4. QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY

4.1 Introduction

4.1.1 In order to solicit public opinion on the major issues being examined under the Stage 1 Public Engagement programme of the Study, questionnaires (view collection forms or VCF) were distributed to the public through various channels, including forum, community workshop, the exhibition venue of the new Central Star Ferry Pier, the Hong Kong Planning and Infrastructure Exhibition Gallery, relevant District Offices, City Hall Library, Central Library and the web, etc.

4.1.2 The VCF was designed to seek views and suggestions on the following:

- Views on the relative importance of the various proposed urban design objectives and urban design issues proposed for the Study and suggestions on other relevant urban design objectives and issues to be considered;
- Views on the major urban design considerations for the eight key sites in the study area;
- Views on the relative importance of the various proposed sustainability design principles and criteria relating to social, environmental and economic aspects to be used in the sustainable design assessment framework for the Study; and
- Views on the alternative concepts for reconstructing the old Star Ferry Clock Tower and reassembling Queen’s Pier.

4.1.3 There were two versions of VCF used in collecting views. The first version (VCF 1) was distributed after the launch of the Stage 1 Public Engagement up to the end of the FGW. A refined version (VCF 2) was prepared and distributed on subsequent occasions taking into account suggestions on VCF 1 received during the FGW. Both versions of VCF are attached in Appendix 5.

4.1.4 A total of 137 VCF were collected during the consultation period for the Stage 1 Public Engagement. The results are collated and reported in the following sections.

4.2 Methodology of Analysis

4.2.1 The VCF comprised two parts. In Part I, the scores assigned by each respondent for assessing the level of importance of various urban design objectives, urban design issues, and sustainability design principles and criteria relating to social, environmental, and economic aspects were averaged to derive the mean scores as presented in the form of bar charts in the section of finding analysis. In Part II, the views on the performance of the four proposed design concepts for reconstructing the old Star Ferry Clock Tower and reassembling Queen’s Pier against various criteria as well as other suggestions were summarized.
4.2.2 For respondents not following the format of the questionnaire for the following reasons, a score of ‘0’ was assigned for analysis purposes:

- No comment on the questions; or
- The meaning of the questions was unclear as opined by the respondents.

4.3 Summary of Major Findings

Urban Design Objectives

4.3.1 The following four urban design objectives were emphasized (mean scores >3.0) (Figure 4.1):

- To improve public accessibility to the harbourfront
- To create a vibrant harbourfront with a mix of uses and diverse activities for public enjoyment
- To create a sustainable design that contributes to economic vitality, commensurate with traffic, environmental and infrastructural capacity, and preserves local character and heritage
- To create an attractive harbourfront with quality public and private developments in a luxuriant landscape setting

![Figure 4.1: Summary of Findings on the Urban Design Objectives (Questionnaire Survey)](image)

[15/959 (1.6%) was assigned score “0”]

4.3.2 Other suggestions on urban design objectives were summarized below:

- Connect to underground transportation system
- Better integration of Oriental and Western styles architecture
- Preserve special characteristics of Hong Kong
- Beneficial to Hong Kong economic development
- Introduce new and advance design ideas for the harbourfront
• Enhance environmental quality of the CBD
• Preserve cultural heritage
• Reduce or minimize reclamation
• Harmonize with the natural context
• Epoch-making and people-oriented

Urban Design Issues

4.3.3 The following three urban design issues were strongly emphasized (mean scores >3.0) for the new Central harbourfront, as shown in Figure 4.2:

• Environmental friendly building design, landscape strategy and greening to enhance the environmental quality
• A sustainable transport system and comprehensive pedestrian linkages to enhance connectivity to the harbourfront
• Harmonizing the design of utility buildings and infrastructure with the waterfront setting

Figure 4.2: Summary of Findings on the Urban Design Issues (Questionnaire Survey)

[21/959 (2.2%) was assigned score “0”]

4.3.4 Other suggestions on the urban design issues were summarized below:

• Creative design of building envelope
• More integrated activities
• Spacious pedestrian linkages
• Sustainable development with flexibility in accommodating future society needs and changes in land use planning and physical design
Urban Design Considerations for Eight Key Sites

4.3.5 The following were considered the major urban design considerations for the eight key sites in the study area (see Appendix 3 for the locations of the eight key sites):

Site 1: Comprehensive Development Area at Central Piers No.4-6
- Improving accessibility to IFC II and the harbour
- Harmony of the development with IFC II
- Mix of commercial uses and open spaces
- Imposing building height restrictions
- Adding more waiting areas
- Utilizing the pier for leisure and catering facilities
- Commercial activities to provide vibrancy for the area
- Continuous waterfront promenade
- Utilizing the spectacular view, prime location and good accessibility for commercial facilities to provide vibrancy for the area
- Strengthening accessibility and quality of urban public space
- New civic square
- More landscaping and planting

Site 2: Commercial site adjacent to IFCII
- Improving accessibility to IFC II and the harbour
- Providing commercial and financial facilities to add vibrancy
- More open space and landscaped facilities
- Imposing building height restrictions
- Improving the current transport facilities
- Integrating with retail facilities in the vicinity
- Identifying clear benefits to its surrounding urban space

Site 3: CDA with landscape pedestrian deck and commercial complex
- Improving accessibility to IFC II and the harbour
- At-grade open space in lieu of landscaped deck
- Mix of commercial and open space uses
- Retaining the cultural hub function in association with City Hall
- Terraced design without blocking views of the seafront
- Low-rise development and maintaining good air quality
- Smaller blocks and footprint
- Interesting built forms
- Covered pedestrian linkage and provision of travellator
- Interaction of public and private spaces for the landscaped pedestrian deck and commercial facilities to have physical and visual connectivity with the harbourfront
- Density control including lower plot ratio
- Free performance venue
Site 4: Waterfront Related Commercial and Leisure Uses site north of City Hall

- Open structures to avoid blocking of vista of City hall
- Less site coverage and harmonizing with City Hall
- Less commercial uses
- Smooth transition from waterfront promenade to the road
- Reduction in development intensity and respecting the existing cluster of City Hall, Edinburgh Place and Queen's Pier in the design

Site 5: Site to the north of CITIC Tower

- Integrating arts and cultural functions with the Academy for Performance Arts
- Harmonizing development with the architectural design of adjacent buildings
- No tall buildings
- Iconic architecture to produce an interesting skyline
- Enhancing the physical and visual connection with CITIC tower, nearby buildings and harbourfront facilities
- Majority of uses in the form of civic amenities for public enjoyment

Site 6: Waterfront Related Commercial and Leisure Uses site north of CITIC Tower

- Mix of leisure and small-scale commercial uses as well as waterfront park
- Improving accessibility
- Dynamic and sustainable
- Providing venues for water-sports and water taxi
- Integrating with the commercial core
- Connection with the Wanchai harbourfront area

Site 7: Promenade along waterfront of CRIII

- Vibrant, dynamic, world class and sustainable
- Continuous waterfront promenade with limited catering and sport facilities
- Natural shading and greening
- Variety of facilities for passive and active facilities
- Providing activity spaces for street-dancing and performance
- Considering the use of design competition as the means to generate a world-class design with the future operation determined by public engagement; setting up a body with substantial public participation to sustain the recurring running of the waterfront in a vibrant manner
- Accessible to the disabled
- Relocating or removing the military berth

Site 8: Waterfront Related Commercial and Leisure Uses site adjacent to piers

- Avoiding the wall-off effect of structures to the harbour
- Continuous waterfront promenade
- Multi-functional
- Integration with Site 7
- Developing cultural and leisure uses and less commercial uses

4.3.6 Other suggestions were summarized as follows:
- The area between the new waterfront and City Hall/Edinburgh Place and Queen’s Pier should be landscaped together with a large water body for creating a “blue finger” so as to have harbour ambience penetrating into the CBD.
- Road P2 and other crossings through the proposed “blue finger” should be minimized in terms of scale and in forms of bridges. Altogether the design would enliven the waterfront area while respecting the old structure, including Queen’s Pier.
- All sites should enhance connectivity along the waterfront.

**Sustainable Design Principles**

4.3.7 The following four sustainable design principles in the proposed sustainable design assessment framework were strongly emphasized (mean scores >3.0) (Figure 4.3):
- Promoting environmental friendly building design and greening
- Promoting harbourfront enhancement
- Responding to the natural context and existing urban fabric
- Improving accessibility and connectivity

![Figure 4.3: Summary of Findings on the Sustainable Design Principles (Questionnaire Survey)](image)

[9/822 (1%) was assigned score “0”]
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4.3.8 Other suggestions on the sustainable design principles were summarized below:

- Special emphasis on economic sustainability
- Adaptive changes for future needs in short to long terms
- Improving environmental quality/ urban climate

Sustainability Criteria

4.3.9 The proposed sustainability criteria comprised three aspects, namely social, environmental and economic aspects.

Social Aspects

4.3.10 Amongst the ten proposed social sustainability criteria, the following two were considered the most important (mean scores > 3.0) (Figure 4.4):

- Public enjoyment and appreciation of the Harbour
- Improving accessibility

Environmental Aspects

4.3.11 Amongst the eleven proposed environmental sustainability criteria, the following two were considered the most important (mean scores > 3.0) (Figure 4.5):

- Minimizing environmental pollution
- Enhancing openness and greenery

Figure 4.4: Summary of Findings on the Social Sustainability Criteria (Questionnaire Survey)

[34/1370 (2.5%) was assigned score “0”]
4.3.12 The economic aspects were generally considered marginally less important when compared to the social and environmental aspects. Nevertheless, amongst the proposed economic sustainability criteria, the following two were considered the most important (Figure 4.6):

- Maintaining attraction of spectacular skyline and harbour views
- Enhancing image and functions of Victoria Harbour

4.3.13 One suggestion on sustainability criteria was as follows:

- Incorporate sustainable transport within the waterfront area such as trolley
Alternative Concepts for Reconstructing Old Star Ferry Clock Tower and Reassembling Queen’s Pier

4.3.14 There were two versions of VCF used in collecting views on the captioned topic. VCF 1 was distributed after the launch of the Stage 1 Public Engagement up to the end of the FGW. A refined version VCF 2 was prepared and distributed on subsequent occasions taking into account suggestions on VCF 1 received during the FGW. VCF 2 has been refined by splitting “Spatial and Historical Context” into “Spatial Context” and “Historical Context” under the section on Considerations for Reconstructing Old Star Ferry Clock Tower and Reassembling Queen’s Pier, and by providing additional entries for the views of “Reconstructing Old Star Ferry Clock Tower and Reassembling Queen’s Pier including reassembling Queen’s Pier at the original location and reconstructing the old Star Ferry Clock Tower at the original location. The numbers of VCF collected for VCF 1 and VCF 2 were 38 and 85 respectively (14 out of 137 questionnaires were left blank in this part, yielding a total no. of 123 valid questionnaires for analysis for this part). For each alternative concept, the respondents could select a range of considerations against which they considered that the concept could well perform.

4.3.15 The respondents’ assessments of the performance of the proposed alternative design concepts against the following considerations were collated and analyzed (Figures 4.7 and 4.8):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6 Considerations</th>
<th>4 Alternative Concepts (No. of Ticks)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Spatial and Historical Context (SHC)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Identity (I)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Functionality (F)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Accessibility (A)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Visual Prominence (VP)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Flexibility for Planning (FP)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VCF 2: collected on subsequent occasions
(Number of VCF collected and analyzed = 85)

(With spatial and historical context split into separate considerations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7 Considerations</th>
<th>4 Alternative Concepts (No. of Ticks)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Spatial Context (SC)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Historical Context (HC)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Identity (I)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Functionality (F)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Accessibility (A)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Visual Prominence (VP)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Flexibility for Planning (FP)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.7: Proposed Alternative Concepts for Reconstructing Old Star Ferry Clock Tower and Reassembling Queen’s Pier (VCF 1)
4.3.16 The table below shows the total number of ticks for all considerations for the four alternative design concepts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Concepts</th>
<th>Total Number of ticks for All Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VCF1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.17 Among the four alternative design concepts, Concept B1 was considered to be able to satisfy most considerations and was most preferred. On the other hand, Concept A2 obtained the least number of combined ticks for the considerations. Concept A1 was marked second, followed by Concept B2.
4.3.18 From the above findings (Figures 4.9 and 4.10), it is noted that the average scores of all the opinion categories fell between 1.00 and 2.60, which indicated that respondents had diverse opinions on the various considerations for reassembling Queen’s Pier and reconstructing the old Star Ferry Clock Tower.

4.3.19 Additional views relating to Queen’s Pier and the old Star Ferry Clock Tower are summarized as follows:

- Queen's Pier must be reassembled close to the harbour for maintaining its functions.
• Queen's Pier and Clock Tower Circa 1957 were modernist and functional structures. Torn-down structures should not be preserved and a more contemporary design for the two structures should be built.
• A new Queen’s Pier should be built along the new waterfront whereas the old Star Ferry Clock Tower could be reconstructed anywhere.
• Queen's Pier together with the old Star Ferry Clock Tower should be reassembled and reconstructed close to Central Ferry Piers Nos. 9 and 10 to improve the proposed Concept B2.
• In considering Queen's Pier, its adjoining relationship with Edinburgh Place should be taken into account.
• Three-dimensional open space and a combination of harbourfront architecture and landscape design could utilize the space more efficiently.
• High-rise buildings with a good design could have a positive effect to the whole harbourfront, such as a distinct and attractive skyline, and a good visual and physical connectivity with the surroundings.
• Pay attention to the facilities that could provide day and night activities for the waterfront. A wide continuous waterfront promenade without commercial facilities cannot make a harbourfront vibrant. Passive and active activities should be allowed in different open space.

4.4 Conclusions from the Questionnaire Survey

4.4.1 The following conclusions were drawn from the questionnaire survey:

Urban Design Objectives, Urban Design Issues and Sustainable Design Assessment Framework

4.4.2 Urban design objectives of improving public accessibility to the harbourfront, creating a vibrant and attractive harbourfront with sustainable design were highly valued by the respondents.

4.4.3 The respondents considered that urban design issues relating to creating an environmentally friendly building design, landscaping and greening, pursuing a sustainable transport system and a comprehensive pedestrian linkage, and harmonizing building designs with the waterfront setting should be important.

4.4.4 Regarding the sustainability principles, promoting environmentally friendly building design and greening, harbourfront enhancement, responding to the natural context and the existing urban fabric, and improving accessibility and connectivity were strongly emphasized by the respondents.

4.4.5 Similar to the CEF, the respondents placed relatively less emphasis on the economic sustainability criteria. Amongst the proposed economic sustainability criteria, the respondents considered maintaining the attraction of the skyline and harbour views most important. For the environmental sustainability criteria, minimizing pollution and enhancing openness and greenery were considered the most important. As regards the social ones, allowing public enjoyment and improving accessibility were considered the most important.

4.4.6 For the eight key sites in the study area, the major urban design considerations
were highlighted as follows:

(a) Improving accessibility
(b) Harmonizing development and iconic architecture
(c) Improving building height restrictions for development sites
(d) Mix of uses to provide vibrancy
(e) Continuous waterfront promenade
(f) More open space and greening opportunities
(g) Smaller footprint for development sites

4.4.7 There were diverse opinions on the alternative design concepts proposed for reassembling Queen’s Pier and reconstructing the old Star Ferry Clock Tower. Concepts B1, A1 and B2 were more preferred as compared to Concept A2. While some respondents supported reassembling Queen’s Pier at the original location, there were others who advocated reassembling Queen’s Pier by the harbour whilst maintaining its marine function. As for the old Star Ferry Clock Tower, some supported relocating it at the original location, while some suggested integrating it into the new harbourfront. There were also a few opinions which suggested not reassembling Queen’s Pier or reconstructing the Clock Tower at all. As the coverage of respondents in the questionnaire survey was wider when compared to the FGW and the CEF, it was not surprising to find a more balanced support of different opinions.