

In Attendance

Miss Rosalind CHEUNG	Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
Ms Jenny WONG	Assistant Secretary (Harbour) Special Duties, DEVB
Mr Gavin YEUNG	Assistant Secretary (Harbour) 2, DEVB
Mr William CHAN	Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB
Mr TONG Hui-ching	Architect (Harbour) 2, DEVB
Mr Carlos FUNG	Engineer (Harbour), DEVB
Mr NG Shing-kit	Engineer (Harbour) Special Duties, DEVB

Absent with Apologies

Mr Freddie HAI	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Ms Connie CHEUNG	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Ms Christina LEE	Individual Member
Mr Alan LO	Individual Member
Mr NGAN Man-yu	Individual Member

For Agenda Item 3

Mr Jason LEUNG	Chief Executive, Yan Chai Hospital Board
Mr Larry SO	General Manager (Social Services), Yan Chai Hospital Board
Mr James LAW	CEO/Founder, James Law Cybertecture International Holdings Ltd.
Mr Charles CHU	Director, James Law Cybertecture International Holdings Ltd.
Mr Dennis WONG	Managing Director (Building Surveying), Prudential Surveyors International Limited
Mr Cipriani MA	Project Manager (Building Surveying), Prudential Surveyors International Limited
Mr CHAN Nap-ming	Project Director 1, Transport and Housing Bureau (THB)
Mr Alfred LEE	Senior Project manager 2, Transport and Housing Bureau (THB)

For Agenda Item 4

Ms Theresa YEUNG	Director, Arup
Mr Barton LEUNG	Urban Planning Manager, Arup
Mr Nicholas FAN	Associate Director, Lu Tang Lai Architect
Mr Steve CHAN	Project Manager, Global Glory Development & Property Limited
Mr Jeffrey CHENG	Assistant Project Manager, Global Glory Development & Property Limited
Ms Camay LAM	Managing Director, AXXA Group Limited
Ms Johanna CHENG	District Planning Officer/Kowloon, PlanD

Welcoming Message

The Chair welcomed all to the meeting. She informed the meeting that-

- (a) Ms Caroline TANG, Senior Town Planner of Planning Department, was attending the meeting on behalf of Mr Derek CHEUNG; and
- (b) Ms Anny TANG, Senior Manager of Tourism Commission, was attending on behalf of Mr Anson LAI.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 34th Meeting

- 1.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the draft minutes of the 34th meeting were circulated on 20 June 2019. The revised draft minutes with Members' comments incorporated were circulated again on 25 June 2019. There being no further amendment, the draft minutes were confirmed at the meeting.

Item 2 Matters Arising

- A. Enhancement of Tsuen Wan Waterfront (paragraphs 4.5 -4.8 of the minutes of the 34th meeting)

Presentation by the Harbour Office

- 2.1 **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** briefed Members on the background and progress of Tsuen Wan Waterfront Enhancement Project, with the aid of a PowerPoint.

Discussion

Management Arrangement and Creation of Dog-friendly Environment

- 2.2 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired if the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) would take up the management of the proposed promenade and if so, whether it would be dog-friendly. **Miss Nixie LAM** supplemented that the subject site was currently not under the management of LCSD. The local community would prefer to remain the site as dog-friendly and did not have strong aspiration to hand the site over to LCSD at this juncture. **Prof Raymond FUNG** agreed that pets should

be allowed at the promenade to cope with present aspiration of society.

2.3 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** further remarked that under the existing Pleasure Grounds Regulation, dogs could be allowed at pleasure grounds if not for the prohibition imposed by the LCSD. He considered that promenades were different from other public open spaces currently managed by LCSD as pleasure grounds. In response to comments by the Harbourfront Commission and Tsuen Wan District Council, LCSD should review its internal guidelines and regulations so as to allow the public to walk their dogs along the promenades. He quoted the Cyberport Waterfront Park in the Southern District as an ideal example. **Mr Derek HUNG** also shared that dogs were also allowed at the waterfront open space at the West Kowloon Cultural District. For some parts of the waterfront, pets were permitted so long as they were kept leashed and under control. There was also a pet zone where pets could play freely. Reference could be drawn to the practices there. **Ms Nixie LAM** opined that while adopting management style that was more humane to pets, it was equally important for LCSD to carry out more education activities or trial schemes to enhance public acceptance towards pets at public open space. For instance, she shared that there was indeed quite some objection when a dedicated pet lane was introduced at the Tsuen Wan Park.

2.4 **Mr Michael CHIU** thanked Members for their suggestions. He expressed that members of the public carry different views on allowing pets in public parks. While some welcomed the ideas of granting more access to pets, others were concerned about the possible nuisance to children and elderly. With a view to providing an inclusive park environment for different users, LCSD was conducting a one-year trial scheme of “Inclusive Park for Pets” in six parks starting from January 2019, including the Kai Tak Runway Park at the harbourfront area. Reviews would be carried out after the trial to map out the way forward.

Facilities to be provided under Phase II of the Project

2.5 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** suggested installing water dispensers as to reduce waste of plastic water bottles. He also opined that trees with big canopy cover should be planted along the promenade to provide better shading.

- 2.6 **Mr Victor CHEUNG** suggested that environmentally-friendly designs such as installation of solar panels and rainwater collection systems could be considered during Phase II of the project, thereby echoing the renewable energy initiative advocated by the Government. **Prof Raymond FUNG** added that to better utilize resources, such designs should not be decorative and should only be adopted if they could serve functional purposes.
- 2.7 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** stated that there was financial, time and space constraints for the project and hoped that the Tsuen Wan Waterfront Enhancement project could become a learning process for all parties.
- 2.8 **Dr Edmund LEE** mentioned that good designs should accommodate the aspiration, well-being and needs of people. He stressed the importance of inclusivity in the design process. A holistic design driven by care for the people could motivate more people to visit the harbourfront.
- 2.9 **Ms Nixie LAM** opined that the design of Phase II should allow the public to get around spaces, provide a pleasant environment with suitable shading for the public to sit down and relax, and introduce cultural activities at the promenade.

Tree Preservation Relating to the Adjacent Cycle Track Project

- 2.10 **Mr Ken SO** said that a member of the public has sought his help in preserving a Ficus Religiosa tree along Hoi On Road which was originally planned to be removed under CEDD's cycling track project there. After site inspection, he considered that the tree had some structural defects but was still in a good condition. He hoped that the Government should reconsider preserving the tree for providing better shading to the public. **Mr YUEN Hoi-man** echoed and considered that the tree should be preserved as far as practicable. **Ms Nixie LAM** supplemented that preservation of trees along Hoi On Road was discussed in the Tsuen Wan District Council's Coastal Affairs Committee under a standing item on the cycle track project. The professionals from LCSD and CEDD's consultant had assessed that the concerned Ficus Religiosa could be potentially dangerous to pedestrians and recommended it be taken down. She welcomed the opportunity to link up Mr SO and relevant departments with a view to finding the best solution for the tree.

[Post-meeting note: After further liaison among Ms Nixie LAM, Mr Ken SO, CEDD and TWDC, it was decided to keep and transplant the Ficus Religiosa to a nearby location along the promenade.]

Conclusion

- 2.11 **The Chair** thanked members for their comments and stressed that promenades should be diversified, user-centric in design and cater for different needs. She concluded that the Tsuen Wan Waterfront Enhancement design had been aspiration driven. She emphasized that public engagement results had illustrated the importance of inclusivity and environmental-friendliness at promenade. She also agreed that promenades should adopt functional designs. She appreciated members' useful comments and looked forward to the design of Phase 1b.

Item 3 Transitional Housing Project at the Junction of Hoi Kok Street and Hoi Hing Road Tsuen Wan (Paper No. TFK/02/2019)

Introduction

- 3.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives from the Yan Chai Hospital Board, James Law Cybertecture International Holdings Ltd, Prudential Surveyors International Limited, and Transport and Housing Bureau to the meeting.

Presentation by the Project Team

- 3.2 With the aid of a PowerPoint, **Mr Jason LEUNG** and **Mr James LAW** briefed the Task Force on the transitional housing project at the junction of Hoi Kok Street and Hoi Hing Road Tsuen Wan.

Discussion

- 3.3 **The Chair** said that **Mr Freddie HAI** from the Hong Kong Institute of Architect was unable to attend the meeting and submitted his written comment. In the meantime, **Mr Ivan HO**, the alternate member of the Task Force representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design also submitted his written comments on the proposal. Their written comments were tabled for Members' information.

Development of Transitional Housing

- 3.4 **The Chair** invited the Project Proponent to further explain how this transitional housing project could provide quality housing for those who were waiting for the allocation of public housing. **Dr Eunice MAK, Mr Ken SO, Mr YUEN Hoi-man, Ms Nixie LAM** and **Mr Derek HUNG** all concurred that it was necessary to provide transitional housing to meet the housing needs of society pending the availability of permanent housing. **Mr CHAN Nap-ming** explained that the engagement of community resources can increase the supply of transitional housing in a swift manner providing short-term relief to the acute housing shortage. **Mr Jason LEUNG** further elaborated that in addition to domestic accommodation, the Project would provide social support to those who had been queuing for public housing for at least 3 years and presently living in less desirable housing condition.

Concerns arising from nearby traffic

- 3.5 **Dr Eunice MAK** asked if the proposed location was suitable for transitional housing as the site was under an elevated highway and was surrounded by roads. **Mr Ken SO** observed that there was busy traffic with heavy vehicles on nearby roads, thus he asked if there were enough air and noise considerations on the design. **Ms Nixie LAM** was also concerned about noise pollution. In response, **Mr James LAW** clarified that the site was next to the elevated highway instead of under it and added that the design team had been working with environmental consultants on the matter.

Connectivity

- 3.6 **The Chair** opined that the proponent should incorporate designs that could improve pedestrian connectivity between the hinterland and the harbourfront. **Mr Ken SO** raised concerns on insufficient pedestrian crossings to reach the subject site. **Mr Andy LEWIS** also considered that the project should contribute to the enhancement of accessibility and connectivity to the harbourfront. **Mr Derek HUNG** asked if TD had any data on nearby transport and how the proposed development would affect the present traffic. **Mr YUEN Hoi-man** asked if TD could construct more pedestrian crossings to enhance the connectivity within the district even without such project. **Ms Nixie LAM** was concerned about the possible technical difficulties in providing an additional pedestrian crossing near the site as proposed by the project proponent

because of the high speed limits of the road there. She was also concerned about the lack of public transportation for future residents.

- 3.7 In response, **Mr David NGU** said the present pedestrian crossing should be sufficient for connecting to the site and provision of additional pedestrian crossing might not be appropriate due to heavy traffic nearby. TD would provide transport and traffic advice to the project proponent upon receipt of other possible options which should give due regard to the appropriateness of the proposed crossing location, its form and associated pedestrian flow. **Mr Jason LEUNG** further added that the project team was prepared to liaise with the relevant parties in exploring options to enhance pedestrian access to the harbourfront.

Zoning and Site Selection

- 3.8 Knowing that the site was zoned "Open Space", **Dr Eunice MAK** asked about the long term development plan of the site. **Mr Andy LEWIS** enquired the reason of choosing the site for the transitional housing project. **Prof Raymond FUNG** asked if the proposed site was the best place for such scheme as the proposed plan could only accommodate around 300 residents.
- 3.9 **Mr YUEN Hoi-man** asked why the site zoned "Open Space" was chosen for this project, rather than "Government, Institution and Community (GIC)" sites in other projects such as the one proposed in Sham Shui Po, and why LCSD and TD did not have any plans for the subject site. Given the site was allocated under the term of short-term tenancy, he was concerned that the five-year project would be extended continuously and undermined the possibility of other permanent development to the site. **Mrs Karen BARETTO** shared his views. In response, **Mr CHAN Nap-ming** said that there were difficulties in identifying suitable sites for transitional housing, with only a handful of projects successfully obtained the support of the relevant district council at the moment. Since the planned use at the proposed site had no development programme yet, the site was selected for the project. **Ms Caroline TANG** further explained that the proposed temporary use was permitted under the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) if it was expected to be for 5 years or less.
- 3.10 **Mr Derek HUNG** suggested the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) conduct a study on whether the site was

suitable for living. In response, **Mr CHAN Nap-ming** said that relevant advice and studies on air quality, noise pollution and traffic conditions at the site had been sought or conducted and there was no indication of insurmountable issues. **Mr Jason LEUNG** further added that the transitional housing would be designed and built to meet Government's required standards.

- 3.11 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** had reservations on the transitional housing development at the subject site and considered that it was proposed under a top-down approach. He enquired the Planning Department (PlanD) on the development plans of the site and the nearby "Government, Institution and Community" site, as well as provision of open space in the district. He considered that the site could be used for more interesting uses such as art-village for young people, and suitable place-making exercise would also be helpful. **Ms Caroline TANG** responded that the subject site was planned for development of a local open space (LO) in the long run. There was a surplus of 3.65 hectare of LO and a surplus of 1 hectare of district open space within the boundary of Tsuen Wan OZP at the moment. **Mr James LAW** replied that a place-making exercise was being planned for the project and would be conducted after the relevant administrative procedures.
- 3.12 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** also asked TD about the progress of Tsuen Wan Road Widening works at the subject site as he reckoned that an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) was conducted for the works back in 2006. **Mr David NGU** responded that the need of the widening works was under review and there was no definite programme for the works at the moment.
- 3.13 **Sr Francis LAM** suggested conducting a more detailed site selection study as there were potential problems with the current site. **Ms Caroline TANG** explained that THB had identified the potential sites for development of transitional housing across Hong Kong and the proposed site was considered not incompatible from a planning point of view.

Design of the Transitional Housing Project

- 3.14 **The Chair** asked about the functionality of the Opods design.
- 3.15 **Dr Eunice MAK** worried that the use of water pipes as housing, coupled with the under-the-flyover location of the site, would have a negative labelling effect on the residents. It was necessary to have the public perceived that the current

project was a better land use than leaving the site vacant. She suggested the proponent reviewing the design to avoid labelling effect and create a better integration with the surrounding environment and development. **Mr Andy LEWIS** echoed Dr MAK's comments and considered that more work was needed to refine the design so as to minimise public perceptions towards the residents and allow them to integrate into the community. **Mr Ken SO** opined that the rendering shown in the PowerPoint had removed present vegetation adjacent to the site. He suggested that rather than adopting a fancy design, the proponent should take the daily needs of target residents into account when enhancing the design. **Mr YUEN Hoi-man** also cast doubt on living quality of future residents.

- 3.16 **Prof Raymond FUNG** appreciated the proposed design. He commented that the project should be used as a trial scheme to promote the idea of trendy and modern transitional housing as a characteristic of Hong Kong to reduce negative perceptions toward such transitional housing.
- 3.17 With reference to examples in Amsterdam and Rotterdam, **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** considered that the design would be of better use for student housing. He also appreciated the design's high energy efficiency, and further asked if temporary housing had same building requirements as permanent housing.
- 3.18 **Ir Janice LAI** considered that the design of housing of this project should be functional. She raised concerns on the residents' privacy and temperature control. In response, **Mr James LAW** said that the orientation of the flats would be slightly-rotated to solve the problem.
- 3.19 **Ir Victor CHEUNG** opined that the proposed design was nice, however building services, electrical and mechanical services, and communal facilities were not shown in the design. He asked if the current sewage system at the site could support around 300 residents and further enquired whether the site had electricity, water and gas provision.
- 3.20 **Sr Francis LAM** asked if adoption of conventional Modular Integrated Construction (MiC) would be considered at the site.
- 3.21 **Mrs Karen BARRETTO** considered that the design of the housing was cute and could bring improvement to the

surrounding area. She mentioned that the Opods should be assessed on their heating and cooling system, and rain shelters and laundry facilities should be provided.

- 3.22 **Mr James LAW** explained that the tube-like design had been recognised internationally as a new type of architecture and was considered more space efficient and cost effective. The required construction time would also be shorter than the conventional square-designed housing. He added that the concrete of the Opods would be thicker than normal pipes, providing better heat insulation. While large glass windows would be installed for better sunlight penetration, curtains would also be added to protect privacy. He stressed that the eventual design of the transitional housing would aim to provide a happy, safe and healthy community for residents. He committed to further enhance the interior design of the housing to cater for actual needs of residents, and keep most of the trees and incorporate them into the design for better privacy protection and noise shielding.
- 3.23 **Mr Andy LEWIS** suggested that the pipes used for Opods should be re-used in other sites after the project.

Local Engagement

- 3.24 **Mr YUEN Hoi-man** foresaw that there may be conflicts between nearby residents and the future residents of the transitional housing. **Ms Nixie LAM**, as the district council member of the constituency concerned, was against the current site selection. She quoted the results of the 3 consultations done in the district, of which 79%, 85% and around 90% of the respondents were against the idea of building transitional housing at the site respectively. She said that no responses had been received from any related departments on the matter against local concerns, and no direct engagement with the local residents had been done.
- 3.25 **Mr Derek HUNG** opined that extensive public consultation should be done to understand residents' concerns and to avoid conflicts in the future.
- 3.26 **Dr Edmund LEE** emphasised the importance of the 4Ps (People, Place, Promotion, Positioning) while conducting the project. He commented that the project should be targeted at a distinct group of users (such as grassroots or young adults); hence the promotion and packaging of the project could be adjusted according to the target users.

- 3.27 **Mr CHAN Nap-ming** responded that the project proponent had presented the proposal of the transitional housing to Tsuen Wan District Council for their comments in March 2019. The proponent would continue to engage the public and collect views to fine-tune the design. **Mr James LAW** added that a holistic design approach was adopted when designing the proposed transitional housing. Members' comments would be taken on board in refining the detailed design.

Future Management

- 3.28 **Mr Andy LEWIS** was concerned about the property management of the transitional housing. **Mr Jason LEUNG** replied that the property management services including cleansing would be provided for handling the daily routine management issue.

Way Forward

- 3.29 **The Chair** concluded by acknowledging the many good intentions underlying the project, especially in addressing the acute problem of housing shortage for many in society. In the light of many members' concerns on the proposed design, she considered that more efforts would be needed in refining the design and articulating the objectives and clientele the project intended to serve so as to provide a better living environment for the beneficiaries and solicit wider district support. Such public engagement was one of the elements encouraged in the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines and was also in line with the "4Ps" theory, i.e. emphasis should be placed on People, Place, Promotion and Position, in project management.
- 3.30 **The Chair** added that the meeting recognised that the project site was currently left idle and fenced-off and hence it should be better utilised by introducing uses compatible with the harbourfront environment. Meanwhile, regardless of this project, the TD should continue to take forward the suggestion of enhancing pedestrian connectivity from the hinterland to the waterfront via the vacant site, in particular that the immediate waterfront would become more vibrant and attractive in the coming future after the Tsuen Wan Waterfront Enhancement (Phase 2). She welcomed the project team to come back to the meeting when they feel that Members' comments expressed at the meeting have been duly considered in a refined development scheme.

Item 4 Proposed Residential Development at Yau Tong Marine Lot Nos. 58, 59, 60, 61 and 62 and adjoining Government Land, Yau Tong, Kowloon (Paper No. TFK/03/2019)

- 4.1 In view of the tight schedule, the Chair proposed and Members agreed to consider the above item by way of circulation.

(Post-meeting Notes: The paper was circulated to Members for comment by email on 27 June 2019 with the deadline of 4 July 2019. Members' comments were then consolidated and conveyed to proponent and relevant departments for consideration and response on 15 July 2019.)

Item 5 Any Other Business

- 5.1 **The Chair** informed Members that this was the last meeting under the current term of HC. She thanked Members for their dedicated service to the Task Force in the last two years.
- 5.2 There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 12:50pm.

**Secretariat
Task Force on Harbourfront Developments
in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing
Harbourfront Commission
September 2019**