照城市規劃條例第5條  
展示的修訂

AMENDMENT ITEM A

(參看附表)  
(SEE ATTACHED SCHEDULE)

2023年1月13日 按照城市規劃條例第5條展示的  
核准圖編號 S/H25/4 的修訂  
AMENDMENT TO APPROVED PLAN No. S/H25/4 EXHIBITED  
UNDER SECTION 5 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE ON  
13 JANUARY 2023

C. K. YIP 葉子季  
SECRETARY  
TOWN PLANNING BOARD 城市規劃委員會秘書

香港城市規劃委員會依據城市規劃條例擬備的灣仔北（港島規劃區第25區）分區計劃大綱圖  
TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE, HONG KONG TOWN PLANNING BOARD  
HONG KONG PLANNING AREA No. 25 - WAN CHAI NORTH - OUTLINE ZONING PLAN

SCALE 1:5000 比例尺  
METRES 100 0 200 400 600 800 METRES 米

圖則編號  
PLAN No. S/H25/5



城市規劃委員會根據《城市規劃條例》(第 131 章)  
對灣仔北分區計劃大綱核准圖編號 S/H 25/4  
所作修訂項目附表

**I. 就圖則所顯示的事項作出的修訂項目**

- A 項 – 把涵蓋現有灣仔政府大樓、稅務大樓、入境事務大樓、港灣消防局、告士打道花園和部分港灣道的用地由「政府、機構或社區」地帶及顯示為「道路」的地方改劃為「其他指定用途(6)」註明「展覽中心及商業用途」地帶，並訂明該地帶內的支區。

根據《鐵路條例》(第 519 章)批准並已竣工的香港鐵路(東鐵綫)(前稱沙田至中環綫)及香港鐵路(南港島綫)，以及根據《道路(工程、使用及補償)條例》(第 370 章)批准並已竣工的中環灣仔繞道須當作為根據《城市規劃條例》第 13A 條獲得核准，並在圖則上顯示，以供參考之用。

已更新的擬議北港島線鐵路專用範圍及擬議正義道擴建部分，在圖則上標示，以供參考之用。

**II. 就圖則《註釋》作出的修訂項目**

- (a) 在「其他指定用途」註明「展覽中心及商業用途」地帶的《註釋》加入新的「備註」，以納入有關「其他指定用途(6)」地帶及其支區的總樓面面積及建築物高度限制；並加入在計算有關「其他指定用途(6)」地帶的總樓面面積時有關豁免附屬用途及設施和略為放寬有關發展限制的條文。
- (b) 在「其他指定用途」註明「展覽中心及商業用途」地帶的第一欄用途內把「住宅」修訂為「住宅(在指定為「其他指定用途(6)」的土地範圍除外)」。
- (c) 修訂「其他指定用途」註明「鐵路通風大樓」地帶規劃意向，把「沙田至中環綫」取代為「東鐵綫」。
- (d) 把「政府、機構或社區」地帶的第二欄用途內的「商店及服務行業」修訂為「商店及服務行業(未另有列明者)」。

城市規劃委員會

2023 年 1 月 13 日



有關《灣仔北分區計劃大綱草圖編號 S/H25/5》的申述人和提意見人名單

I. 申述人名單

申述編號 (TPB/R/S/H25/5-)	申述人名稱
R1	Lau Chun Kit
R2	Yui Hang Cheng
R3	John Douglas Moore
R4	Wilhelmina Evelyn Moore
R5	Genevieve James Moore
R6	Melanie Moore
R7	Roger Emmerton
R8	Mary Mulvihill
R9	MTR Corporation Limited

II. 提意見人名單

申述編號 (TPB/R/S/H25/5-)	提意見人名稱
C1	Mary Mulvihill

**TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

**Minutes of 710<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the  
Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 23.12.2022**

**Present**

Director of Planning  
Mr Ivan M. K. Chung

Chairman

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Vice-chairman

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Assistant Commissioner (Urban), Transport Department  
Mr Patrick K.H. Ho

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department  
Mr Paul Y.K. Au

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment),  
Environmental Protection Department  
Dr Sunny C.W. Cheung

Assistant Director/Regional 1 (Acting),  
Lands Department  
Mr Lawrance S.C. Chan

Deputy Director of Planning/District  
Mr C.K. Yip

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui

**In Attendance**

Assistant Director of Planning/Board  
Ms Lily Y.M. Yam

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng

Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Mr Brian C.L. Chau



9. ~~After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.~~

### **Hong Kong District**

#### **Agenda Item 6**

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Wan Chai North Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H25/4  
(MPC Paper No. 15/22)

---

10. The Secretary reported that Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (ARUP) and Wong & Ouyang (Hong Kong) Limited (WOHK) were two of the consultants of the Hong Kong Trade Development Council (HKTDC) that prepared the technical assessments in support of the proposed amendments. Mr Franklin Yu had declared an interest on the item for having current business dealings with ARUP and past business dealings with Wong & Ouyang (Building Services) Limited which was related to WOHK. The Committee noted that Mr Franklin Yu had not yet arrived to join the meeting. As Mr Franklin Yu had no involvement in the proposed amendments, the Committee agreed that he could join the meeting upon his arrival.

11. The following government representatives and representatives of HKTDC and their consultants were invited to the meeting at this point :

**PlanD**

Mr Mann M.H. Chow	-	District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK)
Ms Floria Y.T. Tsang	-	Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK)
Mr David S.T. Leung	-	Town Planner/Hong Kong (TP/HK)

**Commerce and Economic Development Bureau (CEDB)**

Mr Harry T.Y. Lin	-	Principal Assistant Secretary for Commerce & Economic Development 1 (PAS for Commerce & Econ Dev 1)
Mr Alec Y.P. Luk	-	Engineer(1) (E(1))

**Hong Kong Trade Development Council (HKTDC)**

Ms Jocelyn Chung	-	Head of Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre (HKCEC) Affairs
Mr Max Ngai	-	Principal Project Manager, HKCEC Affairs

**Consultants of HKTDC**

Mr Albert Chan	-	WOHK
Mr Vincent Lau	-	Townland Consultants Limited
Mr Chapman Lam	}	MVA Hong Kong Limited
Mr K. C. Tong		
Mr Ringo Lee	-	Earthasia Design Group
Ms Kylie Lam	-	ARUP
Mr K. S. Lee	-	Cinotech Consultants Limited
Mr Calvin Chiu	-	Ramboll Hong Kong Limited

12. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Floria Y.T. Tsang, STP/HK, briefed Members on the background of the proposed amendments to the OZP, technical considerations, consultation conducted and departmental comments as detailed in the Paper. The main proposed amendment was for rezoning a site currently occupied by Wan Chai Government Towers (WCGTs), Kong Wan Fire Station, Gloucester Road Garden and part of Harbour Road (the Site) from “Government, Institution or Community” and an area shown as ‘Road’ to “Other Specified Uses (6)” annotated “Exhibition Centre with Commercial Development” (the “OU(6)” zone) (Amendment Item A).

13. As the presentation of PlanD's representative had been completed, the Chairman invited questions from Members.

14. The Vice-chairman and some Members raised the following questions :

*Proposed Uses*

- (a) the factors that had been taken into account when deciding on the proposed mix of convention and exhibition (C&E), hotel and office uses (the three proposed uses) and their respective gross floor area (GFA); the reason why the GFA proposed for C&E facilities was lower than that for proposed office; and whether the Site had been fully utilised to meet the demand for C&E facilities;
- (b) whether there was flexibility for the future developer to decide on the GFA mix to cater for the latest market needs;
- (c) the existing supply of C&E facilities in Hong Kong and its demand forecast;
- (d) any examples of development with the three proposed uses accommodated within one building and how management of the three proposed uses in a co-ordinated manner could be ensured;

*Building Bulk*

- (e) noting the substantial scale of the proposed development, how it would be compatible with the neighbouring developments and why the hotel was proposed on top of the office floors under the conceptual scheme;
- (f) how the proposed development could be a 'landmark' building in the context for ridgeline protection under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG);



*Pedestrian Connectivity and Transport Provision*

- (g) how future visitors would access the Site from the MTR Wan Chai Station and how congestion on the existing passageways and footbridges during exhibitions and events could be addressed. How accessibility to the Site, including vertical connectivity within the Site could be enhanced. Whether any resting place/seating area would be provided along the pedestrian passageway from the MTR Wan Chai Station to the Site, as well as within the Site;
- (h) noting that the existing loading/unloading (L/UL) traffic was already very congested during exhibition periods, what the L/UL arrangement for the C&E facilities in the proposed development would be;
- (i) the mechanism to ensure 24-hour public access of the pedestrian passageway and footbridge system;

*Provision of Government, Institution and Community (GIC) facilities and Open Space*

- (j) whether GIC facilities would be provided at the Site to promote social innovation, innovation and technology or start-ups for youth; and
- (k) the reprovisioning arrangement of the affected open space and government facilities and the overall social gain/loss brought about by the proposed development.

15. In response, with the aid of some Powerpoint slides, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, DPO/HK, Mr Harry T.Y. Lin, PAS for Commerce & Econ Dev 1 and Mr Albert Chan, WOHK made the following points :

*Proposed Uses*

- (a) the GFA of the C&E facilities was already maximised at the lowest 10 storeys of the proposed development. As C&E facilities required a larger footprint with specific requirements on extensive column-free

space, it was not practical to locate C&E facilities above 10-storey in view of the site coverage restrictions under the prevailing laws and regulations of the building regime and fire safety concern. To support the C&E facilities, hotel rooms were essential to provide accommodation for overseas visitors (estimated to be about 3,000 to 6,000 exhibitors during large scale exhibition events). Given the limited provision of hotel rooms in the Wan Chai North area (currently about 1,500 hotel rooms at the Renaissance Hong Kong Harbour View Hotel, Grand Hyatt Hong Kong and St Regis), visitors needed to consider alternative accommodations in other locations, including those in the Wan Chai hinterlands or even in Kowloon. Hence, a 500-room hotel was proposed on the Site. The remaining GFA calculated from the total plot ratio of 15 was then reserved for Grade A office;

- (b) to provide flexibility, only a maximum total GFA was stipulated for the “OU(6)” zone on the OZP. While there would be specific requirements on the provision of C&E facilities in land disposal, the future developer would have some flexibility to determine the GFA split of hotel and office uses;
- (c) regarding the demand and supply of the C&E facilities, the existing HKCEC (Phases 1 and 2) and the Asia World Expo provided approximately 90,000m<sup>2</sup> and 66,000m<sup>2</sup> of C&E floor space respectively. The planned extension of Asia World Expo and the proposed development of the Site would provide an additional 34,000m<sup>2</sup> and 30,000m<sup>2</sup> of C&E floor space respectively. Though the future demand for C&E facilities could not be projected with certainty, especially in view of the current pandemic situation, according to the study published by the Global Association of the Exhibition Industry, there would continuously be strong demand for tradition physical exhibitions (versus virtual exhibitions), and hence the need to provide additional C&E facilities;

*Building Bulk*

- (d) while there were not many examples of developments that accommodated the three proposed uses in one single development, the adjacent HKCEC was an example with C&E, hotel and office uses. The C&E facilities would be built and returned to the Government for management. The future developer would manage the office and hotel portions. There would be appropriate separation of traffic and pedestrians of the proposed uses and no adverse interface issue was anticipated;
- (e) regarding the scale of the proposed development, according to HKTDC's consultant, the footprint of the singular tower in the conceptual scheme was similar to that of the International Commerce Center (ICC). Regarding the locations of the office and hotel, reference had been made to other similar developments, including the ICC with the hotel placed on top floors above the office portion. Nonetheless, the future developer would have flexibility to determine the layout;
- (f) according to the HKPSG, whilst building free zone below ridgelines were recommended, it also stated that there should be flexibility for relaxation of building height based on individual merits and for special landmark buildings to give punctuation effects at suitable locations. In this regard, architectural design and special rooftop features could be adopted to create a more iconic design to signify the C&E cluster in Wan Chai North. The conceptual scheme was indicative and subject to detailed design of the future developer;

*Pedestrian Connectivity and Transport Provision*

- (g) for connection with the nearby MTR Stations, with the improvement works of the existing O'Brien Road footbridge system, the level of service for pedestrian would be improved and the estimated time for pedestrian to travel from the MTR Wan Chai Station through the Site to the HKCEC Phase 2 would be shortened. Moreover, the HKCEC can be approached from the new MTR Exhibition Centre Station. With the



proposed new footbridge connecting HKCEC Phase 2 with the MTR Exhibition Centre Station, it was anticipated that more visitors would be diverted to use the MTR Exhibition Centre Station to get to the Site in future;

- (h) it was not practical to provide resting place/seating area along the O'Brien Road footbridge as it would conflict with the busy pedestrian flow. The landing level of the footbridge within the Site would mainly be used for pedestrian circulation space but there might be scope to provide some seating area thereat. Visitors could also use the seating out area at ground level near the eastern boundary of the Site;
- (i) to enhance the connectivity and create better synergy effect with the existing C&E facilities in the HKCEC, an elevated connection was proposed across Harbour Road to provide same level connection to the existing facilities at the HKCEC. Also, barrier free access would be provided within the proposed development to enhance vertical accessibility within the Site and convenient connection to the entire footbridge system that linked with the Wan Chai hinterland and the waterfront area;
- (j) an underground vehicular tunnel would be constructed along Harbour Road as the main route for vehicular access to the proposed development with entrance to the tunnel in the vicinity of Fenwick Pier Street. There would be sufficient space for goods vehicles to queue up inside the tunnel to wait for L/UL without causing congestion to the local roads;
- (k) as the existing HKCEC and the proposed development were/would be managed by the Government or quasi-government organisation (i.e. HKTDC for HKCEC Phase 1), the footbridge connections and pedestrian facilities within the Site would be managed in a coherent manner;

*Provision of GIC facilities and Open Space*

- (l) regarding the possibility to incorporate other GIC facilities, ‘social welfare facility’ and ‘office’ uses were always permitted under the proposed zoning of the Site and no planning permission would be required from the Town Planning Board for the provision of premises to facilitate social innovation, innovation and technology or start-ups for youth. The possibility to provide additional GIC facilities at the Site could be further assessed at the detailed design stage;
- (m) regarding the provision of open space, a landscape deck of about 3,000m<sup>2</sup> would be provided atop the proposed vehicular tunnel entrance in the vicinity of Fenwick Pier Street to the northwest of the Site. Also, under the conceptual scheme, an outdoor seating area near the eastern boundary of the Site would be provided on the ground floor with landscaping design that would provide a comfortable and easily accessible space ideal for public enjoyment. Setback along Gloucester Road was also proposed to create a wider pedestrian path with a tree-lined boulevard that linked up with the existing open space at Central Plaza; and
- (n) the existing government facilities at the WCGTs would be relocated to other districts, including the new Inland Revenue Tower in Kai Tak, new Immigration Headquarters in Tseung Kwan O as well as the new District Court at Caroline Hill Road. With the proposed footbridge system, the general public could benefit from the enhancement in pedestrian connectivity between the Wan Chai hinterland and the waterfront. In this regard, a footbridge across Harbour Road connecting the Site with the elevated West Garden adjacent to the HKCEC was proposed such that pedestrians would have direct access to the harbourfront via the West Landscaped Deck (across Lung Wo Road/Expo Drive) which was already under construction.

[Mr Franklin Yu and Mr Paul Y.K. Au joined the meeting during the question and answer session.]

16. The Chairman remarked that the proposed amendment only stipulated the total GFA and building height restrictions under the “OU(6)” zone while flexibility was allowed for the future developer to determine the detailed land use mix.

17. After deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Wan Chai North Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H25/4 and that the draft Wan Chai North OZP No. S/H25/4A at Attachment II of the Paper (to be renumbered to S/H25/5 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment III of the Paper were suitable for exhibition for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance; and
- (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) at Attachment IV of the Paper for the draft Wan Chai North OZP No. S/H25/4A (to be renumbered to S/H25/5 upon exhibition) as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Town Planning Board (the Board) for the various land use zonings of the OZP and the revised ES would be published together with the OZP.

18. Members noted that, as a general practice, the Secretariat of the Board would undertake detailed checking and refinement of the draft OZP including the Notes and ES, if appropriate, before their publication under the Town Planning Ordinance. Any major revision would be submitted for the Board’s consideration.

[The Chairman thanked the government representatives and representatives of HKTDC and their consultants for their attendance to answer Members’ enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]



摘錄頁

香港特別行政區  
第六屆灣仔區議會屬下  
發展、規劃及交通委員會  
第八次會議紀錄

日期：二零二一年七月十三日(星期二)  
時間：上午十時  
地點：香港灣仔軒尼詩道 130 號修頓中心 21 樓  
灣仔民政事務處區議會會議室

出席者  
區議員

出席時間

離席時間

顧國慧議員	上午 10:00	下午 12:35
林偉文議員	上午 10:00	下午 12:14
李碧儀議員, MH (臨時主席)	上午 10:00	下午 12:35
謝偉俊議員, JP	上午 10:21	下午 12:00
黃宏泰議員, MH	上午 10:00	上午 11:53
楊雪盈議員	上午 10:00	下午 12:35

政府部門代表

鍾駿偉先生	民政事務總署灣仔民政事務助理專員
麥漢森先生	地政總署高級產業測量師/港島東(2)
曾翊婷女士	規劃署高級城市規劃師/港島 3
余靖鈞女士	香港警務處灣仔警區特別職務隊主管
李乃揚先生	香港警務處灣仔警區交通隊主管
傅定康先生	運輸署高級運輸主任/灣仔(署任)
方巧妍女士	運輸署工程師/灣仔 1
李漢先生	土木工程拓展署高級工程師/9(南)
陳啟賢先生	路政署區域工程師/灣仔區
楊俊傑先生	水務署工程師/香港及離島區(分配 4)

其他政府部門及機構代表

符致日先生	渠務署工程師/港島東 1
鄧景華先生	香港警務處東區交通隊主管
連庭欣先生	商務及經濟發展局首席助理秘書長(工商)
陸彥博先生	商務及經濟發展局工程師



~~(會後補註：香港警務處於會議後提交了詳列拖車架次的「灣仔警區交通隊2021年度拖車記錄」，供委員參閱。)~~

36. ~~謝偉俊議員詢問，若某個違泊黑點的巡查次數相對較低，而定額罰款的數字相對較高，是否代表該處的違泊情況特別嚴重。若是，他認為警方應考慮在這些黑點採取拖走車輛的手段，以增加阻嚇力。~~

37. ~~黃宏泰議員表示，據他了解，在其他地區警務人員會先拍攝違泊車輛，再發出告票。他建議警方可考慮在灣仔區內違泊情況嚴重的地方，採取此具警戒性的措施，再配合宣傳，以阻嚇市民違例泊車。~~

38. ~~香港警務處李乃揚先生回應如下：~~

- ~~i. 他重申，受不同因素影響，巡查次數及定額罰款數字並不會成正比。以百德新街為例，因為在商店外面可供上落貨的泊車位非常少，許多貨車因而在附近的避車處落貨。然而，該些車輛並沒有對交通造成嚴重阻塞，故告票數字並不高。~~
- ~~ii. 警方不定時在區內交通黑點，包括灣仔道、港灣道1號、百德新街及加寧街，進行流動錄影執法行動，並會繼續進行有關行動。~~

39. ~~黃宏泰議員表示，若能配合宣傳及教育，流動錄影執法行動將會對司機更具阻嚇力。他期望警方繼續在違泊問題特別嚴重的地方，以流動錄影方式執法，並加強宣傳。~~

40. ~~臨時主席表示，希望警方考慮在委員關注的違泊黑點，以流動錄影方式執法，以打擊違泊情況。~~

41. ~~臨時主席感謝香港警務處代表鄧景華先生出席會議。~~

~~(香港警務處鄧景華先生於是項討論後離席。)~~

**第 6 項：灣仔政府大樓及港灣消防局用地重建項目及港灣消防局重置項目  
(發展、規劃及交通委員會文件第 35/2021 號)**

42. 臨時主席歡迎以下人士出席是次會議：

連庭欣先生	商務及經濟發展局首席助理秘書長(工商)
陸彥博先生	商務及經濟發展局工程師
衛文輝先生	建築署高級工程策劃經理
李偉昌先生	消防處高級消防區長(策劃組)
陳浩德先生	消防處消防區長(策劃組)
鍾倩文女士	香港貿易發展局會展中心事務主管
魏卓生先生	香港貿易發展局會展中心事務項目經理
陳頌義先生	王歐陽(香港)有限公司執行董事
曾思蒂女士	城市規劃顧問有限公司董事(城市規劃)

朱以聞先生  
李建成先生

弘達交通顧問有限公司技術董事  
漢臻顧問有限公司技術總監

43. 商務及經濟發展局連庭欣先生以投影片向委員簡介灣仔政府大樓及港灣消防局用地重建項目，及港灣消防局重置項目。

44. 顧國慧議員有以下意見及提問：

- i. 會展設施似乎是重建項目的重要元素，她希望知道香港會議展覽中心未來一至兩年間的檔期是否已滿，並詢問局方是否因此提出將重建項目的其中10層樓宇劃為會展設施。
- ii. 沙田至中環綫(沙中綫)會展站上蓋用地原定用作興建會展中心，她詢問會展站上蓋用地將來會有何用途。
- iii. 重置後的港灣消防局靠近海邊，離灣仔區的中心地帶有一段距離。她關注有大型展覽活動進行時，附近道路的交通會出現擠塞情況，對區內的緊急救援服務造成影響。

45. 楊雪盈議員有以下意見及提問：

- i. 重置後的港灣消防局將增設社區應急準備體驗館，消防處牌照課港島辦事處亦會設於重置後的港灣消防局，未來會有不少區外的市民到訪消防局參觀或辦理牌照，並帶來一定車流。現時灣仔區的交通已有擠塞問題，但重置計劃並未有提出疏導交通的措施方案，她擔心重置項目所帶來的車流會加劇區內交通問題，並質疑消防處是否有必要將多個設施設置於同一個消防局內。
- ii. 她希望消防處解釋於重置後的港灣消防局設置跨部門行動指揮中心的考慮因素，並詢問處方是否有必要於重置後的港灣消防局設置指揮中心。
- iii. 消防處是否因為重置用地的面積較大，因而將更多設施設置於重置後的港灣消防局？
- iv. 消防處曾否考慮其他選址作重置港灣消防局之用？港灣消防局需要多少面積的用地？現時海軍商場的用地是否比消防局所需的面積大？
- v. 軍人輔導會曾向委員會反映希望原址保留海軍商場，她希望了解政府能否劃出部分用地，讓軍人輔導會於灣仔北重置海軍商場。
- vi. 她憂慮重建項目的酒店、會議展覽及商業設施會為灣仔區帶來更多車流，並認為方案未有提出解決車流量增加的措施。

46. 臨時主席有以下意見及提問：

- i. 她明白發展香港展覽業是必須的，但指出香港現時還有亞洲國際博覽館(亞博館)作展覽場地用途，而亞博館場地的使用量長期不高，政府亦預留了亞博館旁的用地作擴建之用。
- ii. 不少酒店業權人已申請將酒店重建作商廈，例如香港怡東酒店，而未來合和中心二期的酒店亦會提供超過1 000間房間。她認為政府需要評估酒店業界的需求，再考慮是否有必要於灣仔北重建項目中興建酒店。
- iii. 現時灣仔區並沒有正式的文娛中心，她希望政府可考慮在重建項目中預留空間興建文娛中心，讓區內團體可以在一個正式及專業的場地進行演出。
- iv. 擬議的行車隧道入口位於哪一個位置？

47. 黃宏泰議員有以下意見：

- i. 隨著廣州及深圳等地會展業的發展，香港會展業今天所面對的競爭愈來愈大，過往的成功因素已逐漸消失。政府應在方案中加入靈活的設計，令會展設施可彈性地改作其他用途，以應對未來會展業需求可能下跌的情況。
- ii. 他希望了解現時港灣消防局的服務對象主要集中在灣仔哪一個區域，並表示關注消防局重置後，該局的人員是否仍能繼續迅速抵達區內事故現場。此外，在重置方案設計上，他認為消防處應考慮未來海濱地區的服務需求。

48. 林偉文議員詢問消防處對於重置港灣消防局的設計方案有何意見，及處方是否支持將港灣消防局搬遷到分域碼頭街及龍合街的用地。

49. 謝偉俊議員有以下意見：

- i. 現時位於灣仔的香港會議展覽中心場地實際上供不應求，大家不應對香港會展業的發展作過於悲觀的評估。至於亞博館場地需求較低，可能是受交通問題影響。
- ii. 灣仔區的酒店供應因部分酒店(如香港怡東酒店)改建成商廈而減少，故他整體上支持興建酒店的方向。儘管如此，他表示關注重建項目對區內交通造成的影響。
- iii. 根據重建項目方案，政府計劃於告士打道增加多一個入口。他建議政府在告士打道同時增設出口，避免離開的車流集中在港灣道。
- iv. 在重置港灣消防局後，消防人員可使用較暢通的龍和道，前往灣仔區內各地方，故他不擔心重置計劃會影響消防人員前往事故現場的效率。

- v. 重置後的港灣消防局的功能較現有消防局的為多，將來會有許多行人進出該處，辦理牌照申請事宜及進行參觀活動等。他希望了解政府有否在設計上考慮行人的需要，提供便利行人的交通配套措施。
- vi. 目前香港會議展覽中心的泊車位在舉辦大型展覽活動時供不應求，但在淡季時泊車位的需求並不高。即使有關當局已就季節性的車位需求作出調配，把中心的車位出租，但他仍見到許多車位處於空置狀態。就重建項目將提供數百個車位，他希望了解政府有沒有靈活調配車位的安排，以避免出現車位空置情況。

50. 商務及經濟發展局連庭欣先生回應如下：

- i. 就是否有必要於灣仔興建會展設施的問題，他表示在疫情之前，業界對香港會議展覽中心和亞博館場地的需求殷切。在舉辦珠寶展覽及電子產品展覽這些香港最大型的國際展覽的時候，展方同時租用上述兩個會展場地後，仍有眾多參展商在候補名單上。
- ii. 現時灣仔的香港會議展覽中心場地面積約90 000平方米，而重建項目將可增加約30 000平方米的會展場地。另一方面，現時亞博館場地面積約66 000平方米，完成第二期的擴建計劃後，將可增加約34 000平方米的會展場地。在重建及擴建項目完成後，香港的會展場地將合共增加約四成面積。
- iii. 與鄰近地區相比，香港在會展業的競爭優勢在於香港是國際城市，吸引到全球的買家及供應商到香港經商。為應付需求，局方認為有需要增加香港的會展場地的供應。考慮到未來會展業的需求可能出現轉變，局方會將展館設計成多用途的場地，將來有需要時可以轉變其用途。
- iv. 就港鐵會展站上蓋用地的用途，他表示行政長官在二零二零年施政報告提到，有鑑於在會展站上蓋地興建新會議中心涉及多重技術困難、不確定的施工期和不合乎成本效益的考慮，政府決定把用地轉作其他用途。目前相關部門正就該用地的用途進行研究，他手頭上暫時未有相關資料。
- v. 局方曾考慮灣仔北一帶不同的地方作重置港灣消防局之用，經研究後，認為於海軍商場現址用地重置消防局是最適合的方案。在過程中，局方一直與消防處保持溝通。
- vi. 政府將藉重建項目進行一系列的道路改善工程，因此重建項目並不會對灣仔北的交通帶來很大的影響，稍後顧問代表會再作補充。
- vii. 就行車隧道出入口的位置，他表示隧道的入口位於會議道，即香港君悅酒店平台對出位置，而出口則設於港灣道。
- viii. 就議員關注重置後的消防局所帶來的車流及人流，他表示消防處的代表稍後會補充有關牌照課港島辦事處及社區應急準備體驗館的運作安排。

51. 消防處李偉昌先生回應如下：

- i. 重置後的港灣消防局與現有的港灣消防局距離約400米，處方已檢視該用地位置，認為重置方案不會對港灣消防局提供的緊急救援服務構成影響。
- ii. 就議員提到消防人員前往事故現場遇上交通擠塞的問題，消防處有電腦調派系統監察事故現場情況，有需要時處方會調派其他鄰近地區消防局的車輛前往事故現場，確保行動效率不受影響。
- iii. 由於牌照申請人需事前預約，而且申請牌照的承辦商數目有限，故牌照課辦事處並不會帶來許多人流。同樣，參觀社區應急準備體驗館的團體及人士需事前預約，現場亦將設有旅遊巴落客處，並由消防人員帶領體驗各類防災設施，因此體驗館的落成並不會引致大量車流及人流。
- iv. 由於很多大型的活動，如大型展覽、升旗禮等，皆在灣仔區進行，經審視後，處方認為將跨部門行動指揮中心設於重置後的港灣消防局是適合的安排。
- v. 對於有意見提出重置後的港灣消防局可與海軍商場並存，他指出重置後的港灣消防局設施將會升級至消防局暨救護站，並由原來容納到兩輛救護車提升至八輛救護車。考慮到維持緊急救援的需要、消防局的日常運作及就完成處理感染病毒個案在局內進行消毒及清洗程序等行動效率及公眾衛生等因素，處方認為將海軍商場與消防局設於同一土地上並不適合。
- vi. 此外，雖然重置後的港灣消防局面積較現有的消防局大，但該幅用地的部分地下位置設有港鐵的行車隧道，現場亦有一棵有特色的樹木需要予以保留，該用地的可用面積已大為減少，在項目設計上面對許多限制。

52. 商務及經濟發展局連庭欣先生補充如下：

- i. 現時的港灣消防局並未設有標準救護設施，政府希望於毗鄰分域碼頭街及龍合街的用地重置消防局，以提供標準的消防及救護設施。
- ii. 正如消防處的代表提到，重置港灣消防局的工程存在不少技術限制，包括地底設有港鐵行車隧道，而這些因素均限制了用地的可建空間。此外，由於要顧及消防局的運作需要，因此用地並不能同時容納其他用途的建築物。

53. 弘達交通顧問有限公司朱以聞先生回應如下：

- i. 為減低重建項目所引致的額外車流對區內交通造成的影響，公司提出了一系列的交通改善工程建議方案，當中包括於分域碼頭街及會議道附近興建一條行車隧道。該行車隧道將接駁項目的地庫，車輛可經由中環及灣仔繞道進出大樓，無需途經告士打道及菲林明道這些核心地帶，這將大大減輕項目對灣仔北一帶交通造成的額外負荷。



- ii. 重建項目將於港灣道設置兩個出入口，及於告士打道設置一個入口，避免車流集中同一位置出入。就謝偉俊議員建議於告士打道加設出口，他表示公司亦曾就此進行研究，但考慮到告士打道是主要幹道，公司認為於該處設置出口會對交通造成阻塞。
- iii. 重建項目將會興建多條行人連接道及改善現有的行人連接設施(如柯布連道天橋)，為灣仔區內的行人交通帶來改善。

54. 臨時主席表示，重建項目將提供800多個車位，剛才有議員提到現時香港會議展覽中心的車位在淡季時有空置情況，詢問設計方案中有否包括應對車位空置問題的措施。

55. 弘達交通顧問有限公司朱以聞先生表示，重建項目必須提供足夠的車位，以滿足高峰時間的車位需求。在沒有大型會議及展覽活動的時間，停車場的車位可開放予公眾人士使用。他相信隨著區內行人連接系統的改善，項目的停車場會有更多人使用。

56. 楊雪盈議員有以下意見及提問：

- i. 現時許多設施集中於灣仔區設置，以致許多區外人士都會到訪灣仔區，為灣仔區帶來不必要的交通流量。消防處應考慮在有更多人居住的九龍及新界地區，如啟德，興建社區應急準備體驗館，避免為灣仔區帶來更多車流及人流。
- ii. 跨部門行動指揮中心、消防處牌照課港島辦事處，及社區應急準備體驗館所佔的樓面面積分別是多少？
- iii. 政府能否考慮在重建項目中劃出部分地方作興建社區會堂及重置海軍商場之用？
- iv. 政府曾表示有機會使用到灣仔運動場用地作發展用途，現時最新的計劃為何？

57. 顧國慧議員詢問，重建方案中有沒有措施應對大型展覽活動進行時所帶來的交通問題，以及假如附近地方發生車禍，當局有否支援方案……

(會議因火警鐘聲暫停五分鐘。)

58. 臨時主席宣布繼續進行會議，並請顧國慧議員繼續發言。

59. 顧國慧議員續有以下意見及提問：

- i. 當局有否準備應急支援方案，應對項目附近發生車禍的情況？
- ii. 就商務及經濟發展局代表指於港鐵會展站上蓋用地興建新會議中心並不符合成本效益，她表示重建項目同樣是在一幅用地上興建新建築物，不明白為何於會展站上蓋用地興建會議中心的成本會較高昂。

- iii. 現時灣仔區的發展主要集中在商業及會展業，從城市規劃角度而言，政府應推動多元化的發展，譬如推動文化方面的發展。
- iv. 就消防處代表指消防局不能兼容其他用途的建築物，她表示外國有消防局與小型博物館設置於同一建築物，而建築物設有兩個入口，分別供消防局及公眾人士使用，認為政府應讓軍人輔導會於海軍商場現址與港灣消防局一同重置。

60. 黃宏泰議員表示，政府應在項目設計中加入一些公眾可以享用的設施，如休憩地方及餐廳，讓市民在沒有會議及展覽活動的時候，也能享受重建項目內的設施，從而增加市民對項目的支持。他強調政府必須在設計階段進行構思，不能在營運階段才開始研究。

61. 謝偉俊議員有以下意見及提問：

- i. 他對消防處提供合乎標準的救護設施表示支持，因為消防人員的職責重大。然而，他認為重置用地的面積似乎大於消防局的實際需要，令消防處需加設各種設施以填滿用地空間。
- ii. 現有港灣消防局的用地面積及樓面面積是多少？
- iii. 演講廳及社區應急準備體驗館屬可有可無的設施，消防處應考慮將該些設施設置於灣仔以外、空間較大的地區。
- iv. 他曾參觀消防處設於將軍澳百勝角的消防及救護學院，認為將軍澳區人口多、地方亦足夠大，比灣仔更適合設置體驗館等設施。雖然百勝角相對灣仔而言較偏遠，但參觀人士可以視作「半天遊」，行程亦會更輕鬆。
- v. 他明白政府設立跨部門行動指揮中心的需要，但希望了解政府有多大需要將指揮中心搬遷到重置後的港灣消防局，並詢問現有的指揮中心設於哪個地方。

62. 商務及經濟發展局連庭欣先生回應如下：

- i. 就黃宏泰議員的意見，他表示擬議的展覽館是多用途的場地，將來除了可用作展覽外，亦可用作會議、演唱會等用途。
- ii. 目前香港會議展覽中心基本上全年都有活動，每年的三至四月及九至十月主要舉行商業對商業的展覽活動，其他月份則會有商業對消費者的展覽活動，例如書展、動漫展及食品展。

- iii. 就顧國慧議員的提問，他表示由於工程期間需確保港鐵會展站的運作不受影響，因此於會展站上蓋用地興建建築物所面臨的限制會較重建項目為多，工程需時亦較長。此外，目前會展站的地底已被鐵路所佔用，故會展設施亦只能向上發展。然而，按分區計劃大綱圖，會展站上蓋用地的發展高度限制為50米，而會展設施的樓底較一般樓宇高，因此可建的樓面面積非常有限。綜合而言，於會展站上蓋用地興建會展設施並不符合成本效益。相反，在灣仔北三座政府大樓的用地上，政府不但可向下發展興建停車場，而且用地正處於現時香港會議展覽中心的對面，能發揮到協同效應。
- iv. 就楊雪盈議員的提問，他表示二零一七年的施政報告已提出政府擱置使用灣仔運動場用地作會展用途，政府目前並沒有任何拆卸灣仔運動場的計劃。
- v. 就議員提出在重置港灣消防局的用地上同時重置海軍商場，他表示該幅用地存在不少工程技術限制；從消防局的運作層面上而言，建議亦不可行。
- vi. 就重建項目的交通問題，他表示政府已考慮舉辦最大型活動(如書展、食品展等)期間所引致的車流及人流，並指大型展覽活動一般在七至八月期間進行。此外，商業對商業的展覽活動主要是業內人士參與，到訪的人流會較少。

63. 消防處李偉昌先生回應如下：

- i. 消防處參考了外國的防災教育經驗，決定在重置後的港灣消防局率先設置社區應急準備體驗館，並提供互動設施以供市民應對自然災害如風災及水浸時的反應，藉以提升市民的防災意識及應付突發事故的能力。除了港島區，處方亦計劃於九龍及新界設置同類體驗館。
- ii. 目前消防處不少辦公室正租用私人寫字樓的地方，有部分亦需使用消防處的行動設施，處方希望藉重置計劃善用土地資源，故提出將牌照課港島辦事處設於重置後的港灣消防局。此外，現時港島區缺乏一個可供處方人員進行培訓及交流的地方，演講廳將會供處方作培訓之用。
- iii. 就議員查詢重置後的港灣消防局內各項設施的面積，他表示建築署與顧問公司現正商討設計方案。根據他現時的初步資料，牌照課港島辦事處的面積約326平方米，演講廳面積約329平方米，跨部門行動指揮中心及消防行動指揮中心的面積合共約720平方米，分區訓練設施面積約1 100平方米，而社區應急準備體驗館的面積約3 400平方米以容納擺放大型模擬器及機動設施。他解釋，現時將軍澳的消防及救護學院已十分擁擠，消防處希望為港島總區的人員提供一些獨特及更切合工作環境的模擬訓練場景，例如商業大廈、展覽設施及酒店等的間隔，故分區訓練設施的面積會較大。
- iv. 就議員提出港灣消防局與海軍商場於同一地方重置，他重申消防處需顧及救援行動的效率，而且該幅用地本身亦有發展上的限制，因此消防局並不合適與其他用途的設施一同並存。此外，在疫情下，處方亦擔心公眾人士自由出入消防局範圍可能引起的公共衛生問題。

- v. 若某一間消防局的人員在前往事故現場的途中遇到交通阻塞問題，消防處會調派另一間消防局的人員以其他方向前往事故現場處理事故，有需要時亦會額外調派消防電單車及救護電單車前往現場。

64. 建築署衛文輝先生回應如下：

- i. 從建築設計角度而言，重置港灣消防局的用地存在不少技術困難，因為用地的地底設有南港島綫，現場亦有樹木需要予以保留。雖然重置後的港灣消防局佔地約4 000多平方米，但實質可建的部分只有2 000多平方米，而重置後的港灣消防局面積其實比一般消防局所需要的面積少。
- ii. 消防局內有許多設施，包括操練塔、消防車及救護車的泊位等，需在地面設置。此外，重型設備及器材，如氧氣瓶等，亦需要存放在地面的位置，以減少消防人員搬運設備及器材的時間。上述設施及存放設備的地方基本上已佔用了地面大部分的空間，即使把海軍商場建於消防局的樓上，海軍商場亦需在地面設置出入口及落貨區，其所帶來的車流及人流將會妨礙消防局出車。

65. 弘達交通顧問有限公司朱以聞先生表示，在進行交通評估時，公司已考慮了可能出現的最壞情況，並因應情況提出了一系列的交通改善工程方案。

66. 楊雪盈議員詢問社區應急準備體驗館的面積是多少。

67. 消防處李偉昌先生回覆指，社區應急準備體驗館的面積約3 400平方米。

68. 臨時主席表示，各委員已就兩個項目的初步設計方案發表意見，包括增加停車場的使用彈性、增加公眾可享用的設施如文娛中心、文化展示的平台等，希望有關當局能將委員的意見納入考慮之中。她續指，交通問題是委員比較關注的部分，希望重建計劃在施工時及完成後，都不會對灣仔區的交通造成額外的負擔。

69. 臨時主席請委員就是否支持兩個項目的初步設計方案舉手表決，表決結果如下：

贊成：1票（黃宏泰議員）

反對：0票

棄權：4票（顧國慧議員、林偉文議員、李碧儀議員、楊雪盈議員）

70. 臨時主席表示，今次是委員會第一次知悉有關方案，委員就方案發表了不同的意見及提出疑問。她請局方認真考慮委員的意見，並優化有關方案，屆時再就優化方案諮詢區議會的意見。

71. 顧國慧議員表示，剛才建築署的代表指重置消防局的用地有部分地方不能用作發展，希望署方進一步解釋原因。此外，她認為政府應考慮創新的建築設計方法，如橫向發展等。

72. 建築署衛文輝先生解釋，重置項目的工程受現場的樹木及地底的南港島綫所限制。由於建築物會對地底的鐵路造成負重，為免影響南港島綫的結構及運作，在南港島綫橫跨的範圍上需盡量減少結構物的存在。

73. 顧國慧議員表示，希望建築署向委員會提供重置港灣消防局的詳細設計圖則。

74. 臨時主席詢問建築署，能否提供較詳細的圖則供委員參閱。

75. 建築署衛文輝先生回覆指，他可於會議後補充顯示到工地發展限制的圖則予委員參閱。

(會後補註：建築署於會議後提交了有關港灣消防局重置計劃的圖則，供委員參閱。)

76. 臨時主席請各政府部門備悉委員對初步設計方案的意見，並請部門檢視方案的優化空間。

#### **第7項：書面問題：灣仔北發展**

**(發展、規劃及交通委員會文件第 36/2021 號)**

77. 臨時主席表示，此條書面問題與剛結束的議項相關，請委員參閱商務及經濟發展局和發展局的書面回覆。

78. 顧國慧議員表示，根據委員會文件第32/2021號《灣仔區工程概覽》，灣仔運動場的工程將於二零二二年完成，她希望了解有關工程的詳情。

79. 楊雪盈議員有以下意見：

- i. 她希望知道灣仔北三座政府大樓目前已空置的樓面面積是多少，及仍於大樓內辦公的政府部門數目及僱員數目是多少，並指當局的書面回覆並沒有回應上述問題。
- ii. 就剛才建築署提到於港鐵會展站上蓋用地發展的困難，她表示重置海軍商場未必需要建造很深的地基，海軍商場可以靈活的方式，如貨櫃形式，於會展站上蓋地上重置。
- iii. 軍人輔導會多年來為社區提供服務，並在今次計劃作出了很大的犧牲，讓出海軍商場用地作重置港灣消防局之用，政府應考慮會方作出的貢獻及犧牲，撥出會展站上蓋用地部分空間重置海軍商場，讓會方繼續發揮其功能。她相信社區會非常歡迎此重置措施，並指現有的海軍商場面積約3 200平方米，政府可與會方商討重置面積的大小。

80. 顧國慧議員表示，希望了解灣仔運動場的工程與灣仔北海濱長廊工程是否有關連。此外，她希望灣仔北的項目能保留分域碼頭歷史的點滴。

**Harbourfront Commission  
Task Force on Harbourfront Developments  
on Hong Kong Island**

**Minutes of Fortieth Meeting**

Date : 7 September 2021  
Time : 3:00 pm  
Venue : Conference Room, 15/F, North Point Government Offices,  
333 Java Road, Hong Kong

**Present (in person)**

Mr Vincent NG	Chairman, Harbourfront Commission
Mr Ivan HO	Chairman, Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island
Mr LEUNG Kong-yui	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Mrs Margaret BROOKE	Representing Business Environment Council
Mr Winston CHU	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Mr Anthony CHEUNG	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Ir Victor CHUENG	Representing the Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Sr Francis LAM	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Dr Vivian WONG	Representing Friends of the Earth (HK) Charity Limited
Ir Janice LAI	Individual Member

**Present (online)**

Mr Joel CHAN	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Ms Sam LOK	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Mr Desmond NG	Representing the Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Mac CHAN	Individual Member
Mr Karl KWOK	Individual Member
Mr NGAN Man-yu	Individual Member
Ms Angela SO	Individual Member
Hon Tony TSE	Individual Member

**Official Members (attending in person)**

Miss Rosalind CHEUNG	Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Horace HONG	Chief Traffic Engineer/Hong Kong, Transport Department (TD)
Mr Raymond LEE	Chief Engineer/South 3, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Mr Henry WONG	Assistant Director (Leisure Services) 2 (Acting), Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Mr Louis KAU	District Planning Officer/Hong Kong, Planning Department (PlanD)
Ms Angora NGAI	Secretary

**In Attendance**

Mr Steven LEE	Assistant Secretary (Harbour) 2, DEVB
Mr William CHAN	Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Carlos FUNG	Senior Engineer (Harbour)1, DEVB
Mr NG Shing-kit	Senior Engineer (Harbour) 2, DEVB

**Absent with Apologies**

Dr CHUNG Shan-shan	Representing The Conservancy Association
Mr Paul CHAN	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Mr Alan LO	Individual Member
Ms Anny TANG	Senior Manager (Tourism) 21, Tourism Commission (TC)

**For Agenda Item 4**

Mr Harry LIN	Principle Assistant Secretary for Commerce & Economic Development (Commerce & Industry) 1, Commerce and Economic Development Bureau (CEDB)
Mr Alec LUK	Engineer (1), CEDB
Mr Edward WONG	Chief Project Manager 202, ArchSD
Mr LI Wai-cheong	Senior Division Officer (Planning Group), Fire Services Department
Mr Albert CHAN	Executive Director, Wong & Ouyang (HK) Ltd.
Mr Edmond CHU	Technical Director, MVA Hong Kong Ltd.

Ms Jocelyn CHUNG

Head of HKCEC Affairs, Hong Kong Trade Development Council

~~Action~~

**Welcoming Message**

**Mr Vincent NG**, Chairman of the Harbourfront Commission (HC) welcomed all to the meeting, in particular the following new Members who were appointed on 1 July 2021 and attending the Task Force meeting for the first time-

- (a) Mr Joel CHAN Cho-sing, representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design;
- (b) Mr Sam CHOW Man-sang, representing the Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong;
- (c) Mr Jacky CHEUNG Hoi-fo, representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects;
- (d) Ir Ringo YU Shek-man, representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers;
- (e) Mr Jeff TUNG, representing the Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong; and
- (f) Mr Ivan HO, who had been appointed as an individual member since 1 July 2021.

He also informed the meeting that -

- (a) Mr Horace HONG had taken over the post of Chief Traffic Engineer/Hong Kong of the Transport Department, from Mr Alex AU; and
- (b) Mr Henry WONG, Acting Assistant Director (Leisure Services) 2 of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD), attended on behalf of Mr Benjamin HUNG, Assistant Director (Leisure Services) 2, who was on duty visit.

**~~Item 1 Election of the Task Force Chairman~~**



~~4.1 Mr Frankie NGAN nominated and Si Francis LAM as well as Ir Victor CHEUNG seconded Mr Ivan HO to be the Chairman of the Task Force. Mr Ivan HO accepted the nomination and officially took over the chairmanship of the meeting.~~

**Item 2 Confirmation of Minutes of the 39<sup>th</sup> Meeting**

2.1 The draft minutes of the 39<sup>th</sup> meeting were circulated to Members on 1 September 2021. Since no comments were received, the minutes were confirmed at the meeting.

**Item 3 Matters Arising**

~~3.1 No matters arising were raised at the meeting.~~

**Item 4 Redevelopment of the Sites of Wan Chai Government Towers and Kong Wan Fire Station and Reprovisioning of Kong Wan Fire Station (Paper No. TFHK/02/2021)**

Introduction

4.1 **The Chairman** welcomed representatives of the Commerce and Economic Development Bureau (CEDB), Architectural Services Department (ArchSD), Fire Services Department (FSD), the Hong Kong Trade Development Council (HKTDC), Wong &Ouyang (HK) Limited and MVA Hong Kong Limited to the meeting

4.2 Upon **the Chairman's** invitation, **Ms Angora NGAI** briefed Members on the background of the project as follows:

- (a) in the Policy Address in 2017, the Government announced the plan to redevelop the site of the three government towers in Wan Chai North and the Kong Wan Fire Station (KWFS) into Convention and exhibition (C&E) facilities, hotel and Grade A office (thereafter referred as the Wan Chai North Redevelopment), and reaffirmed its implementation in the Policy Address in 2020;
- (b) to take forward the project, the Government was gradually vacating the concerned government towers to make way for the Wan Chai North Redevelopment;

- (c) CEDB had commissioned the HKTDC and its consultants to conduct a series of technical studies and would brief Members on their initial schematic scheme for the proposed redevelopment;
- (d) to tie in with the Wan Chai North Redevelopment, the existing KWFS would be upgraded and reprovisioned. The relevant departments will brief Members on the location selection and its schematic design; and
- (e) to familiarise Members with the project before the meeting, a site visit was held on 27 August 2021 and representatives from CEDB, HKTDC, FSD, ArchSD and Planning Department, as well as the project consultant joined and briefed members on site the proposal.

4.3 **The Chairman** informed Members that the item would consist of two parts, (a) redevelopment of the sites of Wan Chai Government Towers and KWFS; and (b) reprovisioning of KWFS. He further declared that his company was involved in the project of reprovisioning of KWFS and decided that he would not participate in the discussion of the reprovisioning of KWFS. **The Chairman** proposed and Members had no objection that Mr Vincent NG, the Chairman of HC, would take over the Chairmanship of the discussion of (b) regarding the reprovisioning of KWFS.

*A. Redevelopment of the sites of Wan Chai Government Towers and Kong Wan Fire Station (KWFS)*

Presentation by the Project Proponent

4.4 With the aid of a PowerPoint, **Mr Harry LIN** presented to Members the proposal.

Discussion

*Connectivity*

4.5 **Sr Francis LAM** expressed concerns about the high pedestrian flow of the existing footbridge at O'Brien Road, since it was the major pedestrian route linking Wan Chai MTR station to the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre (HKCEC). Instead of upgrading the existing footbridge at Gloucester Road near the Gloucester Luk Kwok Hotel, he suggested providing an additional footbridge from Luard Road to the redeveloped complex, which

could facilitate people walking from Hennessy Road to harbourfront by passing through Luard Road to West Garden and West Landscape Deck. **Mr Harry LIN** responded that the existing footbridge across Gloucester Road outside Gloucester Luk Kwok Hong Kong would be enhanced to facilitate pedestrian access to the redeveloped complex.

- 4.6 Apart from strengthening the connection between the Wan Chai MTR station to the redevelopment complex and HKCEC, **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** stressed that it was also important to improve the pedestrian connection between the Admiralty MTR station to the redeveloped complex and HKCEC. As Admiralty Station was an inter-change station to various lines travelling towards Kowloon and Hong Kong Island South, he said that visitors who participated in convention and exhibition at HKCEC could travel to other destination around Hong Kong easily. The existing hotels located at Admiralty could also serve to ease the hotel service demand during high season of exhibition period.
- 4.7 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** considered that the O'Brien Road footbridge had been overloaded especially during exhibition period and it was essential to improve the pedestrian connectivity, for example widening the existing footbridge or providing additional connection to connect the hinterlands and the redeveloped complex as well as HKCEC. He also suggested providing a 24-hour public access inside the redeveloped complex and HKCEC so that the public could access to harbourfront. **Ms Jocelyn CHUNG** replied that it would be difficult to provide an 24-hour public access inside HKCEC especially during exhibition period due to security concerns. A public access would be provided for public to go to the harbourfront via the HKCEC during normal days. **The Chairman** further asked if a clause for providing a 24-hour public access could be added in the lease condition to the redeveloped complex. **Mr Harry LIN** responded that pedestrians could reach the harbourfront via the proposed footbridge across Harbour Road, which would connect the redeveloped complex and the elevated West Garden adjacent to the HKCEC, and the West Landscaped Deck.
- 4.8 **Mr Joel CHAN** suggested constructing a double-deck footbridge in order to solve the problem of high pedestrian flow of O'Brien Road footbridge. He also commented that at-grade pedestrian connection between the hinterlands and the redeveloped complex and HKCEC should be further improved and greenery at-grade should be provided. **Mr Harry LIN** responded that the redeveloped complex would be set back along Gloucester Road to

create a wider pedestrian path with a tree-lined boulevard, providing greenings & edge plantings, creating a wider and open pedestrian environment along existing bus stops at Gloucester Road. The setback area would be properly landscaped, paved and decorated to improve the street environment.

4.9 **Mr Winston CHU** opined that the Harbour Road was busy with traffic and the existing at-grade pedestrian crossing was dangerous. He considered that a proper at-grade pedestrian crossing should be provided to ensure road safety. **Mr Edmond CHU** responded that they would liaise with Transport Department to study the at-grade crossing at Harbour Road. **Mr Harry LIN** supplemented that an elevated walkway above Harbour Road would be constructed to connect the redeveloped complex with HKCEC Phase 1. **Mr Edmond CHU** supplemented that two elevated walkways with a width of about 10m and 5m respectively would be constructed across Harbour Road and they would be able to absorb high pedestrian flow during exhibition period.

4.10 **Mr Harry LIN** noted Members' concern about the capacity of the existing O'Brien Road footbridge. The existing O'Brien Road footbridge would be enhanced and the first floor of the redeveloped complex would provide a spacious area for pedestrians walking from the Wan Chai MTR station to the harbourfront via the existing O'Brien Road footbridge. In addition, a footbridge would be constructed across Fleming Road, connecting the future MTR Exhibition Centre Station and HKCEC Phase 2. Pedestrians could enjoy direct access from MTR Admiralty, Wan Chai and Exhibition Centre Stations to the redeveloped complex and HKCEC instead of relying solely on the O'Brien Road footbridge connecting to the MTR Wan Chai Station.

*Provision of underground car parking facilities*

4.11 Noting that there were heavy loading/unloading activities along Harbour Road during exhibition period, **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** considered that sufficient loading/unloading and parking facilities for lorry should be provided in order to meet with the future demands when the newly developed C&E facilities was opened. **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** concurred his views and further suggested constructing an underground carpark that would be connected with various buildings around Harbour Road to allow greater flexibilities for diverting traffic and avoid traffic congestion. **Mr Joel CHAN** shared his views.

4.12 **Mr Harry LIN** responded that the proposed redeveloped complex would provide 89 loading / unloading bays to relieve the parking demand in the district. There was also an off-site marshalling area in Tsing Yi for lorries waiting for loading/unloading at HKCEC.

4.13 **Mr Albert CHAN** replied that further widening of the pedestrian's footbridges & decks would lead to increase in sizes of the supporting columns and foundations, which would affect the already congested existing underground utilities and the proposed diversion of the existing sewage pipe for the underground vehicular tunnel on Harbour Road. From the pedestrian flow's point of view, the proposed widths of the pedestrian's footbridges & decks were based on the level-of-service (LOS) in the pedestrian assessment and the proposed widths would be sufficient.

#### *Other comments*

4.14 **Ms Sam LOK** enquired about the development model of the proposed redeveloped complex. She considered that the redevelopment could make use of space to extend and promote the C&E facilities, for example, adding more signage, exhibition information board along the way from the hinterlands to the newly developed C&E facilities. **Mr Harry LIN** responded that the development model of the redeveloped complex was still being studied. It was expected that the construction of the redeveloped complex, the improvement of connectivity and walkability would be developed as a whole. The C&E facilities and the carpark of the redeveloped complex would be owned by the Government and managed by an operator engaged by open tender process.

#### *Way forward*

4.15 **The Chairman** concluded that while members supported the proposal in-principle, the improvement of connectivity including the suggestions of constructing additional footbridge from Luard Road to the redeveloped complex, providing 24-hour public access inside the redeveloped complex at the subject site and providing underground carpark were heard. He asked the project team to take into account members' comments and work out a possible plan which could facilitate the public to enjoy the harbourfront.

## ***B. Reprovisioning of KWFS***

*(Note: Mr Vincent NG took over the Chairmanship at this juncture.)*

### Presentation by the Project Proponent

4.16 With the aid of a PowerPoint, **Mr Harry LIN** presented to Members the proposal.

### Discussion

4.17 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** appreciated the need to reprovision KWFS in Wan Chai North and supported the project. He asked for opening the area where the old tree would be retained for public use, with a view to improving pedestrian experience when people walk along the Fenwick Pier Street to Wan Chai and providing an open space for public enjoyment.

4.18 **Mr Vincent NG** opined that the at-grade pedestrian connection between the hinterlands and the harbourfront was not ideal and should be improved. He asked whether the site boundary would be fenced off which might affect the walking experience of pedestrian. He also enquired if the facilities planned at the south-western part of the site area could be relocated so that the relevant space could be released for public use. **Mr LI Wai-cheong** replied that decontamination facilities would be provided at the entrance of the KWFS that was planned at the south-western part of the site area. **Mr Harry LIN** supplemented that they would further study if more area could be released for public use.

### *Way forward*

4.19 In conclusion, **Mr Vincent NG** concluded that Members acknowledged the reprovisioning need of the KWFS and supported the proposal in principle on the condition that the project team would critically consider releasing the south-western part of the site to provide an open space for public use and widening the passageway to improve pedestrian walking experience along Fenwick Pier Street. The project team should report their revised proposal to the Task Force where necessary.

**Item 5 Any Other Business**

*(Mr Ivan HO resumed the Chairmanship)*

5.1 **The Chairman** said that the Secretariat would inform Members of the date of the next meeting in due course.

5.2 There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 4:36 p.m.

**Secretariat**

**Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island**

**Harbourfront Commission**

**May 2022**

灣仔北規劃區—S/H25/5 的  
主要政府、機構及社區設施和休憩用地的供應

設施種類	《香港規劃標準與準則》的要求	按分區計劃大綱圖規劃人口計算的要求	分區計劃大綱圖所涉的供應		剩餘／短缺 (與分區計劃大綱圖已規劃的供應比較)
			現有供應	已規劃的供應 (包括現有供應)	
地區休憩用地	每100 000人 10公頃 <sup>#</sup>	0.26 公頃	3.19 公頃	3.84 公頃	3.58 公頃
鄰舍休憩用地	每100 000人 10公頃 <sup>#</sup>	0.26 公頃	2.53 公頃	2.19 公頃	1.93 公頃
體育中心	每50 000至65 000 人設1間 <sup>#</sup>  (按地區估算)	0	1	1	1
運動場／ 運動場館	每200 000至 250 000人設1間 <sup>#</sup>  (按地區估算)	0	1	1	1
游泳池場館－ 標準池	每287 000人 設1個場館 <sup>#</sup>  (按地區估算)	0	1	1	1
警區警署	每200 000至 500 000人設1間  (按區域估算)	0	0	0	0
分區警署	每100 000至 200 000人設1間  (按地區估算)	0	0	0	0



設施種類	《香港規劃標準與準則》的要求	按分區計劃大綱圖規劃人口計算的要求	分區計劃大綱圖所涉的供應		剩餘／短缺 (與分區計劃大綱圖已規劃的供應比較)
			現有供應	已規劃的供應 (包括現有供應)	
裁判法院 (8個法庭)	每660 000人設1間 (按區域估算)	0	0	0	0
社區會堂	沒有既定標準	不適用	0	0	不適用
圖書館	每200 000人 設1間分區圖書館 (按地區估算)	0	0	0	0
幼稚園／ 幼兒園	每1 000名3至6歲 幼童設34間課室 <sup>#</sup>	0間 課室	0間 課室	0間 課室	0間 課室
小學	每25.5名 6至11歲兒童 設1間全日制課室 <sup>#</sup>  (由教育局按 地區／學校網估算)	2間 課室	0間 課室	0間 課室	-2間 課室  (根據教育局 按地區估算， 現時有關供應 為足夠 <sup>&amp;</sup> )
中學	每40名 12至17歲青少年 設1間全日制課室 <sup>#</sup>  (由教育局按 地區／學校網估算)	2間 課室	0間 課室	0間 課室	-2間 課室  (根據教育局 按全港估算， 現時有關供應 為足夠 <sup>&amp;</sup> )

設施種類	《香港規劃標準與準則》的要求	按分區計劃大綱圖規劃人口計算的要求	分區計劃大綱圖所涉的供應		剩餘／短缺 (與分區計劃大綱圖已規劃的供應比較)
			現有供應	已規劃的供應 (包括現有供應)	
醫院	每1 000人 設5.5張病床  (由醫院管理局按區域／聯網估算)	37張 病床	0張 病床	0張 病床	-37張 病床 <sup>@</sup>  (醫管局將按聯網估算， 在第二個十年醫院發展計劃下進行檢討 <sup>^</sup> )
診所／ 健康中心	每100 000人設1間  (按地區估算)	0	0	0	0
幼兒中心	每25 000人設100個 資助服務名額 <sup>#</sup>  (由社會福利署按社區估算)	10個 名額	0個 名額	10個 名額	-10個 名額 <sup>*</sup>  (由社會福利署按較大的範圍估算下的 長遠目標 <sup>*</sup> )
綜合青少年 服務中心	每12 000名6至24歲 的人士設1間 <sup>#</sup>  (由社會福利署按社區估算)	0	0	0	0
綜合家庭 服務中心	每100 000至 150 000人設1間 <sup>#</sup>  (由社會福利署按服務範圍估算)	0	0	0	0

設施種類	《香港規劃標準與準則》的要求	按分區計劃大綱圖規劃人口計算的要求	分區計劃大綱圖所涉的供應		剩餘／短缺 (與分區計劃大綱圖已規劃的供應比較)
			現有供應	已規劃的供應 (包括現有供應)	
長者地區中心	每個人口約170 000人或以上的新發展區設1間 <sup>#</sup>  (由社會福利署估算)	不適用	0	0	不適用
長者鄰舍中心	每個人口為15 000至20 000人的新建和重建的住宅區設1間(包括公營和私營房屋) <sup>#</sup>  (由社會福利署估算)	不適用	0	0	不適用
社區照顧服務設施	每1 000名65歲或以上的長者設17.2個資助服務名額 <sup>#</sup>  (由社會福利署按地區估算)	14個名額	4個名額	4個名額	-10個名額*  (由社會福利署按較大的範圍估算下的長遠目標*)
安老院舍	每1 000名65歲或以上的長者設21.3個資助床位 <sup>#</sup>  (由社會福利署按聯網估算)	17個床位	0個床位	0個床位	-17個床位  (由社會福利署按較大的範圍估算下的長遠目標*)
學前康復服務	每1 000名0至6歲幼童設23個資助服務名額 <sup>#</sup>  (由社會福利署按地區估算)	0個名額	0個名額	0個名額	0個名額

設施種類	《香港規劃標準與準則》的要求	按分區計劃大綱圖規劃人口計算的要求	分區計劃大綱圖所涉的供應		剩餘／短缺 (與分區計劃大綱圖已規劃的供應比較)
			現有供應	已規劃的供應 (包括現有供應)	
日間康復服務	每10 000名 15歲或以上人士設 23個資助服務名額 <sup>#</sup>  (由社會福利署 按地區估算)	4個 名額	0 個 名額	0 個 名額	-4個 名額*  (由社會福利署 按較大的範圍 估算下的 長遠目標*)
住宿照顧服務	每10 000名 15歲或以上人士設 36個資助服務名額 <sup>#</sup>  (由社會福利署 按聯網估算)	7個 名額	0 個 名額	0 個 名額	-7個 名額*  (由社會福利署 按較大的範圍 估算下的 長遠目標*)
日間社區 康復中心	每420 000人設1間 <sup>#</sup>  (由社會福利署 按地區估算)	0	0	0	0
殘疾人士 地區支援中心	每280 000人設1間 <sup>#</sup>  (由社會福利署 按地區估算)	0	0	0	0
精神健康 綜合社區中心	每310 000人 設1間標準中心 <sup>#</sup>  (由社會福利署 按地區估算)	0	0	0	0

註：

灣仔北規劃區的規劃人口約為 2 570 人。如計及流動人口，整體規劃人口約為 6 850 人。

備註：

# 有關要求不包括規劃流動人口。

& 欠缺的課室數目是根據灣仔北地區的分區計劃大綱圖的非流動規劃人口計算得出，而根據教育局的資料，整體而言，公營小學學額供應的規劃是以區為本，而公營中學學額供應則按全港整體情況規劃。按現行機制，教育局會參考根據政府統計處定期更新的人口推算而編製的學齡人口推算，並考慮現時各級學生的實際人數，以及最新人口變化(包括內地新來港兒童的數目)，以估計未來對學額和有關資源的需求。教育局在考慮最新的推算數字、其他可能影響個別地區學額需求的因素、在有關地區增加學額供應的不同方案，以及現行的教育政策(包括透過重置改善教學環境)等因素後，會決定是否需要分配校舍營辦新學校或重置現有學校。根據教育局的評估，目前灣仔區有足夠的小學和中學學額應付合資格的學齡人口。

@ 目前灣仔區議會地區已規劃的醫院病床數目，比灣仔區議會地區根據《香港規劃標準與準則》要求而推算該規劃人口所需的病床數目多出大約 1 270 張。

^ 欠缺的病床數目是根據分區計劃大綱圖的規劃人口計算得出，而醫院管理局是根據醫院聯網規劃其服務，並會在規劃及發展各項公營醫療服務時考慮多項因素。港島東聯網為東區、灣仔區及離島(不包括大嶼山)的居民提供服務。第二個十年醫院發展計劃已籌劃進行醫院重建計劃，以提供額外病床服務港島東聯網的人口。因應政府最新的發展策略，當局現正檢討第二個十年醫院發展計劃。醫管局將繼續檢視本身提供服務的情況，以應付各聯網的公營醫療需要。

\* 欠缺的設施數目是根據分區計劃大綱圖的規劃人口計算得出，而社會福利署(下稱「社署」)在評估這些設施的供應時所採用的範圍／地區較大。當局採用以人口為基礎的規劃標準時，須考慮福利設施的分布情況、不同地區的供應、人口增長及人口結構轉變所帶來的服務需求，以及不同福利設施的供應等因素。由於《香港規劃標準與準則》就這些設施所訂立的要求乃長遠目標，在規劃和發展過程中，社署會就實際供應作出適當考慮。政府一直採取多管齊下的方式，透過長、中和短期策略，物色合適的用地或處所，以提供更多需求殷切的福利服務。

2023 年 7 月