

**Second Briefing of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee
held at 2:30 pm on 6 April 2005
at Conference Room, 15/F, North Point Government Offices,
333 Java Road, Hong Kong**

Minutes of Briefing

Present

Professor Lee Chack-fan	Chairman
Mr Paul Zimmerman	Representing Business Environment Council ("BEC")
Mr Leung Kong-yui	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Dr Kwok Ngai-kuen, Alvin	Representing Conservancy Association
Mrs Mei Ng	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Vincent Ng	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Roger Tang	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Mr Kim O Chan	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Mr Mason Hung	Representing Hong Kong Tourism Board
Ir Dr Wong Chak-yan, Greg	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Louis H B Loong	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Hardy Lok	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour Limited ("SPH")
Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke	
Mr Chan Yiu-fai, Steve	
Mr Kwok Chun-wah, Jimmy	
Mr Lau Hing-tat, Patrick	
Mr Thomas Chow	Deputy Secretary (Transport)1, Environment, Transport and Works Bureau
Mr Bosco Fung	Director of Planning
Mr Tsao Tak-kiang	Director of Civil Engineering and Development
Mr Lau Ka-keung	Deputy Commissioner for Transport/Planning and Technical Services
Miss Christine Chow	Secretary
 <u>In Attendance</u>	
Mr Thomas Tso	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau
Mr L T Ma	Project Manager/Hong Kong Island and Islands, Civil Engineering and Development Department ("CEDD")

Mr Lam Sing-kwok
Mr Talis Wong
Mr Anthony Kwan

Chief Engineer/Hong Kong(2), CEDD
Chief Engineer/Kowloon, CEDD
Assistant Director/Metro and Urban Renewal,
Planning Department (“PlanD”)
Chief Town Planner/Sub-Regional Planning,
PlanD

Mr Raymond Wong

For item 1

Mr Ian Brownlee
Miss Jessica Lam
Mr David Choi

Representing Masterplan Limited
Representing Masterplan Limited
Representing Concord Land Development
Company Limited

For item 2

Mr David Lee
Miss Annie Chan
Mr Thomas Tang

Representing David C Lee Surveyors Limited
Representing David C Lee Surveyors Limited
Representing Maunsell Consultants Asia
Limited (“MCLA”)

Mr Kelvin Cheng
Mr Kelvin Leung
Mr Peter Lee
Mr Tong Cheng

Representing MCLA
Representing MVA
Representing CH2M IDC HK Limited
Representing CH2M IDC HK Limited

For item 3

Mr Lau Hing-tat, Patrick

Representing Eastern District Council (“Eastern
DC”)

Mr Hui Ka-hoo
Mr Chiu Chi-keung
Professor Bernard Lim

Representing Eastern DC
Representing Eastern DC
Representing Centre for Architectural Research
for Education, Elderly, Environment and
Excellence Limited (“CARE”)

For item 4

Mr Winston Chu
Mr Carl Chu
Mr Albert Lai

Representing SPH
Representing SPH
Representing Citizen Envisioning @ Harbour
 (“CE@H”)

Mr Paul Zimmerman

Representing BEC

Welcoming Message

Action

(a) **The Chairman** welcomed Members and proponents to the second briefing of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (“HEC”). He reiterated that the purpose of the briefings was for HEC Members to be briefed on harbour-front projects and there was no need for the HEC to form a consensus view on the presentations. The proceedings and deliberations of the briefings would be recorded and uploaded to the HEC website. The confirmed minutes would be passed to all Members and the relevant sections of the minutes would be extracted to the proponents for reference.

(b) **The Chairman** informed Members that Mr Chan tak-chor had resigned from the HEC. The Government was considering a replacement.

[Post-meeting note: Mr Chan Chit-kwai, Stephen has been appointed as Member of the HEC with effect from 7 April 2005 to 30 April 2006.]

Item 1: Presentation by Masterplan Limited on Old Hong Kong at Quarry Bay

1.1 Upon invitation by the Chairman, **Mr Ian Brownlee** of Masterplan Limited presented the proposal on Old Hong Kong. In making the presentation, **Mr Brownlee** indicated that the project was to be considered by the Town Planning Board (“TPB”) on 20 May 2005, and it was not intended to duplicate the process of the TPB and present the actual proposal to the HEC. Rather the intention was to present several issues that the HEC expressed concern and might find useful.

1.2 In response to an enquiry from Mr Paul Zimmerman on the status and importance of the park at the middle of the entry to the Eastern Harbour Crossing Tunnel, **Mr Brownlee** replied that the park was part of the later phase of the Quarry Bay Park which at the moment was under temporary use by the Government. The footbridge across the Island Eastern Corridor (“IEC”) would complete the walkway system around the waterfront. Creating a continuous access to the waterfront was important.

1.3 **Mr Zimmerman** was of the view that the HEC could

ask the Government to respond in due course with respect to the proposal as it was a better plan than the existing temporary use.

1.4 **Mr Roger Tang** asked if the applicant had objected to the zoning of the Outline Zoning Plan (“OZP”) before submitting a section 16 application. **Mr Brownlee** responded that the applicant had submitted an application which basically conformed to the planning intention and most of the development parameters specified in the OZP. The applicant would make representation to the TPB in May 2005 at the review of the planning application. The remaining issue that needed to be tackled seemed to be the temporary use of the site.

1.5 In response to Mr Nicholas Brooke’s query that the project would require granting of a large proportion of government land, **Mr Brownlee** said the applicant was aware of the land administration issue involved in the proposed development, and would take steps to resolve this should the TPB approve their application. **Mr Brooke** went on to ask about the accessibility to the waterfront. **Mr Brownlee** replied that besides the proposed footbridge, people could access the site from the Quarry Bay Park to its east.

1.6 In response to the enquiry by Mr Vincent Ng, **Mr Bosco Fung** briefed Members about the concerns and decision of the TPB in its previous consideration of the proposal and said that the proponent would attend the TPB meeting on 20 May 2005 to further elaborate his case to the TPB. **Mr Ng** then expressed his concern on the development density of the proposal at such a prominent waterfront location. He also had reservation about the many replica “old” buildings in the proposal, pointing out that they did not really serve any heritage value.

1.7 **Mr Zimmerman** considered that a pedestrian deck was more desirable than a footbridge for linking the waterfront with the Quarry Bay Park. He also opined that there should be a pier and some other leisure facilities rather than just to provide an access to the waterfront. **Mr Brownlee** replied that if the TPB approved the proposal, the lease could be modified and a public pier could be built by the applicant but the implementation of the pier was not part of the current proposal as it involved another set of issues.

1.8 In response to the suggestion of Mr Zimmerman to make the TPB aware of the feedback from the HEC on the proposal raised at this briefing, **the Chairman** said that the minutes would be uploaded onto the HEC website and some HEC Members, who were also Members of the TPB, would be able to relate the views expressed at this briefing to the TPB.

1.9 **Mrs Mei Ng** was disappointed at the ratios of green space, sky space and leisure space put forward by the proponent. For greater public enjoyment and better access, the proponent should put up more ideas for improving the ratios of the three spaces. She went on to comment that amenities and community leisure space could co-exist through creative planning and design. She urged the proponent to seek a balance between providing a linear strip of land and attaining a comfortable leisure space. In addition, she suggested to locate within the area an old junk which could be used as a maritime museum. She opined that more innovative planning and design should be adopted.

1.10 **Mr Brownlee** responded that the TPB was of the view that a variety of facilities along the waterfront was more important than purely green space for this strip of waterfront. He noted and thanked Members for their views.

1.11 **The Chairman** thanked Mr Brownlee for his presentation.

Item 2: Presentation by David C Lee Surveyors Limited on Yau Tong Bay Re-development

2.1 Upon invitation by the Chairman, **Mr David Lee** of David C Lee Surveyors Limited presented the proposal to re-develop Yau Tong Bay (“YTB”) to improve the local and surrounding environment.

2.2 **Dr Greg Wong** asked how the proposed reclamation for the Sunshine Island would be compatible with the requirement of the overriding public need test. The proposed island recalled the “island park” of the Causeway Bay Reclamation. **Mr Lee** replied that the Sunshine Island would be surrounded by fresh water of about 2 metre deep. An artificial island with a wide range of leisure facilities and a better design would be welcome

by the public than just a park as it could bring a better feel to the harbour.

2.3 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** was concerned about the responsibility of the clean-up cost for the removal of sediments in YTB. He asked whether the pollution would be aggravated if industrial activity would be allowed to continue at the site. He also commented that in terms of harbour-front enhancement, any plan to reclaim the sea would be against the objectives of the HEC. Furthermore, he opined that YTB required low-rise housing, entertainment facilities and a promenade instead of high density residential development.

2.4 **Mr Vincent Ng** appreciated the provision of the model to allow HEC members to feel the proposal. He supported the applicant to remove the environmental nuisance by the industrial activities. However, he queried that a large scale property development over reclamation would be the only way to remove incompatible land uses. Although the HEC would see it as a way to solve pollution, the public might see it differently and see it as reclamation for another large property development. He asked how the proponent could help HEC to solve the conflict when seen by the public.

2.5 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** said that it would be challenging and difficult to draw up a development plan which could satisfy the aspirations of the owners, the local community and the HEC. He gave credit to the applicant as they tried to respond to the new way of things in terms of reclamation, planning and operation of harbour-front. He asked if it would be possible to maintain the existing shoreline but set back development at the rear of the site so as to generate funds for the development of a vibrant waterfront. He queried the island would be served locally and residents would see the island as their local facilities.

2.6 **Dr Alvin Kwok** asked if reclamation was the only solution to the pollution problem or there could be other viable alternatives. He queried reclamation could solve everything, such as seabed contamination, land contamination, noise, air and interface problems. He suggested the “Pollutant Paid Principle”. He added that large scale reclamation would run contrary to the principles and objectives of the HEC.

2.7 **Mr Jimmy Kwok** said that the most important consideration was public interest, i.e. whether the public could benefit from the proposed re-development and there were measures to enable the public to get free access to it. HEC should adopt an open mind for consideration. If there was a time-limit for proposed development, there would be two supportive justifications, namely an integrated economic benefit for Hong Kong and an environmental harmony for the area. He considered it undesirable for the public to pay a high cost for using the facilities from the re-development.

2.8 **Mr Lee** gave a consolidated response to the comments made by Members. He said that the present pollution problem was a result of the past when people were less conscious of the effects of pollution. There was then no regulation requiring the owners to tackle pollution. In view of this, Mr Lee and his client were proposing a re-development plan that would solve the pollution problem in entirety. If there was no re-development, the owners would continue to use the land in accordance with the uses permitted under the lease, i.e. ship building, saw mills, etc. Residents in the area would then have to bear with such nuisance even though it was within the limit of the law. Mr Lee and his client conducted extensive studies and Environmental Impact Assessment, the latter of which was approved by the Environmental Protection Department. According to their studies, reclamation was the best method to tackle the contamination permanently. With the legal advice they had obtained, they were satisfied that their proposal could comply with the Court of Final Appeal (“CFA”) judgment. The public would be allowed to access the Sunshine Island and Boulevard free of charge. Their proposal included certain commercial uses which could continuously finance the maintenance of the public spaces. He noted that the local community would welcome entertainment facilities, a promenade, an island and retail places even by reclamation. Overall, the proposal could create a territory-wide attraction and the local community would be happy to have one in YTB that they could be proud of.

2.9 **The Chairman** thanked Mr Lee for the presentation and the initiative of bringing along the model for Members’ perusal.

Item 3: Presentation by the Eastern District Council on

Waterfront Development in Eastern District

3.1 Upon invitation by the Chairman, **Mr Patrick Lau** of the Eastern DC and **Professor Bernard Lim** of CARE presented the overall waterfront development ideas for the Eastern District and the waterfront development concepts of individual areas therein as per the recommendations of the ‘Community Workshops for Waterfront Development in Eastern District’ (“workshop”) held on 3 December 2004 and 5 January 2005.

3.2 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** said that the workshop was very encouraging and he saw the partnership evolving between the HEC and the Eastern DC. The list of suggestions was helpful in identifying priority enhancements for the Eastern District waterfront. He enquired whether the Eastern DC had attempted to prioritize the suggestions and had any views on the Old Hong Kong proposal presented under item 1.

3.3 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the models presented during the workshop gave good impression to those who had attended the workshop. He said that the Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (“SHPL”) had replied to him that his view on submerging the IEC would be taken into account as a long-term objective in the enhancement strategy for the harbour-front. He enquired whether the Eastern DC’s study had taken into account the possibility of submerging the IEC. With respect to Mr Zimmerman’s remarks on SHPL’s reply on the IEC, **Mr Thomas Tso** clarified that neither Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works nor SHPL had committed to submerging the IEC.

3.4 **Mr Zimmerman** continued to say that the HEC was an advisory body with no statutory power and asked whether the Eastern DC had any implementation plans to take forward their suggestions on the Oil Street Depot, North Point Estate and Causeway Bay which were different from the current OZPs.

3.5 **Mr Roger Tang** asked if the Eastern DC had their own funds to implement some of the priority projects in partnership with the HEC and the various government departments concerned. **Dr Alvin Kwok** appreciated the workshop conducted by the Eastern DC and enquired whether there were comments from the residents of the Eastern District on the

proposed Central – Wan Chai Bypass (“CWB”), and the difficulties and achievements of the workshop to share with the HEC.

3.6 **Mr Jimmy Kwok** appreciated the initiative of the Eastern DC to conduct the workshop which had stimulated the public to express their wish of a continuous promenade and the accessibility between the waterfront and hinterland along the Eastern District waterfront. He enquired about the implementation plan, the funding required for implementing the plan and the details of further public involvement in implementation. **Mr Kim Chan** remarked that planning was a “living” process and should not be limited by the current OZPs and suggested that the views of the residents of the Eastern District be proactively reflected to the Government.

3.7 **Mr Vincent Ng** said that he had participated in the workshop in the capacity of a member of the HEC and that the workshop was very interactive. He felt that similar workshops should be encouraged. He said that other districts were also concerned with the planning and development of their waterfronts and that the concerns were similar to those raised by the HEC. He appreciated that with very little funding, the Eastern DC had stimulated the thoughts and discussion of the residents of the Eastern District, which were helpful to the Government in planning and developing the future of the area. He suggested that the public participation in planning and developing the Eastern District, Wan Chai, the Western District, Kai Tak and the West Kowloon Cultural District could be enhanced and that the HEC could discuss this in future.

3.8 **Mrs Mei Ng** said that the following should be further considered -

(a) How the planning and development of the waterfront of the Eastern District should be coordinated with that of the adjoining districts;

(b) The planning and development of infrastructure such as refuse transfer centres should be considered in an overall manner and the Government should present an integrated plan to the HEC;

(c) The general and related uses of the embankment at

Causeway Bay;

(d) The balance between active and passive facilities along the eastern waterfront; and

(e) Long-term support for sustainable planning of districts should be financed from land sale proceeds and the Sustainable Development Fund.

3.9 **Mr Patrick Lau** explained that one of their main concerns was the implementation of the recommendations of the workshop, and that in order to encourage public participation and involvement in the workshop, they would implement some of the major and feasible recommendations with funds from the Eastern DC. Since the Eastern DC was also advisory in nature and the issue was new to them, they would further consider the actual implementation plan within their limited budget. As regards the Old Hong Kong proposal, the Eastern DC had considered and discussed it many times and they hoped to have low density, less commercial developments for the waterfront of the Eastern District. In respect of the IEC, he said that the Eastern DC had not yet come to a consensus and they would need to further study it and that there would be a need for the Government to provide technical information and advice on the proposal. On partnership with the HEC, he considered that with the limited resources, the Eastern DC could arrange seminars and workshops to come up with recommendations for consideration by the HEC. They could try to ask for more support from the Government to take forward the selected projects. Regarding the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter, he reported that in the second workshop on 5 January 2005, there were representatives actively taking part and advising on how to solve the pollution problems. He believed that the coming meeting between the Task Force on "Harbour-front Enhancement Review ("HER") - Wan Chai and Adjoining Areas" and the Eastern DC on the HER public engagement kit would enable the HEC to better understand the concern of the fishermen living in the shelter.

3.10 **Professor Lim** said that as a co-organizer of the workshop, he observed that the Eastern DC had good connections with the local residents and concerned groups who could genuinely reflect their concern about the development of their district. He advised that the HEC should actively collaborate

with the various District Councils (“DCs”) in future public participation activities. As a member of the TPB, he took the opportunity to suggest to the TPB and other government bureaux and departments concerned to participate in the various similar workshops and engage the various DCs at an earlier stage of the planning process.

3.11 **Messrs Lau and Chiu Chi-keung** supplemented on the following observations -

(a) The Eastern DC had further discussed the development concepts for the former heliport at Siu Sai Wan, and passed a motion that PlanD and Hong Kong Police Force should consider relocating the Sai Wan Ho Marine Police Headquarters to facilitate construction of a continuous promenade at the Eastern District waterfront;

(b) In response to how to strike the balance between active and passive facilities along the waterfront, they understood that local residents would like more passive ones such as a fishing zone and that the amount of funds required for such a zone from the Government was small;

(c) On locating facilities like refuse transfer centres which would cause nuisance to the vicinity, the public could participate in discussion and advise on reasonable locations given some basic and factual information on the constraints. On the design of the refuse transfer centres and refuse collection vehicles, the local residents suggested that they be covered in order to alleviate the extent of nuisance and enhance their acceptance by the residents; and

(d) Through the workshop, the Eastern DC had successfully coordinated the wishes of the local people on the waterfront and relayed them to the Government. They hoped that the Government would take into account the public views gathered from the workshop when planning and developing the waterfront.

3.12 **The Chairman** appreciated the efforts by the Eastern DC in arranging the workshop. He looked forward to fostering the partnership between the HEC and the Eastern DC, and thanked Messrs Lau, Hui and Chiu as well as Professor Lim for their presentation.

Item 4: Presentation by Society for Protection of the Harbour Limited, Citizen Envisioning @ Harbour and Business Environment Council on “Overriding Public Need Test”

4.1 Upon invitation by the Chairman, **Messrs Winston Chu, Albert Lai and Paul Zimmerman** of SPH, CE@H and BEC respectively gave their presentations on “Overriding Public Need Test” correspondingly.

4.2 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** said that both the HEC and the SPH shared many values about the harbour and held the same passion for improving the harbour. He remarked that the HEC was well aware of its responsibilities in terms of the law and that the SPH had rightly identified room for improving the process of preparation of the first public engagement kit on HER. The Sub-committee on Wan Chai Development Phase II Review recognized the issues and was working to replace the kit with a new one with the various alternatives including those the SPH asked for. He considered the SPH’s view of “could not touch the harbour” a very passive or negative stance and that the HEC should be more positive and open-minded in advising the Government on how to solve the problems of the harbour, including pollution.

4.3 **Mr Winston Chu** regretted very much that he had spent more than 11 years to battle against the Government on protection of the harbour and said that by common sense and good town planning, the harbour could be protected and that there was no need for the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance. When drafting the Ordinance, he had found no such ordinances in other places of the world specifically for protecting natural harbours. Harbours in other cities of the world were protected by common sense and good town planning but not laws. He said that he had never suggested no reclamation when drafting the Ordinance and that Hong Kong needed to balance carefully every aspect of town planning development, since it had lost large area of the harbour after reclamation at Green Island, Central and Quarry Bay. He claimed that he heard visitors commenting Hong Kong people as short-sighted and greedy in reclaiming land from the harbour which was actually destroying Hong Kong’s future. He

remarked that there were two ways to regard the law, either to uphold it or to try to get around it, and that if the Government tried the first way he would disappear and never appear again; but if the Government tried the second way, he would meet the latter at the Court again. Regarding the line between preserving and taking positive action to improve the harbour, he said that we could not improve the harbour which was a natural asset. We could only improve the harbour-front and that we should not reclaim the harbour unless we had to and in doing so, we needed to face our future generations.

4.4 **Dr Alvin Kwok** said that the HEC could protect the harbour and actively improve it for public enjoyment and suggested to apply the CE@H's ideas in the coming years to a specific harbour-front review programme in order to reach a consensus. **Mr Roger Tang** said that the Kai Tak Review somehow had applied the CE@H's model of public engagement.

4.5 **Mr Patrick Lau** remarked that we could heal trees, otherwise they would die. Similarly, we should try to heal the harbour before it died and reclamation was the last resort among other alternatives. **Mrs Mei Ng** was of the view that the HEC should on one hand help forestall further unreasonable and un-coordinated harbour development, and on the other hand recover it. She further suggested the Government to consider swapping the land uses along the harbour-front and relocating those that would generate nuisance to other places as far as possible.

4.6 **Mr Chu** said that according to the CFA judgement, the primary duty of the HEC was to protect and preserve the harbour. He added that the extent of reclamation that had already taken place rendered what remained of the harbour even more precious, and it made the need to protect and preserve what remained of the harbour all the more important and compelling. He remarked that the burden to rebut the presumption was a heavy one and that the need must go far beyond something which was "nice to have, desirable, preferable or beneficial". He considered that the responsibility of the HEC was to fully comply with the law, i.e. to protect the harbour and that if the Government was to reclaim land from the sea, the HEC must request it to carry out its heavy burden to rebut the presumption. He continued to say that the HEC must urge the Government to abide by the law and not to

reclaim and that only when the Government had convinced the HEC on the need for reclamation, could reclamation be attained. He expressed that any unclear interpretation of the CFA judgement by the HEC would result in litigation. He said that the SPH objected to beautifying the harbour-front by reclamation and that as the Government's advisor, it should ensure that the Government must fully comply with the law when planning and developing Hong Kong. He said that all citizens and the future generations relied on the HEC to protect and preserve the harbour.

4.7 **Mr Steve Chan** said that the HEC should be provided with detailed information to facilitate their thorough discussion on issues relating to the harbour-front. In view of the possibility of litigation against the HEC's work and recommendations, he suggested further advice be sought and shared within the HEC.

4.8 **Mr Albert Lai** said that the CFA judgement mentioned that the Court was not a planner and therefore should not assume the role of planning. He added that the overriding public need test could be left to the public to decide. Based on this, the CE@H suggested a mechanism of open endorsement under which there was a three-stage test to meet the overriding public need test as follows -

(a) Stage 1: Information sharing and professional inputs – with professional input, the public was provided with all feasible proposals;

(b) Stage 2: Community deliberative process – given the feasible proposals under Stage 1, the community reached a consensus plan of reclamation (“CPR”); and

(c) Stage 3: Open endorsement – in the form of town hall meetings at which all members of the Legislative Council, TPB, DCs and stakeholder groups to endorse the CPR, which would be termed as an endorsed plan of reclamation (“EPR”) after endorsement.

4.9 **Mr Lai** continued to say that the Government, represented by the public officers, would then make the final decision to take the EPR forward for implementation in its complete, unaltered form, or not to take it forward at all. He

remarked that if the Government chose not to take the EPR, it would have to face the resulting political pressure. The process was stringent and would be activated only under exceptional circumstances. **Mr Roger Tang** was interested in the role of the TPB under the CE@H's model and said that there seemed to be overlapping and contradictions under this model. **Mr Vincent Ng** said that after participating in the HEC for nearly a year and hearing the three presentations, he considered that the HEC should work out a mechanism to meet the overriding public need test for reclamation, with reference to the CE@H's suggestions. **Mr Brooke** opined that any future reclamation would be exception rather than rules and considered that the CE@H's model was complicated and that the HEC might be the more appropriate forum for building a consensus to meet the overriding public need test.

4.10 In connection with the stringent process under the CE@H's model, **Mr Chu** said that the most important nature of the HEC was independence and all the public consultation programmes must be genuine.

4.11 **Mr Zimmerman** said that the HEC was not entirely independent as the Government managed the secretariat and was responsible for all the execution. The HEC was an advisory body and could make mistakes, however, he was confident that in the future there would be recognition of the efforts made by the HEC Members. On the causes for reclamation, he categorized them as follows –

(a) For harbour-front enhancement and marine uses there was much repair required of legacy problems, and some of these might require some reclamation. Also in the future we needed to be able to respond to evolving harbour and marine uses - and these might require reclamation specifically because piling for piers was considered reclamation;

(b) For transport infrastructure and other uses incompatible with harbour-front enhancement (such as the CWB and heliport), legacy decisions needed to be reviewed for reasonable alternatives. Clear policy initiatives were required to avoid generating new demands for harbour-front land for such uses; and

(c) Harbour-front land for development by the private sector or

the Government for its own uses needed to be reviewed, rezoned and where possible re-provisioned to enable harbour-front enhancement by reducing the density and intensity of development. Clearly, reclamation for the formation of land (such as YTB) was unacceptable.

4.12 **The Chairman** thanked the three presenters for their presentations, personal views and advice.

Item 5: Any other business

5.1 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** requested the minutes of this briefing be forwarded to the TPB.

5.2 **The Secretary** said that the minutes would be uploaded to the HEC website. Unlike the regular meetings, the briefings were informal and the minutes need not undergo confirmation by Members at the next briefing, which was an understanding agreed by the HEC. As regards the proposed submission of the minutes to the TPB, she said that the TPB had to perform its statutory role and follow its own statutory procedures and deadlines and it was agreed previously that there should be no formal linkage between the HEC and the TPB. **The Chairman** concluded that the arrangements for the minutes of the formal HEC meetings and those of the informal HEC briefings could be different, in view of the different purposes and objectives of the meetings and briefings. On the proposed change to the rules on the relationship between the HEC and the TPB, he suggested and **Mr Vincent Ng** agreed to defer the discussion to the next HEC meeting.

**HEC
Secretariat**

[Post-meeting note: On 7 April 2005, Mr Zimmerman wrote to the TPB, copied to the HEC, to share his views on YTB and Quarry Bay with the TPB. A copy of the letter is attached for reference.]

5.3 There being no other business, the briefing was adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

**Harbour-front Enhancement Committee
July 2005**

THE EXPERIENCE GROUP

Hong Kong, April 7, 2005

Chair and Members of the Town Planning Board
c/o Town Planning Board Secretariat
15/F, North Point Government Offices
333 Java Road, North Point

Dear Sirs,

On April 6 2005, I attended a hearing by the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee as the alternate member representing the Business Environment Council. The following projects were discussed and I like to share my impressions with you.

Re: Yau Tong Bay

Reclamation is no longer an option and the Environmental Protection Department must be urged to start to address the seabed pollution in the area. The development proposed by the proponent has highlighted that the zoning for the area (with and without reclamation) should be reviewed to bring these in line with the latest insight into harbour-front enhancement and the harbour planning principles.

Re: Quarry Bay

The 'Old Hong Kong' proponent has highlighted an urgent issue we face around the harbour, namely the temporary use of harbour-front land for incompatible uses including car parking, construction material and waste storage, and so forth, primarily by various Government departments.

Further, the 'Old Hong Kong' plan reminds us of the Government's harbour plan, including the 'Quarry Bay Park Extension Action Area Plan' and the need to ensure this vision is implemented. However, we will need to add water/land interfaces such as piers and other facilities which will allow residents and visitors to get on and off the water, moor and store boating equipment, etc to ensure a 'living harbour'.

Yours sincerely,



Paul Zimmerman
Principal, The Experience Group Limited
Convenor, Designing Hong Kong Harbour District

cc: Chair & Members of Harbour Enhancement Committee

The Experience Group, Limited

24th Floor, Caroline Centre
28 Yun Ping Road
Causeway Bay

Tel: (852) 2878 7272
Fax: (852) 2180 9200