

Harbourfront Commission
Task Force on Harbourfront Developments
on Hong Kong Island

Minutes of Forty-third Meeting

Date : 1 December 2022
Time : 3:00 pm
Venue : Room 1303, 13/F, Wing On Kowloon Centre, 345 Nathan
Road, Kowloon

Present (attending in person)

Mr Vincent NG	Chairman, Harbourfront Commission
Mr Ivan HO	Chairman, Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island
Dr Caroline LAW	Representing Friends of the Earth (HK) Charity Limited
Mr Joel CHAN	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Mr LEUNG Kong-yui	Representing the Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Dr CHUNG Shan-shan	Representing the Conservancy Association
Sr Francis LAM	Representing the Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Dr Frankie YEUNG	Individual Member

Present (attending online)

Mr Anthony CHEUNG	Representing the Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Ir Ringo YU	Representing the Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Ms Iris HOI	Representing the Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Mr Edward LO	Representing the 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
Miss Sunnie LAU	Individual Member
Dr Lawrence LI	Individual Member
Ms Angela SO	Individual Member

Hon Tony TSE Individual Member

Official Members (attending in person)

Ms Leonie LEE Commissioner for Harbourfront, Development Bureau (DEVB)

Ms Candy HO Chief Traffic Engineer/Hong Kong (Ag.), Transport Department (TD)

Mr James CHU Chief Engineer/South 3 (Ag.), Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)

Mr Benjamin HUNG Assistant Director (Leisure Services) 2, Leisure Cultural and Services Department (LCSD)

Mr Mann CHOW District Planner Officer/Hong Kong, Planning Department (PlanD)

Mr William LEUNG Secretary

Official Members (attending online)

Ms Anny TANG Senior Manager (Tourism) 21, Tourism Commission (TC)

In Attendance

Mr Peter MOK Project Manager (Harbour) Special Duties, DEVB

Mr TONG Hui-ching Architect (Harbour) 2, DEVB

Absent with Apologies

Mrs Margaret BROOKE Representing Business Environment Council

Ir Janice LAI Individual Member

For Agenda Item 3

Mr Albert CHAN Executive Director, Wong & Ouyang (HK) Ltd

Ms Margaret WONG Executive Director, Wong & Ouyang (HK) Ltd

Ms Athena CHAU Senior Associate, Wong & Ouyang (HK) Ltd

Mr YU Wai-wai General Manager, Henderson Land Development Company Ltd.

Ms Karen TSOI Deputy General Manager Landscape, Henderson Land Development Company Ltd.

Mr Randy LIEKENJIE Deputy General Manager, Henderson Land Development Company Ltd.

Mr Edwin LEE Senior Project Manager, Henderson Land
Development Company Ltd.

For Agenda Item 4

Mr Lawrence LEE Principal Project Coordinator, Drainage Services
Department (DSD)

Mr Matthew KWAN Senior Engineer/System Management Division 1,
DSD

Mr Kenneth KWONG Senior Engineer/System Management Division 2,
DSD

Ms Karen CHAN Senior Engineer/System Management Division 3,
DSD

Mr Ivan LO Senior Environment Protection Officer (Sewerage
Infrastructure) 2, Environmental Protection
Department

Mr Colin CHAN Technical Director, Binnies Hong Kong Limited

Mr Alfred HO Architectural Assistant, Hsin Yieh Architects &
Associates Limited

Mr Calvin LI Director, WSP (Asia) Limited

Mr BEH Kiang Hioke Kentis Director, A.LEAD Architects Ltd.

Welcoming Message

The Chairman informed the meeting that -

- (a) **Ms Leonie LEE** attends on behalf of Mr Vic YAU, Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands) 1; and
- (b) **Ms Anny TANG**, Senior Manager of the Tourism Commission (TC), attends on behalf of Ms Elsa HUNG, Assistant Commissioner for Tourism (2).

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 42nd Meeting

- 1.1 The draft minutes of the 42nd meeting were circulated to Members on 28 November 2022. Since no comments were received, the minutes were confirmed at the meeting.

Item 2 Matters Arising

- 2.1 There was no follow-up matter arising from the last meeting.

Item 3 Master Layout Plan for Site 3 Development of the New Central Harbourfront (Inland Lot No. 9088) (Paper No. TFHK/04/2022)

Introduction

- 3.1 **The Chairman** informed Members that the project proponent will present to Members today the proposed Master Layout Plan for Site 3 development of the New Central Harbourfront. He informed Members that an informal briefing on the subject had been held on 24 November 2022.
- 3.2 Upon the Chairman's invitation, **Mr William LEUNG** briefed Members on the background of the project as follows:
 - (a) With a site area of about 48,000 m² located at a prominent harbourfront location, Site 3 of the New Central Harbourfront was one of the key sites identified under the Urban Design Study (UDS) completed by Planning Department in 2011. Based on the recommendation of UDS to develop Site 3 as a retail and office development with a large landscaped deck, a

Planning Brief was endorsed by Town Planning Board (TPB) in 2016 to set out the broad planning parameters and development requirements;

- (b) Subsequently, a two-envelope open tender process was commenced in December 2020 for disposal of Site 3, whereby tenderer's proposals were evaluated on the bases of design merits and premium offered separately on a 50:50 weighting. The Government received a total of six tenders under the tender exercise. All of them passed the requirements for non-premium proposals. The premium offer of four of the tenders however were lower than the reserved price set by the Government on the day of tender closure, and as such failed to meet the requirement for the premium aspect. Amongst the remaining two tenders, Pacific Gate Development Limited had attained the highest marks for its non-premium and premium proposals and was awarded the site. The Government explained the above information to the public through a press release in early December 2021; and
- (c) The Application Site mainly falls within "Comprehensive Development Area" (CDA) zone and a small area zoned as "Road" on the Approved Central District (Extension) Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H24/9. Following the award of tender in November 2021, the Purchaser submitted a S16 Planning Application on 4 November 2022 with a Master Layout Plan (MLP). The MLP was prepared based on tender requirements, including the provision of Public Open Space (POS), reprovisioning of Post Office, other community facilities, public vehicles parking, etc. as well as the purchaser's winning proposal accepted by the Government.

3.3 **Mr Joel CHAN** declared that his company had current business dealings with the proponent but had no involvement in the subject project. **The Chairman** decided that since he had no direct involvement in this particular project, he could stay in the meeting and participate in the discussion.

3.4 **Ms Iris HOI** declared that her company had involvement in the subject project. **The Chairman** advised that Ms HOI could stay at the meeting but should refrain from commenting this item.

Presentation by the Project Proponent

- 3.5 Upon the Chairman's invitation, **Mr Albert CHAN** briefed Members the proposed MLP.

Discussion

Greening and Sustainability

- 3.6 **Dr CHUNG Shan-shan** appreciated the inclusive of green elements in the design with up to 35% of greenery of the development. She emphasised that due consideration should be given to the choice of suitable tree species having regard to the actual environment in Hong Kong. In addition to the 60 sustainability innovations demonstrated by the developer, she also suggested adopting measures for achieving carbon neutrality. Besides, she suggested providing recycling bins at the site for recycling materials.
- 3.7 **Mr YU Wai-wai** responded that the trees to be acquired would be of three sizes ranging from small to large to provide shade and to beautify the area with the medium-sized trees being the main group. Besides, recycling bins would be provided at the site and information on carbon performance would be released to the public.
- 3.8 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** suggested providing proper natural shading at the Grand Boulevard.
- 3.9 **Mr Frances LAM** expressed concern about the safety of the tall trees to be planted during typhoons and extreme weather, and enquired about the safety measures of the rooftop planting. He further asked about the plant species to be selected for the Grand Boulevard. **Dr Caroline LAW** concurred and suggested to make reference to the landscape guidelines issued by the Singaporean Government which illustrated the setback distance for rooftop trees to avoid the potential risk. She recommended planting climbing species as rooftop vegetation.
- 3.10 **Dr Caroline LAW** enquired whether there were rainwater harvesting facilities for saving water and reducing cost. As for the Grand Boulevard, she suggested providing soil cell structure below ground for plant growth. To enhance biodiversity, she suggested multiple layers of planting including shrubs, and integration of natural water body to attract more animals such as birds.

3.11 **Mr YU Wai-wai** responded that sufficient soil depth and maximum soil cell structure would be provided for tree establishment. Regarding safety measures, setback of tree planting would be provided along perimeter of the Horizon Park, which could minimise the risk of falling of broken tree branches outside of the building. In addition, consideration had been given to collecting rainwater and implementing a smart irrigation system for saving water.

Provision of Facilities

3.12 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** suggested providing alfresco dining facilities such as restaurants on each level including the Horizon Park, and enquired about the connectivity with Site 4. **Mr YU Wai-wai** responded that due to site constraint, a restaurant could not be provided on the rooftop. Alternatively, food kiosks and sitting-out areas would be offered at the Horizon Park to address visitors' needs and to enhance vibrancy.

3.13 **The Chairman** supplemented that the proposal was designed to be complied with the development parameters and design guidelines set out in the Planning Brief, and changes involving modification to the land lease would require approval from relevant departments, resulting in potential financial consequence and project delay.

3.14 **Ms Leonie LEE** reported that at the tender exercise, it was stipulated that no amendments to the land lease would be allowed within the five years after lease execution. The Government was cautious that any substantial amendments to the lease condition might lead to unfairness to other tenderers. Regarding the interface with Site 4, consideration would be given to the interface and connectivity issues when the Central Harbourfront Event Space was to be re-tendered in the future.

3.15 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired the areas of the site that would be opened for 24 hours and whether a 24-hour pedestrian access was available. Moreover, he suggested providing water dispensers away from the toilets in the open area. **Mr YU Wai-wai** responded that a 24-hour public access as well as water dispensers would be provided.

3.16 **The Chairman** enquired about the availability of tables for

public use and whether the Horizon Park would be opened for the public round-the-clock with elevator access. Besides, he commended the provision of toilet at the Horizon Park which was not required in the Planning Brief. **Mr YU Wai-wai** responded that most of the areas of the Horizon Park would be POS for 24-hour public use. Disabled toilet was also planned alongside in addition to the common toilet.

- 3.17 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired on the number of motorcycle parking spaces available for public use and food delivery, and suggested providing a transport map showing the public transport routes for visitors' information. **Mr YU Wai-wai** responded that the public carpark located at the middle parcel of Site 3 would provide 325 parking spaces to meet the needs of visitors.

Connectivity

- 3.18 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** suggested realigning the crossing across Yiu Sing Street for straight-line connection to save pedestrian' time. **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** and **Mr Joel CHAN** concurred. **Mr YU Wai-wai** responded that aligning the crossing with the Grand Boulevard was considered technically not feasible from traffic engineering perspective after liaison with Transport Department. In balancing pedestrian safety and traffic flow, the proposed pedestrian crossing location only required minimal pedestrian detour and would be safe for the pedestrians.
- 3.19 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** would like to seek clarifications regarding the absence of travellers at Site 3 in the proposal, which was identified in the Planning Brief and which he considered it an important link to facilitate pedestrian access between Central and the ferry pier. **Mr Mann CHOW** referred to the Planning Brief which read "provision of traveller(s) running in a south-north direction within the Site should be explored where possible." The provision of travellers was not mandatory according to the Planning Brief.

[Post-meeting note: Subsequent to the meeting, the project proponent provided further information on the subject, including the aspect on hinterland connectivity, which was circulated to Members on 27 March 2023. In response to Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN's comment, the proponent advised that they had studied the feasibility of providing the traveller along the Pedestrian Passageway in the shopping arcade and considered it not feasible.]

- 3.20 **Mr Frances LAM** enquired on the connectivity from the Connaught Road Central to the project site, and whether there were any barrier-free access and facilities. He also raised concern about the circulation from the Central Ferry piers to the hinterland, and if there were any improvement works to the existing pedestrian subway at Statute Square. **Mr YU Wai-wai** responded that the subway at Statute Square was owned and managed by the Government. They would liaise with relevant government departments to discuss how enhancement works would be carried out.
- 3.21 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** expressed concern over the connectivity to the piers, in particular the interface with the Anchor Plaza proposed by the Hong Kong Maritime Museum. **Mr YU Wai-wai** responded that to revitalize the areas around the piers, the project proponent would apply to widen the section of footbridge leading to the piers so as to facilitate various activities to be held in the vicinity.
- 3.22 **Mr Joel CHAN** opined that during the construction stage, disturbance to the operation of the Star Ferry Pier should be minimized and the connectivity with the adjacent areas should not be affected.
- 3.23 **Mr Vincent NG** supported the proposed schematic design and considered that the project would serve as a good connector between the harbourfront and the hinterland. During the nine-year construction period, he suggested adopting an incremental approach to develop the project and enquired the accessibility of the harbourfront areas in the interim. **Mr YU Wai-wai** responded that they would examine the feasibility to provide some temporary open space for public enjoyment during the construction period.
- 3.24 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** enquired on the exact location of transport facilities and suggested providing some retail space between the transport facilities and the harbourfront. **Mr YU Wai-wai** responded transport facilities would be provided as required by the Planning Brief.

Other Comments

- 3.25 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired on the details on the

programme of railway reserve for Airport Railway Extended Overrun Tunnel to facilitate understanding of project interfaces.

- 3.26 **Mr Joel CHAN** opined that the project should be a place for people from all walks of life regardless of their age or financial background. He supported the design of the Crystal, Aqua Tube and Reflection Pool which would be free of charge for public enjoyment. He also supported the proposed design to widen the footbridge connecting to the Star Ferry Pier, which could help enhance the vibrancy and commercial value there.
- 3.27 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** supported the design in general. He enquired if the MLP met the requirements of stepped height profile and clear vista stipulated in the Planning Brief. He remarked that the Government should work with the proponent to enhance the vibrancy of the surrounding areas by organising various events such as flea markets and concerts. Besides, he expressed concern about light pollution.
- 3.28 **The Chairman** observed that due to the site constraint, the development reflected a gentle stepped height profile. **Mr YU Wai-wai** supplemented that the design did observe the requirement of a stepped-profile. The design also included a setback on the Eastern side to make room for the Grand Boulevard, creating a clear vista from the Crystal to the Harbourfront promenade.

Public Engagement

- 3.29 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** raised that during the detailed design and construction stage, the proponent should enhance public engagement, maintain continuous communication with different stakeholders to gain insight on design and management, and also users' aspiration. Also, the proponent should keep the public informed of any changes in the design to enhance the transparency.
- 3.30 **Mr Edward LO** shared the same view. To echo with the theme "Bridge", he suggested procuring inclusive furniture such as long benches. **Mr YU Wai-wai** responded that they would introduce the project to the public, and would consider using inclusive furniture.

Way forward

- 3.31 **The Chairman** concluded that while the Task Force supported the MLP in-principle, he asked the proponent to take into account members' comments during the subsequent detailed design stage, and to consult the Task Force again on details of POS, connectivity and interface with the surrounding areas, and provision of facilities including motorcycle parking spaces, toilets, sitting-out areas, shelters, dining tables, as well as measures to cope with extreme weather. In addition, the proponent was required to provide information on temporary open space and pedestrian connectivity during each phase of the construction stage.

Item 4 Conceptual Design of Dry Weather Flow Interceptors at Wan Chai East, Causeway Bay and Shau Kei Wan (Paper No. TFHK/05/2022)

Introduction

- 4.1 **The Chairman** welcomed representatives from Drainage Services Department (DSD) and its consultants to the meeting for presenting the proposals of Dry Weather Flow Interceptors (DWFIs) at Wan Chai East, Causeway Bay and Shau Kei Wan. He informed Members that an informal briefing on the subject had been held on 24 November 2022.
- 4.2 Upon the Chairman's invitation, **Mr William LEUNG** briefed Members on the background of the project as follows:
- (a) The Government had been striving to improve the water quality of Victoria Harbour waterfronts. In the densely populated old urban districts on both sides of Victoria Harbour, some polluted surface run-off would inevitably drain into the Harbour via the stormwater drainage system and affected the quality of the near-shore waters. To improve the water quality and alleviate odour nuisance at the waterfront of Wan Chai East, Causeway Bay and Shau Kei Wan, DSD was planning to construct DWFIs in three areas, namely Wan Chai East, Causeway Bay and Shau Kei Wan; and
 - (b) DSD strived to blend in the DWFIs and relevant facilities with the adjacent neighbourhood, especially the Wan Chai promenade, the Tunnel Approach Rest Garden, Victoria Park,

Aldrich Bay Park, and Aldrich Bay Promenade.

Presentation by the Project Proponent

- 4.3 Upon the Chairman's invitation, **Mr Calvin LI** briefed Members on the proposed conceptual design of Wan Chai East DWFI project while **Mr. Colin CHAN** briefed on the Causeway Bay and Shau Kei Wan DWFIs.

Discussion

General Comments

- 4.4 Noting the loss of trees at Victoria Park including the area with the proposed DWFI in Causeway Bay caused by Typhoon Mangkhut, **the Chairman** enquired whether LCSD would carry out compensatory tree planting in for example the project sites. **Mr Benjamin HUNG** responded that according to LCSD's general guidelines, compensatory planting would be arranged to replace lost trees under any circumstances. LCSD would assess if the location was suitable for compensatory planting and set priorities for the action.
- 4.5 **Mr Joel CHAN** enquired if any Landscape Architects had participated in the projects. **Mr Colin CHAN** responded that apart from Engineers, there were Architect and Landscape Architect to work on the design of the projects.
- 4.6 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** opined that the design of the proposed DWFIs was not pleasant and suggested the DWFIs to serve more than one purpose, such as provision of a library at the DWFI. **The Chairman** supplemented that the proposed DWFI at Wan Chai east would allow co-using with coach parking.
- 4.7 **The Chairman** enquired on the programme of the three projects. **Mr Lawrence LEE** responded that the projects were all Category B status. Regarding Causeway Bay DWFI which had greater urgency, the proponent was finalising the project details and would submit a planning application and invite tender in February 2023. The project team targeted to seek the funding approval from the Legislative Council in July 2023. As for the other two DWFI projects, the proponent would consult the relevant District Councils and enhance the design to incorporate

comments received from the local stakeholders.

Wan Chai East DWFI

- 4.8 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** opined that the proposed DWFI project should be located at Tunnel Approach Rest Garden (TARG) rather than locating close to the harbourfront. **The Chairman** concurred and pointed out the low utilisation of TARG. **Mr Lawrence LEE** responded that the proposed location of the filtering station was close to the existing DSD Wan Chai East Preliminary Treatment Works, which was beneficial for regular disposal of the screened solid from the filtering station to Wan Chai East Preliminary Treatment Works. **Mr Calvin LI** added that there were several major site constraints in TARG making it technically infeasible of locating the filtering station there, including the Shatin-Central Link underneath TARG and the foundation of the bridges in the vicinity, etc. Hence, TARG was considered not a feasible location.
- 4.9 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** expressed concern over the large structure of the DWFI building and urged the proponent to place certain facilities underground to reduce the building footprint.
- 4.10 **The Chairman** suggested the coach parking area and the DWF Filtering Station to be swapped to minimize the building mass by half. **Mr Calvin LI** responded that the parking area had to be located on G/F to facilitate coach access. Some of the facilities were already placed on the basement level. Moving the coach parking area to the other floors would require an access ramp and construction of the ramp for coaches which would take up space, yet there was short of space within the site area. The proposed arrangement of the parking spaces on G/F was considered the most optimal use of land.
- 4.11 **The Chairman** doubted the need for coach parking spaces at the proposed DWFI site while there would be a coach parking at Convention Avenue. He opined that it was not desirable to have a bulky structure at the harbourfront area. **Ms Candy HO** advised that the proposed coach parking spaces at Wan Shing Street formed part of CEDD's Wan Chai Development II project, and before the pandemic, there was a strong demand for coach parking in Wan Chai North. It was expected that with the gradual easing of the pandemic situation, there would be more

inbound tourists and the demand for coach parking in Wan Chai North would increase.

Causeway Bay DWFI

- 4.12 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** suggested providing lawns instead of planting trees in the Victoria Park as there was a lack of lawn for public enjoyment. **Mr Colin CHAN** responded that they would work with LCSD to arrange tree planting appropriately and explore area with potential for providing more sitting-out areas in the park to suit the different needs of people.
- 4.13 **The Chairman** enquired about the greening ratio of the Victoria Park and whether it was an appropriate arrangement for the proposed DWFI taking some area of the park. **Mr Mann CHOW** responded the subject site was zoned as "Open Space" and DSD would need to submit a planning application. The Town Planning Board would decide whether to approve the change of use of the land.
- 4.14 **Mr Lawrence LEE** supplemented that the proposed building mass had been minimised. In view of the privacy of the residents across the street, the rooftop space would not be opened for public use. The project team would review the design to explore the feasibility of providing more facilities for public enjoyment.

Shau Kei Wan DWFI

- 4.15 **Dr Caroline LAW** enquired if the electrical and mechanical (E&M) kiosk would be fenced off and suggested fenceless design to facilitate pedestrian walkability. She also enquired the construction material to be used, and any facilities for public use. **Mr Colin CHAN** responded that there would be no fences at the DWFI. They would take into account Members' comments in further reviewing the design to provide public open space, if appropriate. Should there be facilities for public use, safe materials would be used.
- 4.16 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** suggested providing some facilities such as benches for public enjoyment. **Dr Caroline LAW** concurred.

Way Forward

4.17 **The Chairman** concluded that the Task Force had no objection to the proposed Shau Kei Wan DWFI and invited the project team to take into account Members' views in enhancing the design of the project. Regarding the proposed DWFI in Causeway Bay, the Chairman concluded that the proposal was not desirable without incorporating the co-use concept and the fence-off approach depriving the public from enjoying the site which was originally a POS. However, due to the extremely tight time schedule as informed by DSD on this project, the Task Force did not raise objection for this project to proceed on for public interest at large. He remarked that more efforts would be needed in refining the design for enhancing public enjoyment and co-use arrangement. As regards the DWFI at Wan Chai East, he concluded that the proposal was not acceptable to the Task Force and DSD was asked to consult the Task Force again with a revised design after incorporating Members' comments and suggestions for the consideration of the Task Force.

Item 5 Any Other Business

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 6:30 p.m.

Secretariat

Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island

Harbourfront Commission

April 2023