

**2nd Meeting of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee**  
**held at 2:30 pm on 8 July 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 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
Mr Louis H B Loong	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong (“REDA”)
Mr Hardy Lok	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour Limited
Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke	
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 Rita Lau	Permanent Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands)
Mr Thomas Chow	Deputy Secretary (Transport) <sup>1</sup> for the Environment, Transport and Works
Mr Bosco Fung	Director of Planning
Mr Tsao Tak-kiang	Director of Civil Engineering and Development
Mr Lau Ka-keung	Deputy Commissioner for Transport/Planning and Technical Services
Miss Linda Law	Assistant Director of Home Affairs (Acting)

Miss Christine Chow Secretary

**In Attendance**

Professor Lo Hong-kam	Associate Professor / Department of Civil Engineering, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology
Mr Albert Lai	Representing Citizen Envisioning @ Harbour
Mr Thomas Tso	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau
Ms Annie Choi	Deputy Secretary (Transport)3, for the Environment, Transport and Works
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 L T Ma	Project Manager/Hong Kong Island and Islands, Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr Talis Wong	Chief Engineer/Kowloon (2), Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr Raymond Lee	District Planning Officer/Kowloon, Planning Department
Mr Raymond Wong	Chief Town Planner/Sub-Regional Planning Section, Planning Department

**Absent with Apologies**

Dr Ng Mee-kam	Representing Citizen Envisioning @ Harbour
Mrs Aliana Ho	Representing Hong Kong Tourism Board

**Action**

**Welcoming Message**

**The Chairman** welcomed all Members to the second meeting of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (“HEC”). He informed the meeting that REDA had confirmed appointing Mr Louis Loong as their representative, and that with the merger of Territory Development Department and Civil Engineering Department, Mr Tsao Tak-kiang was the new Director of Civil Engineering and Development attending the meeting.

**Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of 1<sup>st</sup> Meeting**

1.1 Minutes of the first HEC meeting held on 6 May 2004

were confirmed.

## **Item 2 Matters arising**

### **A. Terms of reference (“ToR”) of the HEC**

2.1 On Mr Hardy Lok’s suggestion to specify in the ToR that the HEC should comply with the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (“PHO”), **the Chairman** said it was expected that the HEC, as an official advisory body, would fully comply with all laws in Hong Kong. He invited Members’ views on the subject.

2.2 **Mr Roger Tang, Mr Jimmy Kwok, Mr John Wu and Mr Leslie Chen** were of the view that there was no need to revise the ToR. **Mr Hardy Lok** agreed. The meeting endorsed the ToR of the HEC.

### **B. The HEC logo**

2.3 The meeting endorsed the logo. The Secretariat would incorporate the design in the HEC publications.

**Secretary**

### **C. ToR and membership of the HEC Sub-committees**

2.4 **The Chairman** said that three Sub-committees on the Wan Chai Development Phase II (“WDII”) Review, South East Kowloon Development (“SEKD”) Review and Harbour Plan Review would be set up. To ensure efficient and manageable operation of meetings and to facilitate in-depth discussions, the Sub-committee membership should not be too large.

2.5 In response to **Mrs Mei Ng**, **the Chairman** said that Members interested in joining any of the Sub-committees could approach the Secretariat.

2.6 **Mrs Mei Ng** asked whether the advices tendered by the Sub-committee Members would be final or they would need to be confirmed by the main Committee. She also asked whether the Sub-committees should entertain presentations made by the public. In response, **the Chairman** said that the Sub-committees should report back to the main Committee on its major findings and recommendations and that the main Committee would have the final decision on the major

recommendations made by the Sub-committees. The issue on public presentations would be discussed under Agenda Item 8.

2.7 **Mr Vincent Ng** suggested that the Sub-committee meetings should be open to the public. **Mrs Mei Ng** was concerned that the issues discussed might have been reported by the media before they were considered and decided upon by the main Committee. **The Chairman** said that the media attending the Sub-committee meetings should be reminded that the views had to be endorsed by the main Committee.

2.8 While agreeing that the HEC meetings should be transparent, **Mr Nicholas Brooke** doubted if the Sub-committee meetings should be open. Separately, he suggested that the Sub-committee on WDII should examine the interface issues between Wan Chai and the neighboring Central / Causeway Bay. **The meeting** agreed this should be followed up by the Sub-committee on WDII.

2.9 **Mrs Mei Ng** suggested that prior to meetings, broad frameworks should be set out for the respective Sub-committees. **Mr Bosco Fung** said that the Sub-committees' ToRs could be used as the basis of such frameworks.

2.10 **Mr Vincent Ng** suggested that the main Committee should give a directive on the mode of operation of the Sub-committees. **The Chairman** said that he would prefer to defer this to the respective Sub-committees for consideration at their first meetings. **Mr Jimmy Kwok** agreed, but suggested that the first formal Sub-committee meeting be open to public.

2.11 **Dr Alvin Kwok** and **Mr Hardy Lok** suggested that some of the main Committee's house rules such as open meetings could apply to the Sub-committees.

2.12 **Ir Dr Greg Wong** had reservation on opening up the Sub-committees as premature release of proposals still being deliberated might cause confusion to the community and might not be desirable. **Mr John Wu** agreed and suggested keeping the discussion closed but making the minutes open for perusal by the public.

2.13 **Mr Chan Tak-chor** suggested that the matter could be further discussed by the Sub-committees in their first meetings.

2.14 **Dr Andrew Thomson** suggested that the Secretariat should prepare and circulate the house rules for HEC and its Sub-committees for Members' consideration. **Mr Steve Chan** agreed. **Mrs Mei Ng** said the rules should cover open meetings, alternate membership, quorum and voting right.

2.15 **The Chairman** concluded the discussion by saying that he had no objection to opening up the formal Sub-committee meetings. He then invited the Secretary to draft and circulate the house rules for consideration. As regards the quorum, he suggested that it should be no less than 50% of the membership.

**Secretary**

#### **D. Land use around Victoria Harbour**

2.16 **Mr Chan Tak-chor** was concerned that land use proposals such as land fill barging point could damage the Central and Western waterfront. He requested to discuss the issue further at the next HEC meeting and asked the Government to provide an information paper on the major existing and proposed land uses along the waterfront of the Victoria Harbour. He suggested that the HEC should be consulted on land use proposals under planning along the harbour-front. **Mr Steve Chan** said that information on major developments that might include tall buildings along the harbour-front would be useful. **Mrs Mei Ng** said that the monitoring work could be followed up by the relevant Sub-committees where appropriate.

**Plan D**

2.17 In response, **Mrs Rita Lau** said that the existing uses of the harbour-front had gone through the due process of statutory plan making and consultation, as well as the funding approval by the Legislative Council ("LegCo"). While the Government should consult the HEC on development proposals under planning, **Mrs Lau** cautioned that projects that had completed the due process of project authorization and funding approval for construction works, or projects that involved private commercial interests should not be discussed by the HEC.

2.18 **Dr Andrew Thomson** agreed that consideration for setting up a Sub-committee to study the possibility of a Harbour Authority could be further explored later when the HEC became more mature. **Mrs Mei Ng** said that the issue could be revisited under the Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review as necessary.

**Harbour**  
**Plan Review**  
**Sub-**  
**committee**

## **E. Budget on improving the harbour-front**

2.19 **The Chairman** said that the HEC, unlike bodies with specified functions and authority, was not a funding agency with a pool of funds for disbursement to other community organizations. **The Secretary** further explained that the Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau (“HPLB”) had set aside about 4.5 million dollars for the fiscal year 2004-05 to finance activities organized by the HEC or its Sub-committees to enhance the harbour-front, e.g. design competitions on the beautification of the hoardings adjoining the Central Reclamation Phase III (“CRIII”) works site. To deliver the “quick-win” projects, departments would have to absorb the capital and recurrent funding required from their existing resources. Depending on the scope and timing for delivery of the project, HPLB might have to seek additional funding from LegCo to implement the “quick-win” projects.

### **Item 3 Alternate Representation of Members**

3.1 Upon the request of **Mr Hardy Lok, Dr Ng Mee-kam** and **Dr Andrew Thomson**, the **Chairman** considered it reasonable to allow one designated alternate member for non-official members appointed as representatives of the respective member organizations. The name and post of the designated alternate member should be provided to the Secretary after the meeting.

**All Members representing member organizations**

3.2 **Mr Steve Chan** and **Dr Andrew Thomson** further suggested co-opting members at the Sub-committee level. The Chairman said he had no objection. Nevertheless, he suggested that the number of co-opted members should be limited so as to maintain the size of the Sub-committees at a manageable level. **Members** agreed. The Secretary would include this in the house rules.

**Secretary**

### **Item 4 The role of the Central – Wanchai Bypass in the context of the strategic network of northern Hong Kong Island**

4.1 Upon the Chairman’s invitation and with the aide of powerpoint presentation, **Mr Lau Ka-keung** briefed the meeting on the transport planning process and tools as well as the

Central – Wanchai Bypass (“CWB”) and the Island Eastern Corridor Link (“IECL”) Trunk Road. Mr Lau explained that the Third Comprehensive Transport Study (“CTS-3”) model was a scientific and advanced transport planning tool well-customized to the special needs of Hong Kong and the forecasts were updated annually according to the up-to-date basic inputs (including land use planning data). The CWB – IECL Trunk Road was a missing link in the territorial strategic route network and it was urgently needed to solve the traffic congestion problem along the northern shore of Hong Kong Island. Apart from building the Trunk Road, Transport Department (“TD”) had studied the alternative measures such as higher utilization of WHC, extending the MTR to Western District, providing more hillside escalators from Central to Mid-levels, reducing bus trips into Central, imposing loading/unloading restrictions in Central, and applying higher taxes on private cars. None of these alternatives was effective in solving the traffic congestion problems. The implementation of Electronic Road Pricing (“ERP”) had also been studied. ERP and CWB-IECL are complementary measures. ERP could not be a substitute because of the absence of an alternative route for through traffic.

4.2 Upon the Chairman’s invitation, **Professor Lo Hong-kam** said that the CTS-3 model was one of the most advanced models and so its traffic forecasts should be highly reliable. If the CWB – IECL Trunk Road was not built, the traffic situation along the northern shore of Hong Kong Island would face further deterioration.

4.3 **Mr Steve Chan** questioned the reliability of the CTS-3 model and suggested that a 3-D model of Wan Chai should be produced so that the public could better understand the issues involved. **Mr Hardy Lok** requested TD to disclose findings with supporting data of all the traffic studies carried out in the past, including those that supported the construction of the CWB as the most appropriate way to proceed further.

**CEDD**

**TD**

4.4 **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** said that some roads along the harbour-front had deprived the public of the accessibility to the harbour-front. Meeting the transport need aside, the Government should also ensure that pedestrian accessibility would not be compromised. He suggested TD to explore the possibility of implementing ERP in parallel with the construction of the Trunk Road to assess whether that would be more

effective in resolving the traffic congestion problem.

4.5 **Professor Lam Kin-che** said that TD should evaluate the effects of combining all the alternative traffic management measures. **Mr Leung Kong-yui** and **Mr Nicholas Brooke** said that TD should take a holistic approach in searching for a comprehensive solution to the traffic problem.

4.6 **Dr Alvin Kwok** was concerned that the Government's efforts to resolve the traffic congestion problems by building roads might attract more vehicles to the area as a result. **Mr Vincent Ng** said that if the CWB – IECL Trunk Road was needed, the Government should consider its impact on the harbour-front. TD should work closely with Planning Department ("Plan D") to ensure that public accessibility to the future harbour-front would not be compromised as a result of building the transport infrastructure.

4.7 **Mr Roger Tang** proposed to resolve the traffic congestion problem from the land use angle, say by moving the Government headquarters away from the Central Business District.

4.8 **Mr Patrick Lau** said that the HEC should focus on how to improve public accessibility to the harbour-front and not the road works *per se*. **Mr Jimmy Kwok** agreed, saying that while a bypass was needed for the through traffic, HEC's main concern should always be enhancing the accessibility.

4.9 **Mrs Mei Ng** said that among the three solutions to traffic congestion problem, i.e. expansion, diversion and provision of options, the Government seemed to have focused on expansion alone. She proposed that TD should explore the other approaches of diversion and provision of options. For the latter, she suggested building park-and-ride interchange points at the fringe of Central, making available more escalators and expanding the existing ferry network.

4.10 **Professor Lo Hong-kam** said that the existing road network along the northern shore of Hong Kong Island had a structural problem as it did not have alternative routes to fulfill the diversion function. Since all east-west traffic had to use the same Connaught Road Central / Harcourt Road / Gloucester Road Corridor ("the Corridor"), a minor accident could paralyze the whole network and cause great inconvenience to the public.

A bypass was therefore urgently needed under such circumstances.

4.11 **Mr Lau Ka-keung** agreed to Professor Lo's observation. He said that the current road network was susceptible to gridlock, and he quoted examples to show that traffic along the Corridor could easily be reduced to crawling speed or even to a halt as a result of a minor incident. Mr Lau said that further scope in reducing the vehicle fleet was limited as taxes on private cars in Hong Kong was already the highest in the world. Hong Kong already achieved an exceptionally low private car ownership rate and an exceptionally high public transport usage rate. As for ERP, Mr Lau said that an alternative route in the form of a bypass would be required. On the effects of combining all alternative traffic management measures, he said that study showed that the effects would be limited and would not address the inherent problem of low stability and reliability of the Corridor. On accessibility, Mr Lau said that the Government had always kept this goal in the course of designing and implementing the CRIII and WDII projects. Under CRIII, the CWB would be built in the form of a tunnel so that public accessibility to the harbour-front could be enhanced through open spaces on top of the tunnel. There were also other pedestrian passage/ crossings to the waterfront area.

4.12 In conclusion, **the Chairman** said that the issue of enhancing public accessibility to the harbour-front and other details relating to the CWB – IECL Trunk Road could be further discussed by the Sub-committee on WDII Review.

**WDII**  
**Review Sub-**  
**committee**

## **Item 5 Public Participation and Consultation**

5.1 **The Chairman** noted that the two papers on public participation submitted by Citizen Envisioning @ Harbour (“CE@H”) and Dr Alvin Kwok were circulated for Members’ perusal prior to the meeting.

### **A. Sustainable review of Central and Wan Chai harbour-front (Paper No. 7/2004)**

5.2 Upon the Chairman’s invitation, **Mr Albert Lai** presented the paper on behalf of Dr Ng Mee-kam. Mr Lai explained that the Sustainability Review (“SR”) aimed to achieve better integrated planning and design through consensus-building

and enhanced public participation. The Central and Wan Chai area was suggested to test out the relevance and effectiveness of an integrated and comprehensive sustainable impact assessment. This would be done in addition to the existing approach that focused largely on engineering, land use and environmental aspects. **Mr Lai** said that the SR would adopt a holistic view and take into account sustainability in terms of economic, environmental and social/community needs.

5.3 **Mr Lai** added that discussions at public workshops with the professionals and the community should start on the basis that the CWB would be required. The aim of the proposal was to achieve an open consensus-building process through a partnership between the CE@H, HEC and the Government.

5.4 **Mr Lai** further explained that the consensus-building and enhanced public participation would culminate in a one-day “town meeting” at which the views gathered from the public and the proposals formulated through the process would be presented to the Government.

5.5 **The Chairman** noted that CE@H had separately consulted HPLB, ETWB, TD and CEDD on the proposal and it was understood that enhanced public participation could be further deliberated by the Sub-committee on WDII Review.

5.6 **Mrs Mei Ng** said that CE@H’s proposal had a public education value and the Government should support programmes of this nature. She noted, however, that similar public consultation projects had been launched previously and that such projects were mainly targeted at academics/professionals. She suggested that if the project were to be further developed under the WDII Review, more ideas from other organizations should be encouraged and a fair process, including tendering, should be undertaken to engage appropriate agencies for undertaking the project.

5.7 In response, **Mr Albert Lai** said that CE@H had involved community groups at public participation projects such as the charettes at Victoria Park and the public forums on heritage conservation of the Wan Chai district. He said that a town meeting involving 800 members of the public was a major proposal in the SR. He agreed that an effective public participation project should strike a balance between professional and community inputs.

5.8 **Mr Steve Chan** said that an enhanced public participation process could potentially form a model for future harbour planning.

5.9 In response to **Mr Albert Lai**'s request for a clearer view from the Government on whether to support the CE@H proposal, **Mr LT Ma** said that a consultant had already been engaged to conduct the WDII Review and to assist the Government in undertaking the public consultation for the Review. **Mr Ma** added that he would further discuss with the consultant on how best the enhanced public participation programme could be arranged. The scope and procedures of the public participation programme could be mapped out through further discussions at the WDII Sub-committee under the HEC. Resources would need to be identified for the programme and in case specialist input was required, the consultant would have to go through the due process of selecting the specialist, which might include tendering as necessary.

**CEDD**

5.10 **Mr Albert Lai** said that the CE@H's initiative was of good intention and it aimed to partner with the HEC instead of becoming a "sub-contractor" of the WDII Review.

5.11 **Mrs Rita Lau** said that the Government was willing to form partnership with different community organizations with a view to enhancing the harbour-front and promoting public participation. She added that a comprehensive strategy on enhancing public participation was required and suggested that the issue be taken forward by the relevant Sub-committee.

5.12 In conclusion, **the Chairman** said that the overall principle of enhancing public participation was agreed and supported by the HEC. He reiterated, however, that the HEC was not a funding agency. As regards CE@H's proposal, he agreed that the issue should be followed up by the WDII Sub-committee.

**WDII**  
**Review Sub-**  
**committee**

**B. A community participation programme using the partnership experiential community participation model (Paper No. 6/2004)**

5.13 Upon the Chairman's invitation, **Dr Alvin Kwok** presented the paper, highlighting that the proposal was aimed to engage the public through a "partnership model" to design a

better harbour-front around the area fronting the Central Outlying Ferry Piers. The model focused on multi-stakeholder partnership and through exchange of ideas, a consensus would be built to map out the best design. The programme would include workshops, charettes and design competitions. At the end of the programme, a plan would be submitted to the Government for consideration.

5.14 **The Chairman** said that Dr Kwok's proposal could be implemented in the course of developing "quick-win" projects. **Mr Bosco Fung** said that the Government supported proposals to improve public participation and added that details could be discussed in the Harbour Plan Review Sub-committee under the HEC.

Harbour  
Plan Review  
Sub-  
committee

5.15 **Mrs Mei Ng** asked about the role of the professional institutes in the project. **Mr Vincent Ng** expressed his support of the project and said that the Hong Kong Institute of Architects would provide professional input if required.

5.16 **Dr Chan Wai Kwan** said that Dr Kwok's proposal of beautifying the piers should fall within HEC's purview. He hoped that the Government could explore the possibility of absorbing the expenditures through the relevant works projects.

5.17 **Mr Chan Tak-chor** expressed support for the proposal and said that he would recommend co-opting Central and Western District Council ("C&WDC") members to participate in the Harbour Plan Review Sub-committee. He added that C&WDC might be able to provide financial assistance.

5.18 **Mr Roger Tang** suggested the Government to allocate funding to carry out the physical work for the beautification works.

5.19 **Mrs Mei Ng** cautioned that there might be conflict of interest if priority of funding support were to be given to proposals submitted by HEC Members. **The Chairman** said that the principles of due process and accountability would be adopted. He ruled out the possibility of awarding a project to a HEC Member simply because the project was initiated by the Member.

5.20 In conclusion, **the Chairman** said that a fair process was required to implement the ideas proposed. He suggested

Harbour  
Plan Review

and Members agreed that Dr Kwok's project be taken forward by the Harbour Plan Review Sub-committee.

Sub-  
committee

5.21 Referring to the two proposals, **Mr Steve Chan** said that a 3-D model for the Harbour should be produced to facilitate discussions. **Mr Bosco Fung** replied that there was an existing model at the Planning and Infrastructure Exhibition Gallery. For the WDII and SEKD Reviews, the consultants would deliver physical models and 3-D computer animated models to demonstrate the planning proposals as necessary.

Plan D  
CEDD

## **Item 6 The harbour-front, skyline and reclamation**

6.1 Upon the Chairman's invitation, **Mr Hardy Lok** made a presentation to the meeting emphasizing that unless the problems of road planning, design and construction were properly handled, it would be hard for Hong Kong to have a decent harbour-front.

6.2 **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** agreed that parks should be provided along the harbour-front but reminded Members of the legal constraints such as the PHO which required minimum reclamation to satisfy the overriding public need test.

6.3 **Mrs Mei Ng** said she noticed that there were competing demands of developments along the harbour-front from different Government bureaux and departments. She considered that a high level authority might be needed to address this problem and to achieve sustainable development of the harbour-front.

6.4 **Mr Vincent Ng** stressed the importance of an integrated approach of land use and transport planning along the harbour-front. **Mr Patrick Lau** said that landscape design was given priority in transport planning in the Mainland. He considered that HEC should help to cultivate a similar culture in Hong Kong.

6.5 **Mr Leslie Chen** said that apart from the discussion on reclamation, a more pressing need was to consider how to improve public accessibility to the harbour-front. **Mrs Mei Ng** quoted an example of an artificial beach in Changsha of Hunan Province, where people could easily access and families could spend time together. She remarked that we should bring romance and family life to Hong Kong's harbour-front as well.

6.6 **Mr Lau Ka-keung** said that the contribution made by the road networks to Hong Kong's economic development should not be underestimated. CRIII and WDII were planned to meet the higher current public aspiration for environmentally friendly and sustainable designs in the adoption of an underground configuration.

6.7 **Professor Jim Chi-yung** said that in future there should be a high quality and continuous promenade along the harbour-front with good connection to the hinterland and that trees should be planted along the promenade. The HEC should aim at attaining this goal.

6.8 **Ir Dr Greg Wong** commented that meeting transport needs and making the harbour-front a nice place to go were goals that could co-exist. **Mrs Mei Ng** believed that an open and transparent HEC would enhance public awareness about the importance of the harbour-front. In conclusion, **the Chairman** thanked Mr Lok for the enlightening presentation.

#### **Item 7 The final report of Designing Hong Kong Harbour District (Paper No. 8/2004)**

7.1 Upon the Chairman's invitation, **Dr Andrew Thomson** presented the report, which was the result of a six-month initiative to build consensus on sustainable planning for the Harbour. The report contained recommendations on, among other things, principles of land use and design, transport policy and infrastructure, institutional arrangements and implementation. **Dr Thomson** invited HEC to endorse the principles laid down in the report.

**Harbour**  
**Plan**  
**Review**  
**Sub-**  
**committee**

7.2 **Mr Vincent Ng** said the views in the report were viable. He asked why the Government had responded so quickly against the setting up of a statutory Harbour Authority. In response, **Mrs Rita Lau** said that the Government had been able to give a ready response because the idea had been examined in the previous planning study by PlanD on the Harbour and the waterfront areas. All factors, including legal, fiscal, land and planning ones, had to be taken into account in considering whether a Harbour Authority was the best model for Hong Kong. While the Government would not rule out the possibility of revisiting the policy on the subject in the long term, there was no

plan to set up a statutory body in the mean time.

7.3 **Mr Vincent Ng** asked whether the Government had considered adopting the same approach as in the case of the West Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD) Development for the harbour-front projects. In response, **Mrs Rita Lau** said that all development proposals had to go through the due process and an open and transparent statutory procedure including funding approval from LegCo. As a general rule, the Government would always adopt an optimal mode of implementation taking into account views from the community.

7.4 Referring to the WKCD and Lantau projects, **Mr Roger Tang** asked about the possibility of setting up an equally high-level authority to steer the development of the harbour-front. **Mrs Mei Ng** agreed that an independent body such as a Harbour Authority should be established. **Professor Lam Kin-che** said that better coordination within the Government could help to improve the implementation of development projects. **Mr Patrick Lau** said that the proposal might have financial implications and so he suggested that the issue of institutional changes should be further studied by the relevant Sub-committee.

**Harbour**  
**Plan**  
**Review**  
**Sub-**  
**committee**

7.5 **The Chairman** said that the Government could consider the above views. In reply, **Mrs Rita Lau** said that the need for an institutional change could be reviewed in due course, taking into account the experience of the work of the HEC and the political, social and economic considerations.

## **Item 8 Any Other Business**

### **A. Submissions/Presentations to the HEC**

8.1 Upon invitation by the Chairman, **the Secretary** reported that less than ten enquiries were received from the public, including private developers who wished to present to the HEC prior to making a formal submission to the TPB. Save our Shoreline had also requested for a presentation of the report on development of the shorelines to the HEC. The request was declined because the coverage of proposals therein far exceeded the terms of reference of the HEC.

8.2 **Dr Alvin Kwok** said that he had reservation on whether HEC should entertain submissions with commercial interests.

**Mrs Mei Ng** added that private firms should be reminded that consultation with HEC was no more than a dialogue that should not cause a binding effect or any influence to the decisions of other statutory bodies such as the TPB. **Dr Andrew Thomson** cautioned against entertaining presentations from private firms, or else HEC would become a “lobbying” target. He was concerned that the HEC should make sure that there was a clear process for entertaining presentations from private firms. The Business Environment Council (“BEC”) was not against submissions from private firms – they had the same rights as every member of the public – the BEC’s concern was to ensure a quality process for managing the presentation of submissions and how the HEC managed its precious meeting time well.

8.3 **Mrs Rita Lau** added that HEC should not entertain submissions involving private/commercial interests or projects that had completed the due process of project authorization and funding approval for construction works. In conclusion, **the Chairman** asked the Secretary to take the above into account in drafting the house rules.

Secretary

## **B. Central Reclamation**

8.4 **Mr Hardy Lok** tabled the letter by the Society for Protection Harbour Limited dated 7 July 2004 to the Government on the extent of the CRIII reclamation, in response to a recent report by a Chinese-language newspaper. He asked whether additional land would be reclaimed and whether variation orders were issued to the contractor for this purpose.

8.5 **Mrs Rita Lau** replied that the newspaper report was factually incorrect. The Government had issued a press statement to clarify that there would not be any increase to the reclamation extent of CRIII. **Mr L T Ma** supplemented that no additional reclamation would be required to build the military berth. He said that a variation order had been issued for dredging of the sea-bed as site preparatory works but not additional reclamation.

8.6 **Mr Vincent Ng** thanked Mr Lok for drawing HEC’s attention to the issue. Nevertheless, he was of the view that the HEC would not be a proper forum to discuss such technical issues. He doubted if it was necessary or appropriate at all for HEC to follow up. **The Chairman** agreed.

### **C. Date of Next Meeting**

8.7 There being no other business, the meeting closed at 7:30 p.m. The next HEC meeting would be held at 2:30 p.m. on 9 September 2004 (Thursday).

**Harbour-front Enhancement Committee**

September 2004