

1st Meeting of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee
held at 2:30 pm on 6 May 2004
at 3/F, 3 Edinburgh Place, Central, Hong Kong

Minutes of Meeting

Present

Professor Lee Chack-fan	Chairman
Dr Andrew L Thomson	Representing Business Environment Council
Mr Leung Kong-yui	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Dr Ng Mee-kam	Representing Citizen Envisioning @ Harbour
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 Leslie H C Chen	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Mr Roger Tang	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Mr Chan Kowk-fai, Bernard	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Ir Dr Greg Wong Chak-yan	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mrs Aliana Ho	Representing Hong Kong Tourism Board
Mr Louis H B Loong	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Hardy Lok	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour Limited
Mr Chan Tak-chor	
Dr Chan Wai-kwan	
Mr Chan Yiu-fai, Steve	
Professor Jim Chi-yung	
Mr Kwok Chun-wah, Jimmy	
Professor Lam Kin-che	
Mr Lau Hing-tak, Patrick	
Ms Lee Wai-king, Starry	
Mr Wu Man-keung, John	
Mrs Carrie Lam	Permanent Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands)
Miss Margaret Fong	Deputy Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works
Mr Bosco Fung	Director of Planning
Mr S V Chai	Director of Territory Development
Mr Lau Ka-keung	Deputy Commissioner for Transport/Planning

Mr Li Pak-chuen, Patrick
Miss Christine Chow

and Technical Services
Assistant Director of Home Affairs
Secretary

In Attendance

Mrs Rita Lau	Permanent Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands) (Des.)
Mr Thomas Tso	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau
Mr Andrew Cheung	Assistant Secretary (Planning)2, Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau
Ms Portia Yiu	Assistant Secretary (Planning)4, Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau
Mr K K Ling	Assistant Director/Metro, Planning Department
Mr Raymond Lee	District Planning Officer/Kowloon, Planning Department
Mr Raymond Wong	Chief Town Planner/Sub-Regional Planning Section, Planning Department
Ms Christine Tse	District Planning Officer/Hong Kong, Planning Department
Mr Kelvin Chan	Senior Town Planner/Kowloon District Planning Office, Planning Department
Mr C W Kwan	Chief Engineer/Traffic Engineering (HK), Transport Department
Mr K W Yau	Chief Engineer/Railway Planning 2, Highways Department
Mr P L Kwan	Project Manager/Kowloon, Territory Development Department
Mr L T Ma	Project Manager/Hong Kong Island and Islands, Territory Development Department
Mr Talis Wong	Chief Engineer/Kowloon (2), Territory Development Department
Mr S K Lam	Chief Engineer/Hong Kong (2), Territory Development Department
Mr Dickson Lo	Representative from Maunsell Consultants Asia Limited, for Item 4
Mr Peter Cheek	Representative from Maunsell Consultants Asia Limited, for Item 4

Absent with Apologies

Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke

Item 1 Modus Operandi (Paper No. 1/2004)

1.1 **The Chairman** welcomed all Members and Government representatives to the first meeting of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (“HEC”).

1.2 In response to the suggestion made by some Members, **the Chairman** asked Members to consider whether this meeting and future meetings should be open to the public and the press. **The meeting** agreed that all HEC meetings should be open.

1.3 **The Secretary** presented Paper No. 1/2004 on modes of operation of the HEC. **The Chairman** invited Members to give views on the proposals in the paper.

A. Terms of reference (“ToR”)

1.4 Wishing to define the HEC’s duties in a clearer manner, **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** suggested to amend the ToR of the HEC. He tabled the proposed amendment by himself and eight other Members including Mr Vincent Ng, Mrs Mei Ng, Dr Andrew Thomson, Mr Hardy Lok, Mr Roger Tang, Dr Alvin Kwok, Dr Ng Mee-kam and Mr Leung Kong-yui. The amendments were as follows:-

- (a) To feature the principle of sustainable development more prominently in the ToR;
- (b) To specify clearly that the HEC would not only provide feedback to, but to “monitor” the reviews of the reclamation proposals at Wan Chai North and Southeast Kowloon;
- (c) To highlight the inclusion of “transport infrastructure” in item (b) of the ToR;
- (d) To include “adjoining areas” in item (b) of the ToR so that HEC’s work would not be confined to the harbour-front, but the adjoining areas as well; and

(e) To include “sustainable framework” and “public-private partnership” in item (d) of the ToR.

1.5 **Mrs Mei Ng** agreed that the proposed revision to the ToR would better describe the role of the HEC.

1.6 **Mr Hardy Lok** expressed his view that the Central Reclamation Phase III (“CRIII”) works should be stopped and that the reclamation schemes under CRIII and Wan Chai Development Phase II should be reviewed.

1.7 In response to Mr Lok, **Mrs Carrie Lam** said that there had already been two court judgments supporting the legality of the CRIII works. She drew Members’ attention to the judgment of 9 March 2004 which noted that in planning matters, time was invariably of importance, and that good administration, far from surrendering to delay, should seek to avoid delay. The Central District (Extension) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) was approved in February 2000, CRIII’s reclamation and roadworks were authorized in December 2001, and funding for construction of CRIII was approved by the Legislative Council in June 2002. Subsequently, tenders were invited in August 2002 and the CRIII works contract was awarded on 10 February 2003. In view of the urgency to meet the essential transport needs and considering the third party interests involved, there was no justification for further suspension of the CRIII works. Mrs Lam added that there had been two comprehensive engineering reviews demonstrating that CRIII met the “three tests” laid down by the High Court in July 2003 and the “overriding public need test” set out by the Court of Final Appeal (“CFA”) in January 2004 respectively. It was therefore not appropriate to re-open the discussion of the CRIII reclamation works under the HEC. Nevertheless, the usage and design of the land formed from the CRIII works could be further discussed by the HEC.

(Post-meeting note: The report on “A Review of Central Reclamation Phase III by applying the Court of Final Appeal’s ‘overriding public need test’” is available in the website

<http://www.hplb.gov.hk/cr3/index.htm>. Members interested to obtain a hard copy of the Review can approach the HEC Secretariat.)

Discussion on the need to highlight “transport infrastructure” in the ToR

1.8 **Mrs Carrie Lam** said that she considered the reference to “development” in the original ToR broad enough to cover “transport infrastructure”. She added that while “transport infrastructure” could be discussed by the HEC, care should be taken not to take over the work of the Transport Advisory Committee.

1.9 **Miss Margaret Fong** said that the transport justifications had been thoroughly examined in the two reviews on CRIII. She was of the view that in planning and designing the harbour-front, transport and infrastructure factors would certainly be considered and there was no need to specify “transport infrastructure” per se. On the proposed inclusion of “adjoining areas” into the purview of the HEC, she expressed doubt on whether a clear boundary could practically be mapped out to distinguish the harbour-front areas from its hinterland.

1.10 **Mr Lau Ka-keung** supplemented by saying that over the years, Transport Department had been working very closely with Planning Department in various harbour-front projects. The community, including the District Councils, were fully consulted throughout the process. He saw no need to pinpoint “transport infrastructure” per se in the ToR of the HEC.

1.11 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** did not see the need for the HEC to discuss territory-wide transport infrastructure issues. He added that while the “no reclamation” pledge should be adhered to as far as possible, some reclamation might be required to build the infrastructure to solve the traffic congestion problem.

1.12 **Mr Jimmy Kwok** said that the inclusion of “transport infrastructure” in the ToR might digress the focus of work of the

HEC.

1.13 **Professor Jim Chi-yung** said that the discussion seemed more like a matter of semantics. In any event, the HEC should take a synergistic approach to planning and developing the harbour-front. As “transport infrastructure” was implied, there might not be a need to make an explicit reference. If reference need to be made whatsoever, he suggested to use looser wordings like “road-building designs” and “landscape design”.

1.14 However, **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** said that the HEC’s work would be multi-disciplinary in nature and discussion of harbour-front planning would inevitably touch upon transport infrastructure. As such, he saw no harm in making it clear that the ToR of HEC would cover discussion on “transport infrastructure”.

1.15 **Mr Vincent Ng** said that an integrated approach should be adopted in the planning process and that transport considerations should not be excluded from the process. The HEC should therefore highlight the discussion of the “transport infrastructure” in its ToR.

1.16 **Mrs Mei Ng** suggested that the HEC members should not be constrained by transport or other infrastructural considerations in its deliberations. Only then could the HEC truly “liberate” the Victoria Harbour.

1.17 **Dr Ng Mee-kam** said she felt that the planning process in Hong Kong was too transport-led to the extent that planning became subservient to transport considerations. Therefore, transport infrastructure issues should be discussed by the HEC to ensure that on the one hand, the accessibility of the future waterfront areas would not be hindered by the transport infrastructure to be built in the harbour-front areas, and that on the other hand, the harbour-front could be developed in a balanced manner.

1.18 **Dr Alvin Kwok** agreed that with clearer indication that

the ToR of HEC covered “transport infrastructure”, the HEC could discuss such issues more conveniently in future.

1.19 **Dr Andrew Thomson** said that the harbour-front should be made more accessible to the public and that transport consideration was one of the key issues. He said that a holistic approach should be adopted by the HEC and so “transport infrastructure” should be included in the ToR. He wished that a clearer geographical definition could be worked out to demarcate the boundary of the so-called “adjoining areas”.

1.20 **Mr Patrick Lau** said that relevant District Councils should be consulted first on the transport infrastructure issues before they were brought to the attention of the HEC.

1.21 **Professor Lam Kin-che** proposed that the HEC should among other things, advise on the planning, design and development issues, including land use, transport and infrastructure relating to the existing and new harbour-front and the adjoining areas.

The Revised ToR

1.22 After listening to different views from Members, **the Chairman** said that “transport infrastructure” seemed to refer more to the “hardware” aspect, while planning and development should normally focus more on the “process”. He suggested the ToR to be revised as follows:-

“To advise the Government through the Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands on planning, land uses and developments along the existing and new harbour-front of the Victoria Harbour, with a view to protecting the Harbour; improving the accessibility, utilization and vibrancy of the harbour-front areas; and safeguarding public enjoyment of the Harbour through a balanced, effective and public participation approach, in line with the principle of sustainable development.

Specifically, the HEC will:-

- (a) Provide feedback to and monitor the reviews on the remaining proposed reclamation within the harbour, namely the Wan Chai North and Southeast Kowloon reclamation proposals;
- (b) Advise on the planning, design and development issues including land use, transport and infrastructure, landscaping and other matters relating to the existing and new harbour-front and the adjoining areas;
- (c) Advise on means to enlist greater public involvement in the planning and design of the harbour-front areas; and
- (d) Explore a sustainable framework to manage the harbour-front areas, including public-private partnership.”

1.23 Subject to any further views from Members, the revised Secretary ToR would be adopted as the ToR for the HEC.

B. HEC logo

1.24 **The Chairman** invited Members to comment on the six draft designs annexed to Paper No. 1/2004.

1.25 **Mr Vincent Ng** said that Designs A and B were more acceptable when compared to the other four designs.

1.26 **Dr Alvin Kwok** suggested that the public be invited to vote on the best logo design for the HEC. He hoped that this would foster public participation in the work of the HEC.

1.27 **Dr Ng Mee-kam** said that she preferred Designs A and B. However, they could be improved by including more “human” elements.

1.28 **Mr Steve Chan** supported the idea of involving the public in selecting the HEC logo and suggested that a competition

be held.

1.29 While appreciating the intention of some members to have more public participation in selecting the logo, **Mr Vincent Ng** suggested that the public could be engaged in a more meaningful manner such as the involvement in the “quick-win” projects to improve the harbour-front. **Dr Ng Mee-kam** agreed.

1.30 **Dr Andrew Thomson** suggested that further views could be collated by the Secretary. In response, **the Chairman** asked the Secretary to prepare variations of Design B for Secretary Members’ further consideration.

(Post-meeting note: On 15 May 2004, the Secretary circulated to Members three further revised designs for consideration.)

C. Sub-committees under the HEC

1.31 **Members** noted the tentative meeting schedule and frequency, and agreed that sub-committees might be set up to consider specific issues in-depth. **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** suggested that the sub-committees could cover reviews of Wan Chai North; South East Kowloon; the harbour plan; the transport plans for Hong Kong Island North; and the engineering work of CRIII. **The meeting** considered that sub-committees would be set up to examine the reviews of Wan Chai North, South East Kowloon and harbour plan. As regards CRIII, it was not appropriate to re-open the discussion of the CRIII engineering works. Regarding the transport planning issue, Members also noted that ETWB would brief the meeting on the transport case for the Central-Wanchai Bypass (“CWB”) in the context of the strategic network for the northern shore of Hong Kong Island at the next HEC meeting. **The Chairman** invited the Secretary to work out details of the sub-committees and inform Member of the progress at the next meeting.

Item 2 Protection of the Harbour Ordinance and the Court of Final Appeal Judgment (Paper No. 2/2004)

2.1 The meeting noted that **Mrs Carrie Lam** had covered the main points in the paper.

Item 3 South East Kowloon Development Comprehensive Planning and Engineering Review – Stage 1 Planning Review (Paper No. 3/2004)

3.1 **Mr Raymond Lee** took Members through the paper. He highlighted the background leading to the South East Kowloon Development (“SEKD”) project, the previous reviews conducted and the current Comprehensive Planning and Engineering Review commissioned in the light of the CFA judgment of January 2004. He added that the Review comprised three stages, namely the Planning Review, Engineering Review and Statutory Planning Process, and emphasized that public consultation and participation would be actively conducted at every stage of the Review.

3.2 In response to **Mrs Mei Ng**’s enquiry on whether a representative from the Urban Renewal Authority (“URA”) should be included in the HEC membership to give advice on the planning of old and new districts, **Mrs Carrie Lam** said that considering the size of the HEC, there might not be a need to have a standing member from the URA. However, URA representatives would be invited to attend HEC meetings on need basis.

3.3 **Mr Steve Chan** asked whether representatives from relevant District Councils would be invited to attend the HEC meetings. **Mrs Carrie Lam** said that the HEC would invite representatives from the relevant District Councils to participate in discussions of the relevant development plans as and when appropriate.

3.4 **Ms Starry Lee** volunteered to be the bridge between the HEC and the Kowloon City District Council. **The Chairman**

thanked her for the support.

3.5 **Mr Roger Tang** welcomed that the Comprehensive Review of SEKD would start on the basis of “no reclamation”. However, considering that the Outline Concept Plan would be ready by end 2004, a longer public consultation might be necessary. In response, **Mr Raymond Lee** said that upon incorporating the HEC’s comments into the Study Brief, Planning Department would invite the shortlisted consultants to submit fees and technical proposals. He added that longer public consultation could be arranged although this would result in delays to the review schedule.

3.6 **Mr Vincent Ng** said that ownership by the public should be built through proactive and on-going public participation. In response, **Mr Raymond Lee** said that three rounds of public consultation were now planned for the Planning Review stage alone.

3.7 **Mrs Mei Ng** said that public participation and consultation should be intensified and improved. She suggested that this be discussed further at the next HEC meeting. **Secretary**
Members agreed.

3.8 **The Chairman** invited Members to convey their further comments, if any, on the Comprehensive Review of SEKD to the Secretary within the coming two weeks.

Item 4 Wan Chai Development Phase II – Planning and Engineering Review (Paper No. 4/2004)

4.1 **Mr L T Ma** said that the Wan Chai Development Phase II (“WDII”) project was to make provision for the Trunk Road comprising the CWB and Island Eastern Corridor Link (“IECL”) and their associated connections to the existing road network, the proposed fourth rail harbour crossing and the Hong Kong Island section of the Shatin to Central Link, and the proposed North Hong Kong Island Line. He said that the Review commenced in

March 2004 and would adopt a “minimum reclamation” approach. He stressed that public consultation would be conducted at various stages of the Review to gauge public views.

4.2 **Mr Dickson Lo** of Maunsell Consultants Asia Limited briefed the meeting on some of the possible alignments of the Trunk Road. He said that consultant’s findings on various alignment options within the WD II boundary would be presented to the HEC and the public for further consideration.

4.3 Noting **Mrs Mei Ng**’s wish to take a “free-hand” approach to the WDII Review, **the Chairman** said that the need for the CWB must be recognized.

4.4 **Mr Hardy Lok** queried the need to build the CWB and the IECL Trunk Road, given the alternative of Electronic Road Pricing (“ERP”).

4.5 **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** said that it might be worthwhile to re-visit the overall transport needs of the northern shore of the Hong Kong Island. In response, **Miss Margaret Fong** said that the need for the CWB and IECL Trunk Road was clearly explained to the public and the Legislative Council on various occasions. She added that the Third Comprehensive Transport Study completed in 1999 was re-run in the fourth quarter of 2003 using the latest data. The re-run reaffirmed the transport need for the CWB and IECL Trunk Road.

4.6 **Mrs Mei Ng** suggested to invite the consultant who conducted the ERP study in 2000 to the next HEC meeting to present the relevant technical findings which led to the publication of the final ERP report in April 2001. **Dr Andrew Thomson** specifically requested release of technical papers to supplement the final report and help HEC Members to understand the key assumptions made therein. In response, **Miss Margaret Fong** said that all relevant information had been disclosed for public information. She agreed to brief Members on the final ERP report at the next HEC meeting. As regards the technical papers, she said that they were overtaken by event and might no

ETWB

longer be valid. **The Chairman** welcomed Miss Fong's proposal to present the findings on the ERP study at the next meeting.

4.7 **Mr Steve Chan** said more coordination within the Government was needed, especially with regard to the major transport infrastructure projects. He quoted the Shatin to Central Link as an example to illustrate the need for an overall review as requested by the local community. A thorough consultation would help minimize objection and disruption to the local community during the construction of the transport infrastructure at a later stage.

4.8 After further discussion, **the Chairman** requested Miss Margaret Fong to present the transport case for the CWB ETWB covering also traffic management measures, including ERP, raised by certain groups as possible alternative to the Bypass at the next HEC meeting.

Item 5 Harbour and Waterfront Plan Review (Paper No. 5/2004)

5.1 **Mr Raymond Wong** presented the gist of the Review which comprised three major stages, namely (a) review of the past harbour development principles and overall planning framework in the light of the CFA judgement on harbour reclamation; (b) planning of the new harbour-front land uses; and (c) identification of priority enhancement projects along the existing harbour-front. Examples of potential improvement projects were the Sheung Wan Gala Point, the West Kowloon and the Tsim Sha Tsui East waterfront areas. **The Chairman** Plan D invited representatives from Planning Department and Territory TDD Development Department to brief Members on the potential projects to improve the harbour-front at the next meeting.

5.2 **Mrs Mei Ng** suggested that innovative themes and approach should be adopted in developing the harbour-front. An example would be setting up a "Beer theme park" for public

enjoyment during weekends and holidays. **Mr Vincent Ng** agreed that the traditional approach of involving the public only after the development options were in place was outdated and needed to be changed. More pilot schemes, competitions and workshops should be organized to encourage the local communities to participate in developing the harbour-front.

5.3 In response, **Mr Raymond Wong** assured the meeting that a fresh mind would be adopted and the public had every opportunity to make proposals at an early stage.

5.4 **Dr Alvin Kwok** agreed that harbour-front cafes and alfresco would be good ideas. He said that HEC needed to solicit views from the end-users of the harbour-front as early as possible. He suggested Planning Department to consider organizing more open forums on Sundays to collate public views on the issue.

5.5 **Dr Ng Mee-kam** felt that there should be genuine and enhanced public participation. She suggested involving children and youngsters more in the process as she believed they had a lot of ideas to offer regarding the development of the harbour-front.

5.6 Citing the waterfront of the Central & Western District as an example, **Mr Chan Tak-chor** requested that the Government should accord priority to relocating the public cargo works facilities along the Central & Western waterfront which were not welcomed by the local residents.

5.7 In response to Mr Chan Tak-chor's suggestion, **Mr Raymond Wong** said that the Harbour used to serve a more functional purpose in the past and that it was not uncommon for the existing land use of the waterfront areas to be dictated by historical and economic factors. He said that Planning Department would try to strike a balance in accommodating competing uses when it came to planning of the harbour-front areas. He also remarked that given the impact of any relocation proposals on the livelihood of relevant industries, it would take time to persuade the existing users to leave and be relocated to

Plan D

other places.

5.8 On the Harbour and Waterfront Plan Review, **Mr Bosco Fung** said that priority should be accorded to improving the existing harbour-front areas. While he agreed that Planning Department would try to maximize the development potential of the harbour-front areas for the enjoyment of the public, he cautioned that objection from affected industries currently occupying the harbour-front should not be under-estimated.

5.9 **Ms Starry Lee** quoted the example of the Green Island Cement Plant which refused to relocate despite repeated requests by the local residents. She also conveyed the concerns of the Kowloon City District Council over whether the Hung Hom waterfront would be enhanced.

5.10 **Mr Jimmy Kwok** said that Hong Kong lacked a "continuous" waterfront promenade and that it was important to create a beautiful and attractive harbour-front promenade. Towards this end, minimum reclamation works might be necessitated to beautify the shoreline.

5.11 **Professor Jim Chi-yung** said that Hong Kong might need to take more reference from world-class harbours in Singapore, Tokyo, Shanghai, Sydney and London.

Item 6 Any Other Business

6.1 **The Chairman** invited Members to join the Ferry Tour **All Members** around the Harbour to be held in the afternoon of 12 May 2004.

6.2 Noting that Mrs Carrie Lam would soon leave the Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau, **the Chairman** applauded the excellent works she had accomplished in regard of promoting public participation in Harbour-related issues. He looked forward to working closely with Mrs Rita Lau on the HEC.

6.3 **Mrs Mei Ng** suggested that the issues on marine

transport, including harbour cruise and ferry services should be discussed by the HEC in due course.

6.4 **Dr Andrew Thomson** requested that the meeting be Secretary provided with information on the rough amount of budget for improving the harbour-front.

6.5 There being no other business, the meeting closed at 6 p.m. The next HEC meeting would be held at 2:30 p.m. on 8 July 2004 (Thursday).

**Harbour-front Enhancement Committee
July 2004**