

**37<sup>th</sup> Meeting of Harbourfront Commission**  
**held at 3:00 pm on 5 May 2020 at the Conference Room**  
**15/F, North Point Government Offices, 333 Java Road, Hong Kong**

**Minutes of Meeting**

**Present**

Mr Vincent NG	Chairman
Mr Michael WONG	Secretary for Development, Vice-chairman
Mrs Margaret BROOKE	Representing Business Environment Council
Prof Becky LOO*	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Dr Vivian WONG*	Representing Friends of the Earth (HK) Charity Limited
Mr Anthony CHEUNG*	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Ms Iris HOI	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Mr Edward LO*	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
Ir Raymond CHAN Kin-sek	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Terence LEE*	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Mr Mac CHAN	
Ms Kelly CHAN*	
Mr Hans Joachim ISLER*	
Ms Christina LEE*	
Mr Alan LO*	
Mr Karl KWOK*	
Ir Janice LAI	
Ms Angela SO*	
Hon Tony TSE*	

**Official Members**

Ms Bernadette LINN	Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands), Development Bureau (DEVB)
Ms Anny TANG*	Senior Manager (Tourism) 21, Tourism Commission (TC)
Mr Michael LAW*	Assistant Commissioner/Urban, Transport Department (TD)

Mr Ricky LAU	Director of Civil Engineering and Development, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Mr Michael CHIU	Chief Executive Officer (Planning)1, Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Mr Tony CHAN	Assistant Director/Planning & Services, Marine Department (MD)
Mr Raymond LEE	Director of Planning
Miss Rosalind CHEUNG	Secretary

**In Attendance**

Mr Winston CHU	Representative of Society for Protection of the Harbour
Ms Doris HO	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Allen FUNG	Political Assistant to Secretary for Development
Miss Teresa SAIR	Press Secretary to Secretary for Development
Mr LEUNG Kong-yui	Chairman, Task Force on Water-Land Interface and Harbourfront Activation
Miss Rosalind CHEUNG	Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Henry LAI	Assistant Secretary (Harbour) 1, 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 Carlos FUNG	Senior Engineer (Harbour), DEVB

**Absent with Apologies**

Dr CHUNG Shan-shan	Representing The Conservancy Association
Ms Vivian LEE	
Mr NGAN Man-yu	

\* denotes attending online

## Welcoming Message

**The Chairman** welcomed all to the meeting. He informed the meeting that –

- (a) Ms Anny TANG, Senior Manager of the Tourism Commission, attended on behalf of Mr Joe WONG, Commissioner for Tourism;
- (b) Mr Michael LAW, Assistant Commissioner of the Transport Department (TD), attended on behalf of Ms Mable CHAN, Commissioner for Transport;
- (c) Mr Michael CHIU, Chief Executive Officer (Planning)<sup>1</sup> of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD), attended on behalf of Mr Vincent LIU, Director of Leisure and Cultural Services; and
- (d) Mr Tony CHAN, Assistant Director of the Marine Department (MD), attended on behalf of Miss Agnes WONG, Director of Marine.

## Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 36<sup>th</sup> meeting

- 1.1 **The Chairman** said that the Secretariat had circulated the draft minutes of the 36<sup>th</sup> meeting to Members on 28 April 2020 and 4 May 2020. There being no proposed amendment, the minutes were confirmed at the meeting.

## Item 2 Matters Arising

- 2.1 No matters arising were raised at the meeting.

## Item 3 Site 3 of the New Central Harbourfront (Paper No. HC/01/2020)

- 3.1 **The Chairman** noted that prior to the meeting, relevant House Rules pertaining to declaration of interests had been circulated and brought to Members' attention. Except **Mr Terence LEE** who had declared before the meeting that he was working for a major landlord in Central, no Member made any further declaration.

**Action**

- 3.2 **The Chairman** invited **Ms Doris HO** to give Members an introduction on this agenda item.

Briefing by the Development Bureau

- 3.3 **Ms Doris HO** informed Members that Site 3 of the New Central Harbourfront had been included in the 2020-21 Land Sale Programme as announced by the Government on 27 February 2020.
- 3.4 She remarked that, occupying a total area of 4.75 hectare, Site 3 was a sizable commercial site remained undeveloped at the heart of the Core Business District in Central. On the other hand, there was strong public aspiration for a world-class harbourfront with quality public open space (POS) and pedestrian-oriented connectivity. Against this background, it was proposed that a two-envelope tendering arrangement be adopted for the disposal of Site 3 such that tender proposals could be evaluated on the basis of design merits and premium offers. She further briefed members on the proposed two-envelope arrangement with the aid of a PowerPoint.

Discussion

*Visions*

- 3.5 The Society for Protection of the Harbour tabled a submission to propose inclusion of, in addition to the three development visions for Site 3 as set out in the discussion paper, the forth vision titled "Enhance Public Enjoyment of the Harbour".
- 3.6 **Ms Iris HOI** said that the public had long been aspiring a world-class development comparable to those in New York and London in Site 3.
- 3.7 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** said that Site 3 should be designed to bring vibrancy to the harbourfront. Sharing the lessons learnt from the Harbourfront Commission (HC)'s overseas visit to

Action

Australia in January 2020, he said that commercial and recreational elements like alfresco dining facilities and outdoor seating would be conducive to enhancing the vibrancy of the waterfront in Central.

- 3.8 **Mr Ivan HO** concurred and stressed that the Government should ensure that the Site 3 development would strike a proper balance between economic viability, environmental sustainability and social equitability.

*Two-envelope Tendering Arrangement*

- 3.9 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN, Hon Tony TSE, Mr Ivan HO, Ms Margaret BROOKE, Ms Kelly CHAN, Mr Anthony CHEUNG, Ir Raymond CHAN, Mr LEUNG Kong-yui, Mr Edward LO and Prof Becky LOO** supported the adoption of the two-envelope tendering arrangement which fully demonstrated the importance that the Government attached to the design merits and social benefits of the development.
- 3.10 **Ms Margaret BROOKE** suggested adjusting the tendering arrangement by allowing tenderers to put up conceptual designs and innovative ideas for incorporation into the Planning Brief (PB), followed by submission of price envelopes based on the revised PB. This arrangement would allow bidders to put together design merits of different proposals and later bring out the best design proposal.
- 3.11 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** concurred, adding that information on design proposals should be released to public for comment, thereby demonstrating fairness in the tendering process and maximizing public interests. Specifically, he recalled that the public was given opportunity to comment on the design proposals of the Tamar Development Project and suggested the same be arranged. On the other hand, he opined that non-conforming design proposals should also be considered so long as justifiable reasons could be provided.
- 3.12 In response, **Ms Bernadette LINN** emphasised that

notwithstanding the adoption of a two-envelope approach, the disposal of Site 3 was essentially a land sale exercise, not a design competition. All land sale tenders, including that for Site 3, had to strictly adhere to internal government regulations on stores and procurements.

*Planning Brief*

- 3.13 **Ms Iris HOI** considered development parameters set out in the PB too restrictive, which may stifle creativity and innovation. For example, the minimum overall greenery coverage of 30% and 50% for the whole site and the POS respectively was considered too little, hence her suggestion on relaxing the requirements in the PB. She also pointed out the stringent building height restrictions were not conducive to creating a landmark development at the harbourfront.
- 3.14 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** shared the same view and suggested relaxing the maximum building height restrictions to provide design flexibility.
- 3.15 **Ms Bernadette LINN** responded that the specified building height restrictions were to respect the harbourfront setting. The PB for Site 3 only focussed on broad planning parameters and minimum development requirements in terms of open space provision, pedestrian connectivity, etc., allowing due flexibility for tenderers to put forward creative and innovative ideas.

*Marking Scheme*

- 3.16 **Ir Raymond CHAN** supported the 50:50 design-to-price weighting which was considered effective in encouraging tenderers to come up with a visionary, innovative and world-class design.
- 3.17 **Ms Kelly CHAN** considered the technical feasibility and design concepts more important than the price offer. In her view, a higher weighting should be given to design in tender

assessment.

- 3.18 **Mr Edward LO** further enquired how the 50:50 design-to-price ratio was arrived at.
- 3.19 **Mr Michael WONG** explained that the proposed weighting was considered to have struck a proper balance between the call for adopting the best possible design for Site 3 on one hand, and the strong public expectation for protecting public revenue to be generated by a valuable site in the Central Business District. He added that the proposed 50:50 ratio was intended to allow the Government to select the proposal with the best combination of both design merits and premium offer.
- 3.20 **Mr Ivan HO** said the Marking Scheme should be carefully designed in terms of say allocation of marks amongst different criteria to differentiate the relative merits of design proposals. On the other hand, he opined that the future developer should strive to maintain connectivity and accessibility to the harbourfront for public enjoyment by providing temporary access arrangement during the lengthy construction period. In this regard, proposals with due consideration to connectivity and inclusiveness should be given extra marks.
- 3.21 **HON Tony TSE** said that it would be desirable if the construction would bring about minimum interference to the local community and neighbouring areas. He suggested awarding higher marks to proposals with concrete measures on ensuring good maintenance of the POS both in the course of construction and after completion of the development.
- 3.22 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** suggested giving bonus marks to proposals with additional elements for public enjoyment, such as plans that would improve and beautify the POS fronting Central Piers 9 and 10, provision of a 24-hour covered pedestrian access and a higher percentage of green coverage.
- 3.23 **Ir Janice LAI** suggested including maintenance and operation plan, sustainability and environmental friendliness as

**Action**

assessment criteria in the Marking Scheme in an attempt to encourage developers to integrate those desirable features in their proposals. In addition, given the sizable area of Site 3, she suggested including more water features in the POS such as a music fountain to lure visitors.

- 3.24 **Ms Bernadette LINN** responded that the Government would consider Members' views and incorporate them in the Marking Scheme as appropriate.

*Tender Assessment Panel (TAP)*

- 3.25 **Mr Edward LO** considered that the Technical Advisors (TA) to be appointed should have extensive development-related expertise and be able to provide advice from urban design and planning perspectives. He also suggested that TAs be allowed to give comments on the Marking Scheme.
- 3.26 **Prof Becky LOO** suggested that TAs should include transport professionals with expertise in pedestrian connection.
- 3.27 **Mr Michael WONG** assured the meeting that it was the Government's intention to appoint TAs from a variety of fields, such as architecture, planning, urban design, landscape design and surveying, to advise the TAP on design merits of different proposals.

*Public Engagement*

- 3.28 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** considered it too late to conduct public consultation only when the Master Layout Plan (MLP) was submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB) for approval, in view that the design at that stage would be close to final. He proposed engaging the public at an earlier stage to solicit their support.
- 3.29 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** pointed out that considerable public engagement had taken place and additional arrangement may not be entirely necessary. The Urban Design Study for the



**Action**

New Central Harbourfront commissioned back in 2005 had organised two stages of Public Engagement to collect public views on the urban design objectives, sustainable design assessment framework and other design considerations and these views were incorporated in the UDS final report that formed the basis for the PB.

*Implementation*

- 3.30 **Ir Raymond CHAN** opined that for such a large-scale project located on reclaimed land with excavation works carried out consecutively for years, it was imperative to conduct a traffic and transportation simulation as well as an assessment on the ground conditions of the Site prior to construction, so as to ensure the feasibility of the design proposal from technical and engineering aspects. He added that the proposed design should comply with all legal requirements for building services and fire escape, etc.
- 3.31 **Prof Becky LOO** said that it would be crucial to ensure the full implementation of the winning design. She asked whether there would be any mechanism in place for overseeing the implementation process to prevent the future developer from deviating from the winning proposal.
- 3.32 In response, **Mr Michael WONG** said that the future developer was required to submit a MLP to the TPB for approval before commencing construction. The MLP had to be premised on the design submitted for the successful tender. Once the MLP was approved by the TPB, the developer had to abide by it.
- 3.33 **Ms Bernadette LINN** supplemented that the winning proposal committed at the tender stage would be contractually binding under the lease conditions whereby the successful tenderer would be required to take forward the development as per the winning proposal. There would be checks and balances under lease to ensure compliance. For example, it would be specified under lease that the construction, management and maintenance of the POS had to be done to the satisfaction of

**Action**

Harbour Office (HO), which would be responsible for monitoring through implementation of the winning design.

*Timeline*

3.34 **Ms Kelly CHAN, Mr Ivan HO, Ms Iris HOI, Mr LEUNG Kong-yui and Mr Edward LO** suggested that the Site 3 development, which had been discussed and planned for more than a decade, should be kick-started as soon as possible to optimise public gain.

3.35 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** suggested the Government giving some more time for Members to consult their respective organisations before submitting further feedback to the Government on the proposed tendering arrangement.

3.36 In response, **Mr Michael WONG** welcomed Members to convey their further views on proposal, if any, to the Secretariat within two weeks from the date of the meeting.

[Post-meeting note: The Secretariat issued an email on 8 May 2020 inviting members to submit further comments on the subject by 26 May 2020.]

*Conclusion*

3.37 **The Chairman** concluded that Members in general welcomed the Government's initiative to adopt a two-envelope tender approach, as a measure to provide assurance in achieving a good design that would be compatible with the harbourfront setting and create a more attractive, vibrant, accessible and sustainable harbourfront for public enjoyment.

3.38 **The Chairman** added that the HC had all along been striving for the early opening of harbourfront sites for public enjoyment. Given that the PB for Site 3 was prepared after years of discussion and public engagement, it was opportune to proceed with the development on the basis of the PB. He invited the Government to take into consideration Members' comments in

the process.

**Item 4 Progress Reports from Task Forces**  
**(Paper No. HC/02/2020) (Paper No. HC/03/2020)**  
**(Paper No. HC/04/2020)**

- 4.1 **The Chairman** informed the meeting that three progress reports had been circulated to Members for perusal prior to the meeting.
- 4.2 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** raised that the Southern District Council was trying to put forward three projects with a view to providing linkage between the Cape D’Aguilar Road and Shek O Main Beach at the southeastern tip of Hong Kong island, the South Bay and Chung Hom Kok Road, as well as the Telegraph Bay and Sandy Bay, the completion of which would facilitate the construction of a 65-kilometer long continuous “Hong Kong Island Coastal Trail”.
- 4.3 **The Chairman** thanked **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** for the sharing. He said it was a shared vision with the HC to connect as much promenades in Victoria Harbour as possible in a timely manner. He further shared that the Government had been bringing to fruition a number of "quick-win" projects in recent years to open up the waterfront sections of promenades ahead of schedule. A “limited edition” concept was also adopted recently to bring in creative and interactive installations at the promenade on various festive occasions to draw in visitors and enhance the vibrancy of the waterfront.

**Item 5 Any Other Business**

*Lessons Learnt from the North Point and Hung Hom Promenades*

- 5.1 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** considered that there was room for improvement for the design of the North Point and Hung Hom Promenades. He pointed out that the spacious piazza between the buildings and the North Point Ferry Pier was not usable by the public as it was filled with potted plants. In

**Action**

addition, the lack of sitting-out areas outside the retails and restaurants at-grade had hindered people from interacting with the harbourfront. He suggested studying the lessons learnt for preventing similar situations in Yau Tong Bay and Yau Ma Tei Typhoon Shelter.

- 5.2 **The Chairman** thanked **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** for the suggestion and said that his views would be relayed to the Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island.

*Declaration of Interest concerning the Relocation of HO*

- 5.3 **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** informed Members that the HO had been relocated from the Central Government Offices in Tamar to Wing On Kowloon Centre (WOKC) in Jordan since 24 December 2019. Subsequently, **Mr Karl KWOK** informed the HO on 27 December 2019 that he was employed by the company that owned the office premise of WOKC. Against this background, the Government considered that there was no conflict of interest given the following reasons -

(a) the site of WOKC was proposed by the Government Property Agency (GPA) in accordance with the relevant regulations;

(b) the decision of relocating to WOKC was made solely out of operational need and the HO was not aware of **Mr Karl KWOK's** employment with the Landlord of WOKC when making the decision; and

(c) the negotiation of the leasing terms and conditions was handled by the GPA, and the HO was not involved in both the negotiation process and acceptance of the final terms and conditions.

- 5.4 Members raised no further comment on the matter.

- 5.5 There being no other business, the meeting ended at 5:15pm.

**Secretariat  
Harbourfront Commission  
January 2021**