

32nd Meeting of Harbourfront Commission
held at 3:00 pm on 27 July 2018 at the Conference Room
(Room G46) at Upper Ground Floor, Hong Kong Heritage Discovery Centre,
Kowloon Park, Tsim Sha Tsui, Kowloon

Minutes of Meeting

Present

Mr Vincent NG	Chair
Mr Andy LEWIS	Representing Business Environment Council
Mr LEUNG Kong-yui	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Mrs Karen BARRETTO	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Freddie HAI	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Evans IU	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Dr Eunice MAK	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Sr Francis LAM	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr Ivan HO	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Ms Elsa MAN	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Dr CHUNG Shan-shan	Representing The Conservancy Association
Mr CHAN Ka-kui	
Mr Walter CHAN	
Ms Kelly CHAN	
Mr Hans Joachim ISLER	
Ms Christina LEE	
Mr NGAN Man-yu	
Hon Tony TSE	
Ms Bernadette LINN	Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands), Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Simpson LO	Assistant Commissioner for Tourism 2, Tourism Commission (TC)
Mr Peter WONG	Assistant Commissioner/Urban, Transport Department (TD)
Ms Ginger KIANG	Deputy Head of the Sustainable Lantau Office (Planning & Conservation), Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Ms Rebecca LOU	Assistant Director (Leisure Services) 2, Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Mr Tony CHAN	Assistant Director/Planning & Services, Marine

Mr Raymond LEE
Miss Rosalind CHEUNG

Department (MD)
Director of Planning
Secretary

In Attendance

Mr LIU Chun-san
Mr Allen FUNG
Miss Teresa SAIR
Mr Henry LAI
Ms Jenny WONG

Under Secretary for Development
Political Assistant to Secretary for Development
Press Secretary to Secretary for Development
Assistant Secretary (Harbour) 1, DEVB
Assistant Secretary (Harbour) Special Duties,
DEVB

Mr Peter MOK
Mr Michael CHIU

Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB
Chief Executive Officer (Planning)1, LCSD

Absent with Apologies

Ir Raymond CHAN Kin-sek
Mr Winston CHU

Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Representing Society for Protection of the
Harbour

Mr Karl KWOK
Ir Janice LAI
Ms Vivian LEE
Mr Alan LO

Agenda Item 2

Mr NG Tak-wah
Mr Derek YUE
Ms Daisy WONG
Mr Kim TSUI
Mr WONG Sai-chung
Ms Amy YU
Mr George CHAN
Mr Simon LEUNG
Mr Murdo FRASER
Ms Cindy TSANG
Mr Chapman LAM
Mr Antony WONG

Senior Town Planner / HK 2, Planning
Department
Senior District Engineer / HES, Highways
Department
District Lands Officer/ Hong Kong East, Lands
Department
Senior Building Surveyor/ Hong Kong East 1,
Buildings Department
Chairman, Concord Group
General Manager, Concord Group
Project Manager, Concord Group
Managing Director, MLA
Associate Director, ARQ
Director, Townland Consultants Limited
Director, MVA
Technical Director, SMEC

Welcoming Message

The Chair welcomed all to the meeting. He welcomed Ms Christina LEE and Dr CHUNG Shan-shan, representative of the Conservancy Association, for joining the meeting for the first time.

The Chair informed Members that Mr Simpson LO, Assistant Commissioner for Tourism, attended on behalf of Mr Joe WONG; Mr Peter WONG, Assistant Commissioner of the Transport Department (TD), attended on behalf of Ms Mable CHAN; Ms Rebecca LOU, Assistant Director of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD), attended on behalf of Ms Michelle LI; and Mr Tony CHAN, Assistant Director of the Marine Department (MD), attended on behalf of Ms Maisie CHENG.

Item 1 Matters Arising

- (i) Proposed Consultancy Study on Suitable Model(s) for Managing and Maintaining the Harbourfront (Management Study) (paragraphs 5.1 - 5.11 of the minutes of the 31st meeting)
 - (ii) Proposed Consultancy Study on Enhancing Visitors' Experience and Connectivity from the Hinterland to and within Harbourfront Areas (Visitors' Experience and Connectivity Study) (paragraphs 4.1 - 4.17 of the minutes of the 31st meeting)
- 1.1 **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** briefed members on the latest progress as follows -
- (a) The Management Study: taking into account comments made by Members at the last meeting, it was agreed that in-house efforts should be made to draw up suitable management and maintenance rules for use in harbourfront areas. The initiative would be carried out by the Harbour Office (HO) through existing resources, and it would not be necessary to deploy the \$500 million

Action

dedicated funding;

- (b) Visitors' Experience and Connectivity Study: instead of conducting local case studies, the meeting agreed to invite the Consultant to study international and local waterfront exemplars, and derive good practices from these examples for application to the two pilot areas. The meeting also supported shortening the study period from 24 months to 18 months. As regards a Member's suggestion of covering Tsing Yi promenade in the study, it was agreed that it could be handled in consultation with relevant departments outside the scope of the study;
- (c) Proposed consultancy study on design guidelines for promenades in Hong Kong and locations for better water-land facilities: the meeting agreed that another consultancy study on formulating a set of design guidelines for promenades of different lengths and sizes should be commissioned. The Study would also identify suitable locations for better water-land facilities. It would be financed by the \$500 million dedicated funding; and
- (d) Way forward of the Task Force on Water-land Interface (TFWL): it was agreed that the terms of reference of the existing HC Task Force on Water-land Interface (TFWL) should be expanded to cover the wider issues of implementation, design matters and management of harbourfront areas and its adjacent waters. The revamped Task Force would also be responsible for the matters proposed under (a), (b) and (c) above. This arrangement was generally supported the TFWL at its meeting on 12 July 2018.

1.2 **Mr Ivan HO** was concerned about the workload of HO if it had to make in-house efforts in drawing up suitable management and maintenance rules. He suggested employing more contract staff to relieve HO's workload and ensure timely completion of the initiative. In response, **Ms Bernadette LINN** said that HO's workload and staffing requirements would be critically examined and the

Action

Government would provide it with the necessary funding for additional staffing when necessary.

- 1.3 **Dr CHUNG Shan-shan** supported the initiatives set out in paragraph 1.1(a) to (d) above. She further suggested the HC conduct risk assessment on sea level rise in future as a result of climate change and possible mitigation measures. While recognising the need of drawing up long-term policies against climate change, **Mr LIU Chun-san** said that the Government had established an inter-departmental Steering Committee on Climate Change to coordinate the relevant matters. **The Chair** added that the subject had been discussed at previous TFWL meetings. He foresaw that there would be increasing challenges on urban and harbourfront planning design as a result of climate change, and that members with different expertise could offer their professional comments on the issue.
- 1.4 **Ms Kelly CHAN** said that the Tsim Sha Tsui and Tai Kok Tsui promenades were appropriate locations as pilot areas for the Visitors' Experience and Connectivity Study but thought that 18 months was still too long. To address her concern, she enquired whether there would be interim reports.
- 1.5 **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** responded that four task reports were proposed to be included in the scope of work and the consultant would be requested to report the study progress to the HC regularly.
- 1.6 **Mr KY LEUNG**, as the Chair of TFWL, welcomed members to join the Task Force for bringing in different expertise and contribute to the consultancy studies.

Item 2 Proposal on Enhanced Harbourfront Development at Hoi Yu Street, Quarry Bay through Land Exchange (Paper No. HC/10/2018) (Paper No. HC/11/2018)

- 2.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives from the Development Bureau (DEVB), Buildings Department, Highways Department, Lands Department and Planning Department, as well as those of the lot owner.

2.2 **Ms Elsa MAN** declared that she worked in Swire Properties and her company owned properties in the vicinity of Hoi Yu Street in Quarry Bay. **The Chair** decided that Ms MAN could remain in the meeting.

Briefing by HO

2.3 Upon Chair's invitation, **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** briefed Members on the background on the land exchange proposal concerning two private lots at Hoi Yu Street in Quarry Bay as follows -

- (a) the two private lots were originally permitted for industrial and/or godown purposes and building plans for an 25-storey (about 85mPD) industrial building (IB) development was approved in September 2001;
- (b) the lots and their adjacent government land were then rezoned to "Other Specified Uses (1)" annotated "Cultural and/or Commercial, Leisure and Tourism Related Uses" ("Other Specified Uses (1)") and "Open Space" in 2003;
- (c) the lot owner commenced the development in mid-2017. Members were briefed on the background of the IB development, as well as its progress at the meetings of the Commission and its Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island on 10 and 26 October 2017, as well as 23 January and 7 May 2018. Members expressed disappointment about the development as it was not in line with the Harbour Planning Principles & Guidelines (HPP&Gs) and invited the Government to explore ways to achieve a "win-win" situation;
- (d) following the discussion with DEVB and other relevant government departments, the lot owner had put forth an alternative proposal involving a harbourfront leisure, tourism and commercial development, in place of the IB development. The proposed development would be

Action

implemented by way of in-situ land exchange, subject to the planning approval of the Town Planning Board (TPB) and land administration procedures. According to the initial estimate, the lot owner would surrender the two private lots with a total area of 2 477m² in return for a re-grant of 8 532m² of land from the Government; and

- (e) the latest development would be more compatible with the planning intent of “Other Specified Uses (1)” zone. Apart from the significant reduction in building height, the existing 10-metre-wide promenade would also be maintained along Hoi Yu Street for public enjoyment, and pedestrian access would be provided to enhance the connectivity to and vibrancy of the waterfront.

Presentation by the lot owner

- 2.4 With the aid of a Powerpoint, **Mr WONG Sai-chung**, **Mr Simon LEUNG** and **Ms Cindy TSANG** introduced the design of the proposed development.

Discussion

Planning Intention

- 2.5 In place of the original 25-storey IB development, **Hon Tony TSE**, **Mr Walter CHAN**, **Mr Ivan HO**, **Mr KY LEUNG** and **Mr CHAN Ka-kui** supported the Administration’s proposal for a land exchange so that the development would be compatible with the planning intent of the “Other Specified Uses (1)” zone. **Hon Tony TSE** added that it could truly realise the objective of “returning the harbour to the people”.
- 2.6 Although the proposed development was more compatible with the planning intent than the original IB development, **Dr Eunice MAK** doubted if there was any cultural element in the lot owner’s proposal. In response, **Mr Simon LEUNG** said that an open deck had been proposed on the roof of the Office block as a multi-purpose space for uses including but not limited to exhibition, events and performance.

Design

- 2.7 **Mr Ivan HO** opined that the proposed design of a landscaped podium deck along the promenade would affect the visual permeability from the harbour. In addition, there was no detailed design, especially for the landscaped podium deck, the promenade and the green roof top. He saw no variation in the building height of the five proposed buildings, which made the design uninteresting. He added that the proponent should take care of the impact of the sightline of drivers using Island Eastern Corridor (IEC) when refining the design. He hoped the proponent could further enhance its design and consult HC again.
- 2.8 Instead of facing the IEC, **Dr Eunice MAK** considered that the proposed landscaped podium should face the harbour, with a view to making it a more comfortable spot for enjoying the harbour view. Varying building height for the five proposed buildings would be acceptable if it could allow a larger public open space (POS) at ground level.
- 2.9 **Mr Freddie HAI** and **Mr CHAN Ka-kui** opined that the proposed design still had room for improvement and wished to see an enhanced design with more information at a later stage. **Mr Freddie HAI** considered that varying building heights had to be introduced to create a more interesting and aesthetically-pleasing building height profile. Meanwhile, the proponent might consider adopting a stepped-height design for the landscaped podium deck along the waterfront side so as to enhance visual permeability to the harbour.
- 2.10 **Mr KY LEUNG** supported the design of a landscaped podium deck as it could minimise the potential noise nuisance of the IEC. He also welcomed the proponent's effort in putting forward an alternative proposal to address public aspirations, and that the proponent had offered to set-back the buildings facing Hoi Yu Street and release a wider space with greening works at the podium level.

Action

- 2.11 **Mr Andy LEWIS** asked if there could be other design options, for instance, different building design and footprint which could allow an even wider promenade. He wondered whether it would be feasible to build an underground restaurant with aquarium.
- 2.12 **Mr Simon LEUNG** replied that the proposed design was preliminary and it would be enhanced to take into account Members' views. Specifically, the suggestion of building height variation would be further considered. As regards the proposed aquarium, it would be built inside the building so as not to damage the sea wall.

Connectivity between waterfront and the hinterland

- 2.13 **Sr Francis LAM, Mr KY LEUNG and Mr Walter CHAN** were concerned about the connectivity between the waterfront and the hinterland and asked whether the developer would build the planned elevated pedestrian walkway from Hoi Yu Street to Hoi Tai Street.
- 2.14 **Mr KY LEUNG** stressed the importance of having seamless connection between the waterfront and its hinterland on both elevated and at-grade levels.
- 2.15 **Mr Simon LEUNG** replied that the landscaped podium deck would serve as a connection point for the future elevated pedestrian walkway, providing north-south connection across IEC linking the Hoi Yu Street waterfront with its hinterland. In addition, a 24-hour pedestrian passage running through the building at ground level would also be available and open for public use. This would improve the connectivity between the waterfront and the hinterland.

Accessibility

- 2.16 **Hon Tony TSE, Mr Ivan HO, Mr Freddie HAI, Mr Andy LEWIS and Sr Francis LAM** raised concerns as to whether the proposed landscaped podium deck, pedestrian passage from Hoi Yu Street to the promenade and an open deck on the roof

Action

of the Office block would be accessible by the public round-the-clock.

- 2.17 **Dr Eunice MAK** stressed the importance of providing POS on the ground level at harbourfront areas for public enjoyment. **Mr CHAN Kai-ku** echoed her views.
- 2.18 **Ms Kelly CHAN** enquired whether parking area would be provided for public use as the location was not easily accessible by members of the public.
- 2.19 **Mr Simon LEUNG** confirmed that the landscaped podium deck, the promenade and the pedestrian passage would be opened round-the-clock for public use. However, the open deck on the roof of the Office block would only be used for events and exhibition by reservation. He added that public carparks would be provided in the development.

The promenade and its management

- 2.20 While the promenade would be under Government's ownership, it was proposed to be designed and constructed by the proponent. **Hon Tony TSE** asked how the Government could ensure that the design was in compliance with the HPP&Gs and would be opened for public enjoyment.
- 2.21 **Mr Andy LEWIS, Dr Eunice MAK** and **Sr Francis LAM** wondered whether it was possible to widen the existing 10-metre wide promenade with a view to providing a more spacious POS and enhancing the vibrancy of the area.
- 2.22 **Mr Ivan HO** said that the presentation had not shown the design of the promenade, nor mentioned whether or not there would be public toilets, drinking fountain or lawn for public use. He hoped the proponent could further enhance the proposal and consult Members again.
- 2.23 **Ms Kelly CHAN** enquired if diversified range of activities such as cycling or skating would be allowed in the promenade.

Action

2.24 **Mr Simon LEUNG** responded that the width of the site was 20 to 40 metres, and that there would be design challenges if the proposed new development had to set-back further and release space for widening the promenade to more than 10 metres.

Other comments

2.25 Noting that there were suspended piling and foundation works of the IB development in the Site, **Mr Andy LEWIS** and **Sr Francis LAM** enquired if those works would affect implementation of the alternative proposal.

2.26 **Ms Kelly CHAN** asked the following -

- (a) if marine transport would be available for public use in the alternative proposal; and
- (b) whether there was any measure to control sewage discharge from the proposed development to avoid polluting the harbour.

2.27 **Mr Simon LEUNG** responded that the foundation piles would be removed. As the alternative proposal had a waterfront location, the Applicant had a long term vision of having marine transport linking Quarry Bay to Hung Hom and Tsim Sha Tsui with a view to creating a vibrant new destination on the waterfront and greatly improving connectivity to the area, but it needed time to further study its feasibility.

Way Forward

2.28 **The Chair** said that Members had a thorough discussion on the alternative proposal from the harbour planning perspective, and offered comments on further improving the scheme including promoting public enjoyment of the harbourfront area, enhancing connectivity between the harbourfront and its hinterland, improving visual and

Action

physical permeability of the design, having variation in building height, as well as enhancing the design and management of the promenade. In general, Members were supportive of replacing the original IB development with an alternative proposal which was more compatible with the harbourfront environment. As the proponent aimed to submit the alternative proposal to the TPB later this year, he expected that the HC would be consulted again on the revised design at a later stage.

Item 3 Any Other Business

3.1 There being no other business, the meeting ended at 5:10 pm.

**Secretariat
Harbourfront Commission
October 2018**