

Summary of Public comments on Draft Harbour Planning Guidelines and Responses

Item No.	Comments	Organization	Responses
	General		
1	The HPGs should be applied to Government plans and developments as to private projects.	The Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong (12.2.2007)	As stated in the ‘Introduction’, the HPGs are to provide guidelines to both the private and public sectors to facilitate sustainable planning, preservation, development and management of the Victoria Harbour and its harbour-front areas.
2	It is considered imperative that the HPGs should not be allow to erode private property rights which are being protected by Article 105 of the Basic Law.	The Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong (12.2.2007)	The HPGs are advisory in nature and do not override statutes.
3	The draft Harbour Planning Guidelines (HPGs) are acceptable in general. Nonetheless, ferry piers should be provided at suitable locations along the harbour front so as to make it more accessible by the public without aggravating traffic congestion on land and pollution problems arising from it.	New World First Ferry Services Ltd. (26.2.2007)	Similar provision has already been included under ‘Physical Linkage’. Explicit example on provision of ferry pier is added in para. (c) under “Physical Linkage”.
4	No comments provided that emergency vehicular access (EVA) shall be provided for each and every building/structure situated at the Harbour front Areas in accordance with Part IV of the Code of Practice for Means of Access for firefighting and rescue administered by the Building Department.	Fire Services Department (23.2.2007)	Similar to other developments, waterfront developments are required to comply with Government regulations and requirements.

5	Could the HPGs be incorporated into the HKPSG and if overriding public need would be defined so that marine-based activities might be considered.	HEC Meeting on 25.1.2007	<p>Similar suggestions to incorporate HPGs into the HKPSG have been raised by the HEC, TPB and other organizations. This suggestion will be put forward to the Government for consideration.</p> <p>Overriding public need has been elaborated in the Guidelines to accord with the judgment of the Court of Final Appeal.</p>
6	Support the HPGs in general and suggested that the HPGs should be included in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines as well as the Town Planning Board.	The Conservancy Association (20.4.2007)	See response to Item No.5 above.
7	The Government should consider integrating the HPGs into the sustainable development policy-making modeling and that at various public consultations, efforts should be made to help the public understand the spirit of HPGs.	HEC Meeting on 25.1.2007	See response to Item No.5 above.
8	Consideration could be given to making the Guidelines mandatory.	Strategy Sub-committee of Council for Sustainable Development Meeting on 3.4.2007	See response to Item No.5 above.

9	<p>Difficulties would be created in the implementation stage as HEC has no enforcement power. For example, the Guidelines has suggested that “wall building” along the waterfront should be avoided. It is also indicated that a gradation of height profile with building heights descending towards the Harbour is encouraged. However, without compulsion on one will follow these guidelines as no one is willing to give up the chance of erecting valuable properties along the harbour-front. It is very hard, if not impossible, to ask project proponent to follow the Guidelines if the Guidelines does not have statutory power. The Group, therefore suggested that the Guidelines should at least be incorporated into the Hong Kong Planning Standard and Guidelines; better still if, where necessary, particular guidelines are incorporated into statutory town plans. Whether a proposal complies with the Guidelines will be for the Town Planning Board to decide on.</p>	<p>Long-Term Development Policy Group of Hong Kong Policy Research Institute (HKPRI) (20.4.2007)</p>	<p>See response to Item No.5 above.</p>
10	<p>The draft HPGs seems to imply that environmental considerations should take precedence over the need for economic development, a proper balance should be struck.</p>	<p>Town Planning Board Meeting on 16.3.2007</p>	<p>The Guidelines aim to strike a balance on economic, social and environmental aspects and promote sustainable developments.</p> <p>A set of sustainable principles and indicators will be added to Annex IV of the Guidelines for reference purpose.</p>
11	<p>A set of sustainable principles and indicators similar to that developed in the HER project could serve as a useful checklist to be attached to the HPGs for reference.</p>	<p>HEC Meeting on 25.1.2007</p>	<p>A set of sustainable principles and indicators will be added to Annex IV of the Guidelines for reference purpose.</p>

12	Both physical and social linkages should be emphasized in the Guidelines. It is very common in town planning to consider the compatibility of the proposed projects with its surrounding areas. It should not be excluded from harbour-front planning guidelines. Social linkage is important in harbour-front planning. It would be a loss if a beautiful harbour-front promenade were undesirably affected by incompatible land use so much so that no one is able to enjoy the harbour view even when physical linkages are provided.	Long-Term Development Policy Group of Hong Kong Policy Research Institute (HKPRI) (20.4.2007)	Para. (b) under “Land Use Planning” amended to incorporate suggestions.
13	The HPGs should emphasize the importance of integrated harbour planning and the use of place-making strategy in public engagement.	HEC Meeting on 25.1.2007	Para. (b) under “Public Engagement” amended to incorporate suggestion.
14	(a) Marine use should be looked at in addition to land use. (b) While there were suggestions to deal with vacant land under “Open Space” and “temporary Land Uses”, the issue of incompatible land uses was not addressed.	HEC Meeting on 25.1.2007	(a) Provisions on marine use have been included in paras. (a) and (b) under “Land Use Planning”. (b) Para. (b) under “Land Use Planning” amended to incorporate suggestions.
15	(a) Please consider identifying some key sites for enhancement so as to achieve quick results. (b) For harbour-fronts which are prominently industrial or far away from key areas or with no harbour enhancement proposal, it is more appropriate to adopt a more relaxed control for temporary uses.	Lands Department/ Estate Management Section (7.5.2007)	(a) From time to time, the HEC has identified or give advice on enhancement opportunities. (b) The general intention is to promote harbour-front enhancement. While individual circumstances may warrant special consideration, measures to positively enhance the area for public enjoyment should be encouraged as priority.

16	Specific comments on the wordings of HPGs were suggested.	Mr. Nicholas Brooke, HEC Member, Margaret Brooke Best Practice Committee of HBF (9.3.2007)	Guidelines amended as appropriate to incorporate suggestions.
17	The wording should be reviewed. The use of “should” to replace “could” so as to make the Guidelines more positive.	HEC Meeting on 25.1.2007	Guidelines amended as appropriate to incorporate suggestions.
18	Language could be stronger throughout the Guidelines. The “could’s” ought to be replaced with “should’s”.	Harbour Business Forum (26.4.2007)	Guidelines amended as appropriate to incorporate suggestions.
19	More quality typical illustrations and sections to present the possible or recommended harbourfront design treatments should be provided.	Mr. Ng Siu-man (29.3.2007)	Agreed and incorporated.
20	The principles as embodied in the draft HPGs were generally acceptable to the Town Planning Board (TPB). The TPB has all along attached great importance to the planning and development of the harbour-front areas and was ready to work closely with the HEC to achieve a synergetic effect with the same objective of protecting the Victoria harbour. The TPB was poised to discharge its statutory functions properly in this regard.	Town Planning Board Meeting on 16.3.2007	Noted.
21	It was important to ensure that HPGs would give Hong Kong a special flavor setting out its own uniqueness and distinctiveness which would different from the harbours of other cities.	Town Planning Board Meeting on 16.3.2007	Noted.

22	Quoting the example of the water-front in Kwun Tong and Yau Tong, the design of the public open space and road layout there were unattractive or even discouraged the public from accessing the water-front and were not in line with the draft HPGs. It was important to rectify these mistakes in the future planning for harbour-front areas.	Town Planning Board Meeting on 16.3.2007	Noted.
23	The Hong Kong Housing Authority (HA) supports in-principle the proposed HPGs which is generally in line with HA's objectives and current practice, particularly in terms of public engagement, land use planning, urban design, landscaping and sustainable development. HA, as a responsible public body, has already taken and will continue to take into account these guidelines during the development/redevelopment process.	Hong Kong Housing Authority (19.4.2007)	Noted.
24	No comment as there was not much coverage on planning of roadwork infrastructure with development of harbour-front.	Western Harbour Tunnel (18.4.2007)	Noted.
Introduction			
25	More information needed on HEC. Missing from the introduction are key element of the work of the HEC, namely the Integrated Harbour Planning Framework, "Temporary Land Use and Quick-win Enhancement Strategies", CHarM, and various submissions to hearings, including the interpretations of issues pertaining to the Protection of Harbour Ordinance, as well as work by others on the harbour related issues, such as the report by CE@H in 2003, Designing Hong Kong Harbour District Report in 2004, the various submissions and publications by the Harbour Business Forum.	Harbour Business Forum (26.4.2007)	Information on the work of HEC can be found at its website. It is considered not necessary to include them in the Guidelines, the purpose of which is to elaborate the intentions and requirements of the Harbour Planning Principles (HPPs).

26	More information is needed on the funding of harbour-front Enhancement and Institutional Arrangements for Harbour-front enhancement. As well as the relationship between HEC and Town Planning Board, or at least a clear definition of the role and function of the HEC.	Harbour Business Forum (26.4.2007)	The role and function of the HEC have been set out in the Guidelines. Inclusion of information on funding and institutional arrangements for harbour enhancement as suggested will distract the focus of the Guidelines.
27	Need to describe how these Guidelines will have an effect under the Town Planning Ordinance, the Road Ordinance and Rail Ordinance.	Harbour Business Forum (26.4.2007)	It has been made clear in the Guidelines that the document is advisory in nature. As such, it will not devolve the power and responsibilities of other authorities established by statutes.
28	Rather than explaining in the appendix which HPP is impacted against each guideline, the 'body' of the guidelines should refer to each aspect of the HPP more often and succinctly.	Harbour Business Forum (26.4.2007)	Yes, the Guidelines have referred to different aspects of HPP e.g. public engagement, accessible harbour-front, public enjoyment and etc.
29	Para 1.2 stated that the Guidelines "elaborate..... on the HPP", this should also include that the guidelines are "to elaborate on the work of the HEC and the aspiration expressed by the community".	Harbour Business Forum (26.4.2007)	Information on the work of HEC can be found at its website. It is considered not necessary to include them in the Guidelines, the purpose of which is to elaborate the intentions and requirements of the Harbour Planning Principles (HPPs).
Land Formation			
30	(a) Please review the application of "overriding public need" in the Court of Final Appeal (CFA) judgment for reclamation associated with waterfront enhancement which is not excessive. The adoption of this principle will likely disable many harbourfront enhancement opportunities for the benefit of the public and our future generations. (b) In the pre-1997 situation, reclamation was too frequent and the scale was large. Many reclaimed sites were formed for private	Mr. Ng Siu-man (29.3.2007)	According to the judgment of the Court of Final Appeal (CFA) on the interpretation of the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (PHO), the "presumption against reclamation in the harbour" can only be rebutted by establishing an overriding public need for reclamation. The intention is not to impose an absolute bar against any reclamation. However, any reclamation, even for the provision

	<p>commercial purpose in the expense of our harbour resource. This was not acceptable from environmental and social points of view. However, after the judgment in Town Planning Board v Society for the Protection of the Harbour Limited 2004, the situation changes to another extreme to “zero reclamation” approach in order to avoid legal disputes as it may be difficult to justify an “overriding need” for reclamation. The existing promenade is fragmented occupying a small proportion of the waterfront area. The waterfront setting in many areas are poor with non-sensitive uses. The adoption of this extreme will make reclamation virtually impossible for harbourfront enhancement even though it is not excessive and without alternative. This is detrimental to the harbour and us.</p> <p>(c) For example, in the waterfront around Causeway Bay Typhoon, some parts of the space are only about 1.5m wide which are less than a normal footpath in the urban area. Truck roads and flyovers are directly adjacent to this narrow space without buffer planting. Such waterfront setting is poor and it cannot meet vision as “an attractive, vibrant, accessible and sustainable world-class asset”. The typhoon shelter is near to our popular Causeway Bay shopping paradise and it had boat dining activity as a tourist attraction in the past. It has a high potential to be revitalized and changed into a popular quality waterfront to facilitate the appreciation of the harbour by the public if some reclaimed space can be formed to provide adequate land for promenade facility and buffer planting. Shouldn’t we blindly avoid reclamation which are required for harbourfront enhancement and leave these untreated spaces as “assets” to our future generations?</p>		<p>of waterfront promenade or other harbour-front enhancement, needs to demonstrate that there is a strong public need, including economic, environmental and social needs of the community, which can override the statutory principle of protection and preservation of the Harbour.</p> <p>The construction of the current guidelines is to follow the judgment of the CFA. Any new interpretation of the PHO will be a matter for the court to decide and is outside the scope of these guidelines. To address the comments, it is proposed to add an explicit provision in para. (c) under “Land Formation” for harbour enhancement.</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>(d) The Protection of Harbour Ordinance (PHO) does not prohibit reclamation at all. Most people over emphasize the presumption against reclamation in order to avoid “troubles” and overlook the fundamental purpose of the ordinance is “to protect and preserve the harbour as a special public asset and a natural heritage of Hong Kong people”. A thorough review in the interpretation of the ordinance and CFA’s judgment from the perspective to fulfill the “purpose” of the ordinance is required so that unreasonable and inappropriate adoption of the presumption damaging the fundamental purpose of the ordinance. The following are some opinions in interpreting the ordinance.</p> <p>(e) <u>Creation of a Continuous Promenade around the Harbour – within the scope to “protect and preserve the harbour as a special public asset and a natural heritage”</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● In Para. 34 of the judgment in Town Planning Board v Society for the Protection of the Harbour Limited 2004, it emphasized what is to be protected and preserved is the harbour as a special public asset and a natural heritage of Hong Kong people. This is the fundamental “purpose” of the ordinance. “To protect and preserve” are act to be done. It is very important that in the statement, the act has an aim “as a special public asset and a natural heritage of Hong Kong people”. It should not be simply interpreted as just to protect and preserve the seawater in the harbour. ● “Reclamation” is generally considered as a threat to such unique purpose. Therefore, there is a presumption against reclamation but not an absolute prohibition of reclamation. The focus should be whether the work is within the scope “to protect and preserve the harbour as a special public asset and a natural heritage”. 		
--	---	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● “To protect the harbour as a special public asset and a natural heritage” means to keep it from harm or damage with the aim to make it as a special public asset and a natural heritage. The creation of a continuous promenade can enhance the setting of the harbour as a special public asset and a natural heritage. It is part of the harbour as if the walking trails are also part of our natural country parks. The continuous promenade is definitely not a harm or damage to the harbour. ● “To preserve the harbour as a special public asset and a natural heritage” should not be simply interpreted as “keeping it at its present state” and “do nothing”. Polluted harbour should not be preserved as “polluted” and inherited to our future generations. It connotes maintenance and conservation of the harbour as “a special public asset and a natural heritage”. ● The provision of a continuous promenade can enhance the setting of the harbour and it will facilitate the public to appreciate the beauty of our harbour. It will be inherited to our future generations for their enjoyment of the harbour. The promenade is a public asset for public use and the harbour will remain as a special public asset and a natural heritage. The continuous promenade is within the scope “to protect and preserve the harbour as a special public asset and a natural heritage”. <p><u>(f) Continuous promenade – not causing excessive impact</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Para. 30 of the judgment clarified that “the legislative purpose is to ensure that [the harbour] will be protected against excessive reclamation” and Para. 64 of the judgment disclosed that the Society for the Protection of the Harbour Ltd also had no objection to the provision of a promenade along the waterfront if the extent of reclamation is not excessive. 		
--	---	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The creation of a continuous promenade framework may involve small-scale reclamation at some locations around the harbour. Such small-scale reclamation can provide continuity of the waterfront promenade framework and bring into substantial improvements to the waterfront setting. This is in line with the purpose of the ordinance if it involves no excessive reclamation and no alternative is available. • “Excessive” is interpreted as substantially more than what it is intended for. If more than 100m wide reclaimed land is created along the shoreline as a promenade, it can be described as excessive. For reclamation to create a promenade with a reasonable width similar to Tsim Sha Tsim Promenade, it can satisfy that no “excessive reclamation” is involved. • The presumption against reclamation should not overrule the fundamental purpose of the ordinance if the underlying concern in the presumption relating to excessive reclamation can be adequately addressed in the harbourfront enhancement work. <p><u>(g) Establishing an overriding need for the creation of a continuous and quality promenade</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For projects which are not related to harbourfront enhancement requiring reclamation within the harbour such as reclaim land for roads or oil tanks, the adoption of overriding need test is relevant. Extending the overriding need test to cover the reclamation works associated with harbourfront enhancement is not appropriate as they are in line with the purpose of the ordinance. • It is clear that the public would like to protect and preserve the harbour. In many consultations, they also revealed that the public also wanted to have a continuous and quality promenade. These two aspirations are not mutually exclusive. They can both be achieved with proper planning, design and implementation. 		
--	---	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a supplement to the review in the interpretation of the PHO and CFA’s judgment, if overriding need for harbourfront enhancement works is desirable, extensive consultations can be conducted to reveal the public need for the creation of a continuous and quality promenade around the harbour. <p>(h) <u>Amendments to PHO</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a last resort, amendments to the PHO to facilitate the implementation of the harbourfront enhancement works should be considered. 		
31	<p>To plan for a better harbour-front environment, small scale reclamations are inevitable, since there is inadequate space along the harbour-front for public uses. Different kinds of utility installation and private uses have already occupies the waterfront area. The court has ruled that no reclamation is allowed unless it can proved that there is an overriding public need. It discourage any harbour-front improvement scheme that requires, even if the reclamation is very small. The Protection of Harbour Ordinance is too rigid and kills all the opportunities to improve the harbour-front areas. The Group strongly supports any effort to remedy this situation by amending the Protection of Harbour Ordinance. HEC should take on the responsibility of finding ways to lift this legal barrier against better harbour-front planning for public enjoyment.</p>	<p>Long-Term Development Policy Group of Hong Kong Policy Research Institute (HKPRI) (20.4.2007)</p>	<p>See response to Item No. 30 above.</p>
32	<p>The HEC should consider elaborating in the HPGs the need to put the “Land Formation” aspect in a wider context so as not to deter any creative plan which would enhance the quality of the harbour.</p>	<p>Town Planning Board Meeting On 16.3.2007</p>	<p>See response to Item No. 30 above.</p>

	Public Engagement		
	Paragraph (a)		
33	Paragraph should state clearly that public engagement is encouraged throughout the project planning and development stage.	Harbour Business Forum (26.4.2007)	Para. (a) under “Public Engagement” amended to incorporate suggestions.
	Paragraph (b)		
34	The 20 hectares threshold for conducting public engagement should be reviewed and justified as based on this criteria, it appears that there are very few, if any, future projects along the waterfront would need to conduct public engagement. In addition, size should not be the only criteria for determining whether a project should undergo comprehensive public engagement process, other criteria may include, the prominence of the project location within Victoria harbour such as the Tamar Project, the critical effect project may have on the overall city environment (e.g. whether it would block the major breezeway into the City).	Professional Green Building Council (19.4.2007)	Most of the large-scale public projects along the harbour-front fall within the 20 hectares threshold. Para. (b) under “Public Engagement” amended to the effect that project of territorial significance should also require to carry out a comprehensive public engagement programme.
35	The 20 hectares benchmark is too high and the public should be engaged in all projects and be given an opportunity to express their views.	Harbour Business Forum (26.4.2007)	Please refer to response to Item No. 34 above.
36	(a) Suggested involving the public at an early stage of consultation to encourage creative ideas and ensure smooth implementation afterwards. (b) District Councils should be involved as they were at the local level, in touch with the public and were more skillful in public engagement. There should also be guidelines on how to deal with comments received during public engagement process.	HEC Meeting on 25.1.2007	(a) Similar provisions have been made in Para. (a) under “Public Engagement”. (b) Paras. (a) and (b) under “Public Engagement” amended to incorporate suggestion.

	Paragraph (c)		
37	No objection to Para 2.2(c) but would suggest that for private developments, it should only be applicable to projects that would result in a material change to development density.	The Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong (12.2.2007)	A change in land use and/or other development parameters (including building height) may also be of public concern. The HEC and relevant stakeholders should be consulted at an early stage on these changes.
38	Suggest adding “or have the potential of creating major barrier to wind into the inner City” as one of the criteria in Paragraph (c) of “Public Engagement” for needing consultation with HEC.	Professional Green Council (19.4.2007)	Whether one development would have potential to create major wind barrier is a subjective judgment, which may not be appropriate to apply as a criteria. Nonetheless, it has been made clear in Para. (a) under “Public Engagement” that project proponents are encouraged to carry out early public engagement no matter what type and scale of their development proposals are.
39	In drawing up of Outline Zoning Plan (OZP), public consultation has already been carried out. Public consultation for redevelopment of existing private building will entail unnecessary objections from adjoining land owners who have self-interest in mind. It may stifle redevelopment because of uncertainty of the result of public consultation and the length of time required of such exercise.	Lands Department/ Estate Management Section (7.5.2007)	The proposal here is to encourage project proponents of those developments which are not permitted as of right under the OZP to undertake early public engagement.
	Paragraph (d)		
40	Suggest land use and project development should be reviewed continuously for enhancement and the (changing) public aspiration.	Harbour Business Forum (26.4.2007)	Similar provisions have been included in Paras. (a) and (d) under “Land Use Planning”.

	Land Use Planning		
	Paragraph (a) - Diversity of Uses		
41	Review of land use zoning in order to generate more land to facilitate the creation of an attractive and vibrant promenade is required. For example, Police Officers' Club in Causeway Bay can be changed to public harbourfront entertainment uses and re-provisioning of the club at another site can be considered. There is a big open car park and an open boat repair area in the Hong Kong Royal Yacht Club (HKRYC). The boundary of the HKPYC should be revised to improve the promenade linkage between Wan Chai and Causeway Bay.	Mr. Ng Siu-man (29.3.2007)	Similar provisions have been included in Para. (a) under "Land Use Planning".
42	Cruise terminals over the world are often situated in the inner harbour of major cities, being able to locate cruise terminal in the inner core of the harbour is the advantage of Hong Kong over the other neighbouring cities. The proposed cruise terminal at Kai Tak was designed to provide berthing for 2 cruise ships with supporting facilities, however, the growth of the cruise industrial indicated that there will be a need to further expand the planned berthing and supporting facilities. In order to better utilise the terminal and the associated facilities on the coast and to balance the need for economic development and improving people's livelihood, we opine that more land should be reserved and the coastline be left open to cope with the expansion of the cruise terminal. (Translation)	HK Logistics Management Staff Association (12.4.2007)	Land has been reserved at Kai Tak to cater for the development and future expansion of cruise terminal.
43	Suggest to add at the end of paragraph (a): "Activities along the foreshore are vital to the success of a vibrant harbour. It is not sufficient to just plan for harbour access. These activities should be diverse and appeal to local population as well as tourists. Many of these activities should be free such as parks, sitting out areas, sculpture garden, fishing area etc.	Harbour Business Forum (26.4.2007)	Similar provisions have been included in Para (a) under "Land Use Planning" and Para (c) under "Harbour-front Management". The suggested wordings are merely elaboration and may not be necessary.

44	Apart from the provision of more green and landscape areas, thoughts should be given to the provision of ancillary facilities, e.g. café and retail outlets, which would make the harbour-front more vibrant and attractive.	Town Planning Board Meeting On 16.3.2007	Similar provisions have been included in Para. (a) under “Land Use Planning”.
Paragraph (b) - Diversity of Uses			
45	The proposed relocation of public cargo handling areas outside the inner harbour core would have impact on freight handling at KCRC Hung Hom waterfront areas. The HPGs should allow sufficient flexibility for planning and development of the KCRC Hung Hom waterfront site so as to achieve a positive, effective and balanced utilization of land uses in the harbour-front area.	Kowloon -Canton Railway Corporation (18.4.2007)	In the Planning Study on the Harbour and its Waterfront Areas completed in 2003, the Hung Hom KCRC freight yard has been identified as an incompatible land use. When opportunities arises, the KCRC freight yard should be relocated elsewhere, leaving the areas in the Inner Harbour Core for activities conducive for public enjoyment.
46	Other than the KCRC freight yard which is managed by KCRC, there is no public cargo working area within the Inner Harbour Core. The word ‘public’ could be deleted from ‘public cargo working areas’, in order not to confuse with the Public Cargo Working Area (PCWAs) managed by the Marine Department. Furthermore, no maintenance depot or ship repair facilities are located in the Inner Harbour Core.	Marine Department (19.4.2007)	Para. (b) under “Land Use Planning” amended to incorporate suggestion on Cargo Working Area .
47	Typhoon shelters are critical facilities to protect lives and properties at the sea during the passage of tropical storms. Since the majority of marine activities take place in the Victoria Harbour, sheltering space within the Harbour are vital to the safety of the marine crafts. There seems no incompatibility between typhoon shelter and inner harbour activities.	Marine Department (19.4.2007)	At present, there is only one typhoon shelter, i.e. Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter, within the Inner Harbour Core. Under the WDII Review, the typhoon shelter is proposed to be retained with its cultural and heritage elements preserved and enhanced. In view of the above, it is considered not necessary for the Guidelines to suggest relocation of the typhoon shelter outside the Inner Harbour Core. Para. (b) under “Land Use Planning amended accordingly.

48	The Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter in close proximity to the Victoria Park has potential to be integrated with the future waterfront promenade and incorporation of some commercial/recreational elements. The draft Guideline (b) can be recasted not only to recognize the potential of the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter in contributing to the public recreation and tourism-related activities, but also to help clear the misunderstanding of some stakeholders (e.g. the Hong Kong Cargo-vessel Traders Association Limited) of the intention of the HEC in preparing the HPGs.	Port, Maritime & Logistic Development Unit, EDLB (25.5.2007)	See response to Item No. 47 above.
49	Relocation of privately owned facilities will result in compensation	Lands Department/ Estate Management Section (7.5.2007)	Noted.

50	<p>(a) We note the draft HPGs with disappointment and concern, and are strongly opposed to the proposal by the Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review to relocate the public cargo working areas, typhoon shelters and maintenance depots outside the inner core of the Victoria Harbour. Typhoon shelters offer the last line of defense for protecting the life and property of marine operators, while public cargo working areas play an important role in the development of Hong Kong's logistics industry. Typhoon shelters are places where small vessels, barge, fishing boats, tug boats and ferries seek shelter from typhoon. From the perspective of safety, any shortfall will not be acceptable. According to the assessment report on typhoon shelter spaces requirement (2004-2021) that the Marine Department released in February 2005, the demand for typhoon shelter spaces is 427 hectares in 2007, while the actual supply of typhoon shelter spaces is just 406 hectares. Because of the uncertainties about Kwun Tong and To Kwa Wan Typhoon Shelters in the South East Kowloon Development Plan, typhoon shelter spaces are in short supply. If typhoon shelters are to be relocated from the deepwater and well-provisioned harbour, the shortage will be all the more acute. In case a typhoon strikes, the loss of life and property will be beyond estimation. Public cargo working areas are important sites for mid-stream operations peculiar to Hong Kong. The smooth operation of these sites can enhance the competitiveness of the logistics industry and boost our entrepot trade. With the provision of public cargo working areas, tens of thousands of loading workers and ocean container drivers can earn a</p>	<p>HK Cargo-Vessel Traders' Association (20.4.2007)</p>	<p>The Guidelines do not seek to terminate all activities related to cargo working areas, typhoon shelters and etc., but encourage them to relocate outside the Inner Harbour Core. The Inner Harbour Core stretches, on Kowloon side, from the planned West Kowloon Cultural District in the west to Harbour Plaza Hotel at Hung Hom to the east, and on Hong Kong Island side, from the Outlying Island Ferry Piers in the west to Oil Street in the east.</p> <p>Also see responses to Item Nos. 45 and 47 above regarding the KCRC freight yard and Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter.</p>
----	--	---	---

	<p>livelihood. From an economic perspective and to achieve the objective of safeguarding people's livelihood, the government is obligated to look after the needs of these poor educated workers and ensure the survival of the relevant trades.</p> <p>(b) The Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review dismisses the land uses such as public cargo working areas, typhoon shelters and maintenance depots as something not conducive towards public enjoyment of the harbour and its harbour-front areas. By doing so, ignores the interests of marine operators unreasonably. If the government can provide associated facilities and improve the public cargo working areas and typhoon shelters with their uniqueness and local flavor retained, such land uses (the barge operations) will be appealing to the public. Instead of pulling them down, the government should act proactively to balance the needs between the public and the maritime operators in accordance with the principle set down by the Sub-committee, i.e. to provide a vibrant harbour with comprehensive facilities and a sustainable network.</p> <p>(c) Marine operators were not represented at the Sub-committee, and it is doubtful whether the Sub-committee can fully take into account the safety aspect and the economic needs of marine operators. The proposed closure of public cargo working areas, which will exacerbate the problem of typhoon shelter shortage and deprive marine operators of the last line of defense for their life and property. In order to cope with the heavy demand for typhoon shelter spaces from marine operators, maintain the mid-stream operations peculiar to Hong Kong and forge the economic and business ties with the Mainland and the rest of the world, we hope the Sub-committee could respond to the concerns and aspirations of the relevant industries. (Translation)</p>		
--	---	--	--

51	<p>(a) We strongly object to the relocation of the land uses of port facilities, including public cargo working areas, typhoon shelters and maintenance depots, outside the inner core of the Victoria Harbour.</p> <p>(b) The development of Hong Kong has all along been based on the port. In the future development of Hong Kong, constraints should not be placed on the port/shipping industry for the sake of promoting the tourist industry. Hong Kong has been an international shipping centre. In the past hundred years, countless batches, cargo boats, tug boats, water boats, ferry vessels, passenger-carrying launches, repair boats and other work boats provided support services for ocean-going vessels visiting Hong Kong. The typhoon shelters have not only offered essential typhoon sheltering facilities, but also served as the mooring and repairing base for vessels. For decades, numerous stores of ship supplies, ship repair workshops and loading operators have clustered in the surrounding areas of the Yau Ma Tei Typhoon Shelter, such as Yau Ma Tei, Mongkok and Tai Kok Tsui. Many workers and business people in shipping have also chosen these districts as their home, and this has become a special feature of these districts. If the Government intends to close the typhoon shelters in the Victoria Harbour for the sole consideration of promoting tourism, this will be detrimental to the operation of the port and hurts the livelihood of the employees of the port industry, local ship owners and employees of the ancillary industries associated with the port. The neighbourhood where their family live will also be adversely affected.</p>	<p>HK & Kowloon Motor Boats and Tug Boats Association (20.4.2007)</p>	<p>See response to Item Nos. 47 and 50 above.</p>
----	--	---	---

	<p>(c) Typhoon shelters are essential facilities for vessels to seek refuge from typhoons. As we all know, the ferry service should still be maintained within two hours of the hoisting of the typhoon signal no. 8. If typhoon shelters are located far away from the Victoria Harbour, ferries will be exposed to risks during their long-distance voyage to these shelters for refuge. Given the need to provide the public with prompt ferry service after the lowering of the typhoon signal, there could also be delays in ferry operation if typhoon shelters are located far away from the Victoria Harbour.</p> <p>(b) Local vessels will continue to play an important role in the future development of the port traffic and tourism of Hong Kong. The needs of local vessels and the basis for community development should not be neglected in any planning. Therefore we request the Government to pay attention to the needs for typhoon shelter sites within the Victoria Harbour and take into consideration the actual needs of users.</p> <p>(d) We support the development of the Victoria Harbour touring but the need for nurturing the shipping industry cannot be ignored. The shipping industry relies on typhoon shelters which are essential harbour facilities for survival. The boats that our members own boast an impressive and beautiful appearance and are frequently rented out for use as leisure boats. With their local characteristics the boats adorn, and add vibrancy to, the harbour when berthing in the typhoon shelter, giving the harbour an appearance of a yacht club. No incompatibility will arise by retaining the existing typhoon shelter next to the tourism and leisure/recreational areas.</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>(e) The government has already launched a number of major projects such as the Disneyland Theme Park on the Lantau Island, Ma Wan theme park and Sai Kung Water Sports Centre. If the government again places too much emphasis on the need for public enjoyment of the harbour and the waterfront areas and adopts a broad-brush strategy to relocate harbour facilities outside the inner core of the Victoria Harbour, it will be infeasible and also against the economic interests of Hong Kong in the long term. Relocation of harbour facilities from the harbour will lead to a rise in transportation cost and undermine the competitiveness of our shipping industry, thus affecting its chance of survival and causing a surge sharply in unemployment in the shipping sector. Therefore, the plans on the land uses along the waterfront areas should not just focus on public enjoyment but also have to maintain a balance between public enjoyment and the need of the shipping industry. (Translation)</p>		
52	<p>Public landing steps and piers are important facilities for the use of the harbour and for promoting harbour touring. The plans on the land uses along the waterfront areas should then reserve sufficient land for passenger embarking/disembarking and for provision of appropriate transportation facilities. Construction of more berth spaces and a covered pier with a good transportation network will make the harbour a place of attraction to residents and tourists alike. This will help develop the commercial activities in the neighbouring districts and create more job opportunities in the long run. (Translation)</p>	<p>HK & Kowloon Motor Boats and Tug Boats Association (20.4.2007)</p>	<p>Similar provisions have been made in Para. (c) under “Physical Linkage”.</p>

53	<p>We are concern that the marine facilities will be forced to relocate away from the Inner Core of Victoria Harbour. Typhoon shelters offer the last line of defense for protecting the life and property of marine operators, while public cargo working areas play an important role in the development of Hong Kong's logistics industry. The Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review dismisses the land uses such as public cargo working areas, typhoon shelters and maintenance depots as something not conducive towards public enjoyment of the harbour and its harbour-front areas. By doing so, ignores the interests of marine operators unreasonably. (Translation)</p>	<p>Victoria Harbour Typhoon Shelter Concern Group (23.4.2007)</p>	<p>See responses to Item Nos. 45, 47 and 50 above.</p>
54	<p>Suggest to also include: “Land uses such as cargo working areas, maintenance depots, and other private or public industrial marine supporting facilities should be minimized. However, where possible marine supporting and water-dependent land uses compatible with harbour-front enhancement should be encouraged and prioritized.”</p>	<p>Harbour Business Forum (26.4.2007)</p>	<p>Similar provisions have been included in Paras. (a), (b) and (g) under “Land Use Planning”.</p>
55	<p>We appreciate the idea of preserving the Victoria Harbour. Although there is a need to promote environmental protection in town planning, one cannot ignore the economic function of the Victoria Harbour. There is a pressing need to go ahead with the cruise terminal project, and we are very concerned about the impact of the guidelines on the construction and development of the cruise terminal. For years, we have been facing an acute shortage of berthing spaces for cruise liners. There have been many occasions over the past few years that cruise liners have to bypass Hong Kong or berth at the container terminal or dock because of the unavailability of berthing spaces. On February 28 Queen Mary II, the world's largest liner, was forced to berth at Kwai Chung Container Terminal. The news hit the international headlines and brought harm to our reputation as a metropolitan city.</p>	<p>HK Logistics Management Staff Association (12.4.2007)</p>	<p>The Guidelines do not preclude the development of cruise terminal and associated facilities. However, careful consideration should be given to their design to ensure that any future development could be commensurate with the surrounding waterfront environment.</p>

	Cruise traveling industry will be conducive to the development of the catering sector as well as the logistics and associated industries in Hong Kong (which will in turn enhances the employment prospects). It may even help create and lay the foundation for our new local brand names. This will go a long way towards realizing our vision to "transform the Victoria Harbour and its harbour-front areas into an attractive, vibrant, accessible and sustainable world-class asset" and to "achieve a positive, effective and balanced utilization of land and marine resources". (Translation)		
Paragraph (d) - Diversity of Uses			
56	Important aspects of temporary Land Use and Quick-win Enhancement Strategies (for example, the removal of "existing" billboards, fences, car parking, etc.) have not been dealt with, and should be added.	Harbour Business Forum (26.4.2007)	Similar provisions have been included in Paras. (c) and (d) under "Temporary Land Uses".
57	Suggest to include at the end of paragraph (d): "A full audit of all the available government land along the harbour should be undertaken to ensure that appropriate activities are located on the harbour-front."	Harbour Business Forum (26.4.2007)	The current construction of Para. (d) under "Land Use Planning" already serves similar purpose.
Paragraph (j) - Open Space			
58	Cycling is a common recreational facility along waterfront in many countries. The land along waterfront does not have significant changes in gradient, it is suitable for cycling and adequate width should be provided in order to create a continuous cycle track network along harbourfront. The cycle network can also provide an environmentally friendly transport mode. With the improved pedestrian linkage to the harbourfront (e.g. by means of landscape deck), people can walk to the waterfront and ride the bikes to their destinations along waterfront (e.g. from Chai Wan to Causeway Bay). Facilities for hiring and parking bikes can be provided along waterfront.	Mr. Ng Siu-man (29.3.2007)	Similar provisions have been included in Para. (j) under "Land Use Planning".

59	The suggested “Cycle Track” should be for recreation and leisure uses but not for commuting use.	Assistant Commissioner Transport/Urban (4.4.2007)	The purpose of the cycle track will be spelt out explicitly in para. (j) under “Land Use Planning”).
Paragraph (k) - Open Space			
60	Suggest to include : “That existing incompatible uses should be minimized, as is set out in the principles”.	Harbour Business Forum (26.4.2007)	Para. (k) under “Land Use Planning” amended to incorporate suggestions.
Paragraph (n) - Cultural Heritage			
61	HPGs should also cover tangible and intangible cultural heritage, sustainable transport as well as social connectivity with the hinterland in planning harbour-front land uses.	HEC Meeting on 25.1.2007	Para. (n) under “Land Use Planning” and para. (d) under “Physical Linkage” amended to incorporate suggestions.
62	Besides preserving buildings and structures of historic interest or cultural value, intangible heritage should also be considered.	The Conservancy Association (19.4.2007)	Para. (n) under “Land Use Planning” amended to incorporate suggestions.
63	Intangible heritage has not been but should be considered in the Guidelines. For example, the whole setting of Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter is a kind of intangible heritage. It is not the kind of physical structure or buildings that are urged to be preserved in the Guidelines.	Long-Term Development Policy Group of Hong Kong Policy Research Institute (HKPRI) (20.4.2007)	Para. (n) under “Land Use Planning” amended to incorporate suggestion.

64	In regard to the demolition or removal of Queen's Pier, the government can leave the memorial tablet intact and have it exhibited in the Hong Kong Museum of Coastal Defense or Hong Kong Maritime Museum. (Translation)	HK Logistics Management Staff Association (12.4.2007)	Noted.
	Paragraph (q) - Utility Installations		
65	The heading "Utility Installations" should read "Infrastructure and Utility Installations" to better reflect the content.	HEC Meeting on 25.1.2007	Heading amended to incorporate suggestion.
66	Consideration should be given to include in the HPGs that utility installations should not be constructed along the harbour-front as far as possible unless they were essential.	HEC Meeting on 25.1.2007	Para. (q) under "Land Use Planning" amended to incorporate suggestion.
67	HPP No. 8 ("Land required for the impact from infrastructure development, utility installations and land uses incompatible with the harbour planning principles should be minimized.") has not been dealt with adequately. There is no guidance how this aspect of the Harbour Planning Principles can be made a reality for future infrastructure and utility projects.	Harbour Business Forum (26.4.2007)	Para. (q) under "Land Use Planning" elaborated to cover this aspect of the HPPs.
68	Agreed in-principle with the "common utility duct" proposal for utility installations. However, ownership, maintenance responsibility, mechanism for construction and maintenance cost sharing and for management as well as detailed common utility duct design should be reviewed case by case for each particular development project.	CLP Power (17.4.2007)	Noted.

69	Agreed that the affected areas of utility installations should be minimized, the number of utilities installed should also be minimized as a matter of principle.	The Conservancy Association (19.4.2007)	Para. (q) under “Land Use Planning” amended to incorporate suggestions.
70	Utility installations should not be put at harbour-front areas at all, unless there are essential needs and the harbour-front sites in question are the only choices.	Long-Term Development Policy Group of HKPRI (20.4.2007)	Para. (q) under “Land Use Planning” amended to incorporate suggestions.
71	It is noted that infrastructural facilities such as seawater pumping stations, cooling water discharge pipes and ventilation shafts of cross-harbour tunnel are essential facilities that located near the waterfront. Since the construction of these facilities will incur aesthetical impacts on surrounding area, we would suggest including more detailed information on the implementation plan for the construction of these facilities.	The Hong Kong Institute of Engineers (15.5.2007)	The Guidelines seek to bring to the attention of project proponents the need to minimize the visual impact and area required along the waterfront for the utility installations. In developing individual infrastructure and utility facilities, detailed information on the design of the infrastructures should be submitted to relevant authorities for approval before implementation.
72	Effective safety design and operation management of the waterfront facilities is essential to the overall land use planning in the seafront area. Taking into consideration the existing information available on the safety design of the seashore as mentioned in the document focuses only on the construction of underground facilities to reduce flooding risk arising from storm or heavy rainfall, it is recommended that a more comprehensive safety design in the waterfront are should be included in the document to provide a clearer picture of the development of the waterfront facilities.	The Hong Kong Institute of Engineers (15.5.2007)	Project proponents can refer to the Practice Note for Authorized Persons promulgated by Buildings Department and other Government Guidelines/Regulations for guidance on the detailed design of developments/facilities. It is considered not necessary to spell out such requirements on safety building design in this Guidelines.

	Urban Design		
	Paragraph (b) - Building Height		
73	Agreed in-principle about development density and building height's control. However, flexibility in building height limit, sufficient site area and allowable site coverage for horizontal development should also be taken into account to cater for the functional requirements of some buildings from various utility companies.	CLP Power (17.4.2007)	Utility installations, unless absolutely necessary, should not occupy a waterfront location. Besides, their spatial requirement should be minimized as much as possible.
74	Setting back of development, reduction in development density and reduction in building heights will greatly hamper development potential of such sites. These proposals will result in a reduction in land revenue and discourage redevelopment of private lots. In addition, restriction of existing private land with a plot ratio or gross floor area entitlement to a lower height development will result in a lateral development, thus, it causing wall effect.	Lands Department/ Estate Management Section (7.5.2007)	The overall intention is for waterfront developments to adopt a lower development density to be commensurate with the waterfront setting. Appropriate plot ratio and building height restrictions should be stipulated in the lease conditions or OZP to control building massing.
	Paragraph (f) - Permeability		
75	From an urban climatic perspective, the harbourfront area is the "window" for ventilation of the inner city, ensuring permeability of the developments at the harbourfront and appropriately leaving land undeveloped is therefore of paramount importance to the overall wind environment of the entire city. In order to highlight this importance, the guidelines for permeability should be better presented as a separate Guideline rather than subsumed under the Urban Design section.	Professional Green Building Council (19.4.2007)	Subsuming 'Permeability' under 'Urban Design' section does not mean that this aspect of the guidelines is less important. The grouping is considered appropriate.

	Paragraph (g) - Permeability		
76	Item (g) of “Urban Design” only highlight one criteria in the ETWB/HPLB joint Technical Circular (TC) on Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) for requiring AVA, this selection approach is not supported; we suggested that developments fulfilling any of the criteria in the joint TC on AVA should need to conduct AVA.	Professional Green Building Council (19.4.2007)	Para. (g) under “Urban Design” revised to make reference to the joint TC.
	Paragraph (i) – Streetscape Design		
77	For some parts of the promenade which can have generous width, a stepping promenade can be adopted to facilitate the enjoyment of the seaview when the distance from the seaside increases. This can be achieved by creating terraces, platforms, inclined lawn areas and low-rise buildings to create elevated views to the harbour.	Mr. Ng Siu-man (29.3.2007)	Para. (j) under “Land Use Planning” amended to incorporate suggestions.
	Paragraph (j) – Streetscape Design		
78	If “High quality” and “non-standard” street furniture are recommended in a harbour-front setting, the maintenance agent should be involved early in the design of those furniture.	Assistant commissioner Transport/Urban (4.4.2007)	Noted.
79	It was important to improve the quality of the street furniture and incorporate the provision of street arts for the future planning and development of the harbour-front areas.	Town Planning Board Meeting On 16.3.2007	Similar provisions have been included in Para. (j) under “Urban Design”.

	Landscaping		
	Paragraph (a)		
80	For tree planting or landscaping work at pavement, it is better to accommodate them in tree pots to provide larger flexibility for future utility installation.	CLP Power (17.4.2007)	Where circumstances permit, tree planting into the ground is more desirable from aesthetic point of view. Besides, tree planting in tree pots will reduce ground space for lawn planting and pedestrian circulation.
81	Vertical greening should be added as a possible alternative for maximizing greening.	Professional Green Building Council (19.4.2007)	Para. (e) under “Landscaping” amended to incorporate suggestion.
	Paragraphs (d) & (f)		
82	<p>(a) The guidelines suggested maximizing greening at the harbourfront to improve micro-climate and thermal comfort, this guideline is supported in principle. However, to provide a better guidance for project proponent, it is suggested that the extent of greenery provision should be quantified into a ratio, such as green coverage, for both public and private projects. Government’s current data on greening under the Greening Master Plan is in terms of number of plants planted, this may not be meaningful as scrubs, trees and lawn differ in area of green coverage, and the more important aspect of greening for improvement of micro-climate is in fact, the area of land covered by greenery vis-à-vis built-up (be it buildings, road or hard paving). As for private sites, the coverage restrictions under the existing land/planning/building legislation are similarly ineffective to maximizing greening in our City.</p> <p>(b) Greening ratio (percentage of landscaped area within development site) should be pursued for private development sites.</p>	Professional Green Building Council (19.4.2007)	It is understood that a similar subject is now under study by the Government. It may not be appropriate to stipulate a greening ratio at this juncture pending completion of the study.

	Physical Linkage		
	Paragraph (a)		
83	To add “Other than essential public transport infrastructure,” at the beginning of Paragraph (a) of ‘Physical Linkage’.	Environment, Transport and Works Bureau (15.5.2007)	The suggested revision to the Guidelines is not in line with the general intention to encourage the provision of a traffic-free environment for pedestrian to access the waterfront. Nevertheless, the provision of essential public transport infrastructure along the harbour-front could be considered on individual merits.
84	A traffic-free environment along the harbour-front is an ideal situation. Yet, provision of minimum internal transportation facilities are required to support commercial activities inside the harbour-front development.	Assistant commissioner Transport/Urban (4.4.2007)	Noted.
85	The harbour front areas should be pedestrian priority zone; if need be, preference should be given to non-motorized transport.	The Conservancy Association (19.4.2007)	The guidelines encourage provision of cycle track where circumstances are appropriate. However, cycling along the harbour-front is for recreation and leisure purpose, rather than a means of transport.
	Paragraph (b)		
86	Access to and from the harbour and along the water-front (not just along) should be primary at grade.	Harbour Business Forum (26.4.2007)	Similar provisions have been included in Paras. (b) and (d) under “Physical Linkage”.

	Paragraph (c)		
87	KMB fully support the aim to enhance Victoria Harbour to become an attractive, vibrant, accessible and sustainable world-class asset. To achieve these ends, the provision of an integrated and efficient public transport system and its related infrastructure is essential.	The Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Ltd (20.4.2007)	Agreed.
88	In addition to an enhanced pedestrian linkage, the provision of an enhanced public bus network/service is vital to the vibrancy of the area. Since public bus is the most efficient on street transport carrier with environmentally friendly features, an integrated bus network connecting the harbourfront area will ensure the accessibility and sustainability of the area. The HPGs should incorporate measures that enhance the development of bus network in the area, including the provision of adequate priority measures and facilities e.g. bus only lane, bus lay-by and/or bus stopping places and bus terminus/Public Transport Interchange.	The Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Ltd (20.4.2007)	Whilst public bus is an efficient public transport which helps to enhance the accessibility of the harbour-front areas, our intention is to encourage provision of an integrated public transport infrastructure comprising various modes of land and marine transport.
89	To improve pedestrian connections to the harbour-front, the connection with public transport network e.g. walkway connected PTI and major bus stops should also be improved. In alignment with the goal to improve the attractiveness and vibrancy of the harbourfront area, refurbishment of the public transport facilities should be considered.	The Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Ltd (20.4.2007)	Para. (f) under “Physical Linkage” amended to incorporate suggestions.
	Paragraph (d)		
90	Linkages should also cater to different users. Additional elevated and subway connections should be used (but not replacing street level connections) to provide high-capacity connections under all weather conditions between major transport hubs and key destination areas.	Harbour Business Forum (26.4.2007)	Similar provisions have been included in paras. (d) and (e) under “Physical Linkage”.

	Harbour-front Management		
	Paragraph (a)		
91	The general principle should be further explored. It is certainly not suitable if the development is for private residential use as the development will fall into multi-ownership. It may be feasible if the development is for hotel use. For other uses, more study should be conducted.	Lands Department/ Estate Management Section (7.5.2007)	Noted.
	Paragraph (b)		
92	Harbour-front Management should ensure that within the waterfront area there are provision for uses including street markets, outdoor dining, street vendors, small commercial enterprises, and other commercial activities. An appropriate mix of public and private realm must be pursued.	Harbour Business Forum (26.4.2007)	Para. (b) under “Harbourfront Management” amended to incorporate suggestions.
	Sustainable Development		
	Paragraph (a)		
93	Use of recycled water, e.g. from rain collection or properly treated sewage effluent or grey water from the nearby facilities, may be considered for landscaping irrigation system.	Drainage Services Department (13.4.2007)	Para. (f) under “Sustainable Development” amended to incorporate suggestions.
94	Key sustainable development initiatives, like renewable energy and energy efficiency facilities, may be adopted to demonstrate Hong Kong as a world-class city.	Drainage Services Department (13.4.2007)	Para. (e) under “Sustainable Development” amended to incorporate suggestions.

95	Sustainability indicators should be developed and targets established for assessing achievements of the Guidelines.	Strategy Sub-committee of Council for Sustainable Development Meeting on 3.4.2007	A set of sustainable principles and indicators will be added to Annex IV of the Guidelines for reference purpose.
96	Private investors should be involved in the preparation of the Guidelines. While bulky developments would affect the view and airflow within the area, private investors would need to consider the issue from the business point of view as to how to make the project financially sustainable.	Strategy Sub-committee of Council for Sustainable Development Meeting on 3.4.2007	Subsequent to the Guidelines' endorsement of the Guidelines as a working draft for public consultation, stakeholders including REDA and members of public have been invited to comment on the draft Guidelines as part of the public engagement process.
97	Sustainable harbour planning should also take into account the climate change factor, which would affect the sea level.	Strategy Sub-committee of Council for Sustainable Development Meeting on 3.4.2007	The Guidelines promote the development of waterfront open space, provision of more landscape area, use of 'green building' and a less dense built environment, all of which help improve the micro-climate of the harbour-front areas and reduce heat island effect.
98	More concrete details in Harbour Planning Guidelines were expected. The next step would be to come up with a harbour-front layout plan that met population needs.	Strategy Sub-committee of Council for Sustainable Development Meeting on 3.4.2007	The Harbour Planning Principles and Harbour Planning Guidelines provide a framework to guide the review of the Harbour Plan.

99	Specific comments on the wordings of 'Sustainable Development' section of HPGs were suggested.	Sustainable Development Unit (15.5.2007)	Guidelines amended as appropriate to incorporate suggestions.
Paragraph (d)			
100	It is suggested that a more definitive statement on commitment on green buildings to the effect of say, "wider adoption of comprehensive green building principles should be encouraged with a view to improving micro-climate and health living as well as achieving conservation of energy and other resources. For all public projects as demonstration, the project proponent should carry out green building assessment to evaluate the comprehensive building environment performance."	Professional Green Building Council (19.4.2007)	Para. (d) under "Sustainable Development" amended to incorporate suggestions.
Paragraph (e)			
101	The use of cool materials for buildings and paving should be stated, cool materials e.g. paving with a high percentage of white aggregates or cool sink like water bodies, would reduce the absorption of solar radiation and hence, help to reduce the urban heat island effect.	Professional Green Building Council (19.4.2007)	The Guidelines encourage the general use of environmentally friendly materials. Reference to one specific type of building materials and approach in the Guidelines is considered not necessary.
102	The use of green energy should be encouraged in all public spaces.	Professional Green Building Council (19.4.2007)	The Guidelines apply to both public and private developments.

	Temporary Land Uses		
	Paragraph (a)		
103	In respect of temporary land use, enhancements for public enjoyment should be encouraged as priority.	HEC Meeting on 25.1.2007	Para. (a) under “Temporary Land Uses” amended to incorporate suggestions.
104	Paragraph (a) should clearly state that all temporary and Government land uses should be reviewed for enhancement opportunities, including changes in temporary land uses.	Harbour Business Forum (26.4.2007)	Similar provisions have been included in Para. (a) under “Temporary Land Uses”.
	Paragraph (c)		
105	Shorter fixed term may affect feasibility of proposed land uses, particularly if some enhancement works are to be carried out by the tenant. Some flexibility should be allowed.	Lands Department/ Estate Management Section (7.5.2007)	Noted.