

Fourth Meeting of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee
held at 2:30 pm on 4 November 2004
at 3/F, 3 Edinburgh Place, Central, Hong Kong

Minutes of Meeting

Present

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Professor Lee Chack-fan | Chairman |
| Mr Paul Zimmerman | 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 Kwok-fai, Bernard | Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors |
| Ir Dr Greg Wong Chak-yan | Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers |
| Mr Mason Hung | 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 (“SPH”) |
| Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke | |
| Mr Chan Tak-chor | |
| Dr Chan Wai-kwan | |
| Mr Chan Yiu-fai, Steve | |
| Professor Jim Chi-yung | |
| Professor Lam Kin-che | |
| Mr Lau Hing-tat, Patrick | |
| Ms Lee Wai-king, Starry | |
| Mrs Rita Lau | Permanent Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands) |
| Mr Thomas Chow | Deputy Secretary (Transport)1 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
Miss Christine Chow

Assistant Director of Home Affairs (Acting)
Secretary

In Attendance

Mr Thomas Tso

Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1,
Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau (“HPLB”)
Assistant Secretary (Planning)2, HPLB
Assistant Secretary (Planning)4, HPLB
Project Manager/Hong Kong Island and Islands,
Civil Engineering and Development
Department (“CEDD”)

Mr Raymond Lee

District Planning Officer/Kowloon, Planning
Department (“PlanD”)

Mr Raymond Wong

Chief Town Planner/Sub-Regional Planning
Section, PlanD

Ms Christine Tse

District Planning Officer/Hong Kong, PlanD

For item 3(b)

Ms Christine Loh

SPH

Mr Ian Brownlee

Masterplan Limited

Mr Fred Brown

MVA Hong Kong Limited

For item 4

Ms Eva Cheng

Commissioner for Tourism, Tourism
Commission (“TC”)

Miss Patricia So

Assistant Commissioner for Tourism, TC

For item 5

Mr Raistlin Lau

Principal Assistant Secretary (Environment)1,
Environment, Transport and Works Bureau
Assistant Director (Waste & Water) (Acting),
Environmental Protection Department (“EPD”)

Mr Malcolm Broom

Mr David Wong

Principal Environmental Protection Officer
(Sewage Infrastructure Planning), EPD

Mr W W Chui

Chief Engineer (Harbour Area Treatment
Scheme), Drainage Services Department

Absent with Apologies

Mr Kwok Chun-wah, Jimmy

Mr Wu Man-keung, John

Welcoming Message

The Chairman welcomed Members to the fourth meeting of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (“HEC”).

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the third Meeting

1.1 **The Secretary** had circulated the revised draft minutes of the third HEC meeting held on 9 September 2004 incorporating comments received. There being no further comments, the revised draft minutes were confirmed.

Item 2 Progress reports from the HEC Sub-committees (Paper Nos. 15 – 17/2004)

A. Sub-committee on South East Kowloon Review (Paper No. 15/2004)

2.1 Upon invitation by the Chairman, **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** briefed Members on the progress report. Members noted that the public participation activities on the mapping out of the vision for the development of Kai Tak had commenced, and that a site visit was arranged for Members to the ex-Airport Control Tower, Kai Tak Approach Channel and the former runway.

2.2 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** remarked that the Government should explore and maximize the temporary use of the Kai Tak site for public enjoyment.

**Sub-committee
on SEKD
Review**

B. Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review (Paper No. 16/2004)

2.3 Upon invitation by the Chairman, **Mr Vincent Ng** briefed Members on the progress report. Members noted that a district-based approach to the review of the Harbour Planning Framework would be adopted under which the Harbour would be divided into several districts. Details would be further discussed

at the coming meeting of the Sub-committee.

2.4 On the review of Harbour Planning principles, **Mr Vincent Ng** said that the Task Group convened by Dr Andrew Thomson had agreed on a set of principles which would be further considered by the Sub-committee at its next meeting.

2.5 The meeting noted that the Task Group convened by Dr Alvin Kwok was prepared to engage the public in the beautification of the Central Ferry Piers area. An invitation for tender was being prepared by PlanD and the tendering process was expected to begin shortly. The whole participatory programme was expected to complete in six months' time. Regarding the project to beautify the hoarding outside the works sites of Central Reclamation Phase III ("CRIII"), **Dr Alvin Kwok** expressed his wish to co-operate with the Central & Western District Council ("C&WDC") on the project so as to promote the positive image of the HEC working with local partnership. **Mr Chan Tak-chor** welcomed this idea and said that he would arrange discussion with the C&WDC on the matter. **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested that "see-through" hoarding should be used in order to preserve the visual access to the Harbour at ground level and that street market stalls should be considered to bring vibrancy to the area. This could be included in the area enhancement review.

Sub-committee
on Harbour
Plan Review

2.6 On the size of the Sub-committee, **Mr Vincent Ng** said that the membership should be capped to keep it manageable. In response, **the Chairman** suggested that today's HEC meeting should be the "cut-off" date for HEC Members joining the three Sub-committees. **Members** agreed and endorsed the tabled membership lists.

C. Sub-committee on Wan Chai Development Phase II ("WDII") Review (Paper No. 17/2004)

2.7 Upon invitation by the Chairman, **Mr Leung Kong-yui** briefed Members on the progress report. A planning specialist (City Planning Consultants Ltd.) was hired for the Harbour-front Enhancement Review – Wan Chai and Adjoining Areas ("HER project"). **Mr L T Ma** supplemented that the planning specialist would partner with experts and academics in promoting public participation under the WDII Review.

2.8 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** said that CEDD was preparing a 3-D computer animation model as a baseline model for WDII. The model would be presented to the Sub-committee on WDII Review when available.

CEDD

2.9 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** said that the Sub-committee on WDII Review had decided to issue action minutes to record the follow-up actions required and the gist of its discussions and to upload the audio recording of the proceedings of meetings to the HEC website. **The Chairman** invited Members' views on whether this practice should be extended to the main Committee and the other two Sub-committees.

2.10 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said he understood that it took time and resources to prepare minutes. The inclusion of details of the discussion had also made the minutes rather lengthy. He recommended the action minutes be adopted by the main Committee such that relevant parties could start follow-up actions promptly after the issue of the minutes. **Dr Ng Mee-kam** shared his view as the regular minutes were not intended to be verbatim. Nevertheless, she did not insist that the format of the action minutes should be adopted by the main Committee.

2.11 **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** did not support the adoption of action minutes for the main Committee, considering that it was very important to record the deliberations of the meetings. **Mr Vincent Ng** agreed with Dr Chan as he was also of the view that the recording the views expressed by Members was very valuable from the perspective of public participation. **Professor Lam Kin-che** said that it was important to reflect the due process of deliberations by Members, and to uphold the spirit of full participation by Members in the discussion process. However, he suggested that the minutes of the Sub-committees could be simplified. **Mrs Mei Ng** agreed as the recording of the thinking process was very important.

2.12 After discussion, the meeting agreed that the Secretariat of the main Committee would keep the present format of minutes. Nevertheless, the Sub-committees could adopt a simpler format of minutes as they felt appropriate.

The
Secretariats

2.13 **Dr Alvin Kwok** suggested that the audio recording of

meetings should be uploaded to the website for the benefit of the visually impaired and the illiterate. **Members** agreed.

The Secretariats

Item 3 Matters arising

A. Terms of reference (“ToR”) of the Sub-committees (para. 2.4 of the revised draft minutes of the 3rd HEC meeting refers)

3.1 The meeting noted that the Sub-committees had further considered their respective ToRs and suggested to keep the present versions.

B. Inventory of harbour-front land use (paras. 2.22 and 3.10 refer)

3.2 The meeting noted that on the basis of the presentation to the HEC at its meeting on 9 September 2004, PlanD was preparing an inventory of harbour-front land use by districts. PlanD would regularly update the database and keep Members informed.

PlanD

C. New development proposals along the harbour-front (para. 3.9 refers)

3.3 **The Chairman** noted that the HEC would be consulted on major development projects such as the Cruise Terminal and the Harbour Area Treatment Scheme.

D. Meeting between the HEC and the four District Councils of Hong Kong Island (para. 7.1 refers)

3.4 **The Chairman** reminded Members that the meeting would be held on 5 November 2004.

E. Proposed arrangements on submissions and requests for presentation to the HEC (paras. 2.16 and 2.27(c) refer) (Paper No. 18/2004)

3.5 Upon invitation by the Chairman, **the Secretary** briefed Members on the proposed arrangement as followed. The gist of submissions would first be uploaded to the HEC website for

information. The actual submission materials would be deposited at a library located on 18/F of Murray Building where Members could access as they wished. Quarterly briefings on submissions would be arranged for Members and the first briefing was proposed to be held in December 2004/January 2005. The Sub-committees, however, would enjoy flexibility in deciding whether they wished to discuss the submissions after or in between the briefings.

3.6 The meeting noted Mr Paul Zimmerman's comments that the HEC could and should make recommendations to the TPB on any existing plan or plans under consideration, especially where it related to the enhancement of the harbour-front and its surrounding areas and that the TPB had a duty to consult the public. The HEC, with public representation and focus on and expertise in harbour-front enhancement, was a logical source of consultation. Nevertheless, on the relationship between the HEC and the Town Planning Board ("TPB"), **the Secretary** said that the two bodies had different ToRs. However, as the HEC's purview concerned enhancement of the harbour-front, the TPB would circulate submissions it received on harbour-front related development to the HEC for information. Nevertheless, the HEC was not expected to provide comments.

3.7 **Mrs Mei Ng** raised the following questions on the proposed briefings –

- ◆ whether the proceedings of the briefings would be recorded;
- ◆ whether decisions of the HEC would pre-empt or influence the procedures to be taken by other bodies; and
- ◆ whether the HEC would have enough time to entertain follow-up issues arising from the briefings.

She also cautioned that –

- ◆ "no objection" by the HEC could easily be interpreted as approval by the proponent;
- ◆ the press coverage at the briefings could serve as free advertisement for the proponents; and
- ◆ the draft form at Annex C of the paper seemed to be designed for submissions from commercial bodies.

Furthermore, she suggested that instead of indoor briefings, the HEC should reach out to the districts to hear the submissions as and when appropriate. On this, **Dr Ng Mee-kam** said that the briefings could have parallel sessions if there were plenty of submissions. Members could choose as they wished which

workshop to attend. She suggested that the briefings could be named “Harbour Dialogue” or in Chinese, “維港圍講”.

3.8 Regarding the draft form at Annex C of the paper, **Dr Ng Mee-kam** shared Mrs Mei Ng’s observation and suggested that the form should be revised to accommodate requests from non-commercial parties including students. In line with the sustainability concept, she suggested that proponents should be invited to indicate how their proposals would benefit the society in different aspects. **Mrs Mei Ng** further suggested that proponents should be asked to specify what other bodies they had to or would consult and when.

3.9 **Professor Jim Chi-yung** enquired about how the views of the HEC Members would be conveyed to the proponents. In response, **the Chairman** said that the HEC Secretariat would provide extracts of the record of briefings to the proponents for reference. He believed that discussions by the HEC would not affect the decision of other bodies as they had established procedures to follow. **Mrs Rita Lau** supplemented that using the TPB as an example, the TPB had to follow statutory procedures and deadlines. There was no need for the HEC to adjust its schedule to meet the deadlines as explained in Paper No. 18/2004.

Secretariat

3.10 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** applauded the openness of the proposed arrangement. He said that Members should exercise caution in giving views as such views might be taken by the proponents as a kind of approval or support.

3.11 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** also appreciated the proposed arrangement. He said that the briefings could be called “HEC Town Hall Meetings” but there should be no commitment that the HEC had to hear the submissions. He suggested that the proponents could be invited to further discuss the submissions at the relevant Sub-committees as appropriate.

Secretariats of
the HEC and
the three Sub-
committees

3.12 **Mr Roger Tang** drew Members’ attention to the flow chart at Annex B of Paper No. 18/2004 where it was stated that discussions or presentations at briefings would only be arranged by the Secretariat “upon request by Members”. He sought clarification as to whether all requests for presentation should be entertained or only those requested by Members. **Mrs Mei Ng**

and **Ir Dr Greg Wong** shared his concern.

3.13 In response, **the Secretary** clarified that apart from the requests made by Members, it was up to the proponents themselves to decide whether they wished to present their submissions to the HEC. There would be submissions which were straight-forward and did not warrant a briefing. The flow suggested at Annex B was meant to inject flexibility to the process.

3.14 **Dr Alvin Kwok** suggested amending “upon request by Members” to “upon request by Members or the proponents and subject to approval by the Chairman”. **Mr Vincent Ng** supported the suggestion and said he believed that the mechanism could be reviewed in future as necessary. **Members** agreed.

Secretariat

3.15 **Professor Lam Kin-che** agreed that there was no need for the HEC to entertain all submissions, given the commitment required on the part of the Members. If there were too many submissions, Members should be allowed to decide which ones to entertain. He opined that since briefing for the HEC would not affect any statutory procedures that the submissions had to go through, proponents should be made clearly aware of this.

Secretariat

F. The Society for Protection of the Harbour Limited’s rezoning request on the Central District (Extension) Outline Zoning Plan (“OZP”) (para. 3.3 refers) (Paper No. 19/2004)

3.16 Having regard to the arrangements of handling submissions and requests for presentation that were endorsed under the last item, **Mr Vincent Ng** asked if it was appropriate for the HEC to discuss the rezoning request at this meeting. In response, **Mr Hardy Lok** clarified and **the Chairman** confirmed that the matter was followed up as a matter arising from the discussion at the last HEC meeting.

3.17 Upon invitation by the Chairman, **Mr Hardy Lok**, **Mr Ian Brownlee** and **Mr Fred Brown** briefed Members on the rezoning request proposed by the SPH.

3.18 **Mr Bosco Fung** said that the TPB would follow the established statutory procedures in processing all rezoning

requests, including the one submitted by the SPH in this case. He explained that it was not appropriate for the Administration to give a response to the rezoning request now, lest it would pre-empt the decision by the TPB. Nevertheless, PlanD would brief Members on the planning intention of the Central District (Extension) OZP and to clarify some misunderstandings on the planned land uses on the new reclamation. Upon invitation by the Chairman, **Ms Christine Tse** briefed Members on the background, planning and urban design concepts of the land use proposals of the OZP and the consultation process involved.

3.19 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that he was disappointed by PlanD's presentation as the Department had not taken into account the changed public aspirations to the planning and design of the harbour-front. He said that the size of the Road P2 network was larger than Connaught Road Central and would therefore pose a serious barrier for pedestrian access to the harbour-front. He also criticized the designs of the CR III promenade and the groundscraper, saying that the latter would create "dead zones" at ground level. He suggested that the Government should reconsider the Central District (Extension) OZP and invite the public to take part in the process.

3.20 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** cautioned that the HEC might pre-empt the discussion by the TPB. He said that the HEC should withhold discussion of the subject until the outcome of the TPB's consideration was available.

3.21 **Mr Hardy Lok** said that the Central District (Extension) OZP was approved before the Court of Final Appeal handed down its judgment in January 2004. He was of the view that as the Government had not conducted another round of public consultation after the judgment, the legality and validity of the OZP was dubious.

3.22 In response, **Mrs Rita Lau** said that the OZP was an approved and valid plan and that it would remain so until and unless it was put aside by a court order. She declared interest as she was the Chairperson of the TPB.

3.23 **Mr Vincent Ng** doubted whether the HEC should deliberate on the SPH's or the Government's CR III reclamation proposals. Instead, he believed that the HEC should focus on

such issues as the design and use of the harbour-front and the design of buildings and control over their heights. He reminded Members that the HEC did not play a role in the plan-making process of the Central District (Extension) OZP as it was finalized before the HEC was formed. He called upon Members to focus the discussion on whether more public participation should be enlisted to ensure that the development would satisfy the community's needs.

3.24 Referring to the suggestion discussed under the last agenda item that the TPB would circulate harbour-related submissions to the HEC for information, **Mr Roger Tang** questioned whether the SPH's rezoning request had been referred to the HEC by the TPB. If not, he suggested that there was no need for the HEC to discuss this matter at this meeting. In response, **the Chairman** explained that the rezoning request was a follow-up item as it arose from the discussion at the last HEC meeting.

3.25 **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** said that while there might be an urge among some members of the public that the reclamation extent at Central should be reduced, the TPB should complete the processing of the SPH's rezoning request without interference from the HEC. He reminded Members that the Central District (Extension) OZP had gone through a long planning process and that it had taken into account public aspirations as far as possible. As land would be formed under CRIII, he believed that the HEC should focus on how to ensure that the newly formed land could be put to the best use. If the TPB accepted the rezoning request, a new plan would have to be made and it would have to go through public consultation. On the other hand, if the TPB rejected the request, it would have to provide an explanation. Either way, the public were always free to participate in the discussion on CRIII's land use in the context of the town planning process.

3.26 **Mrs Mei Ng** noted that the main arguments between the SPH and PlanD could be on the size of public areas, sky space and greening provided under the OZP and the number and size of pumping stations required to be reprovisioned along the waterfront. She said that these should be looked at in a holistic manner.

3.27 **Mr Vincent Ng, Dr Ng Mee-kam and Mr Leung Kong-yui** agreed that the HEC should not pre-empt the discussion of the rezoning request by the TPB. Nevertheless, **Mr Leung** said that the Sub-committee on WDII Review would be happy to examine the land use and planning issues of the Central District (Extension) OZP after the TPB had made a decision on the rezoning request. Having said that, he emphasized that the priority of the Sub-committee at this stage was to carry out the HER project. **Professor Lam Kin-che** supported this arrangement.

3.28 **The Chairman** concluded that he fully respected the due process that the SPH's rezoning request would have to go through under the established statutory requirements.

Item 4 Progress of the proposed development of a Cruise Terminal (Paper No. 20/2004)

4.1 Upon invitation by the Chairman, **Ms Eva Cheng** briefed Members on the background and progress of the Government's plan for developing a new cruise terminal facility in Hong Kong. She indicated that according to the preliminary findings of the consultants commissioned by the Government, Hong Kong would need an additional berth in the medium term (2009) and one to two further berths for the long term (beyond 2015). The Government intended to conduct an open Invitation for Proposals ("IFP") exercise to solicit innovative proposals from the private sector for the timely development of a new cruise terminal facility to meet the medium term needs of Hong Kong.

4.2 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** expressed reservation about the IFP exercise, as he believed that it served more of a cosmetic than practical purpose. In the interest of time, he suggested that efforts and resources should be focused on identifying a few locations in the Harbour that would be able to accommodate mega cruise ships.

4.3 **Mr Vincent Ng** said that it was undesirable to leave it to the market to propose the location of the cruise terminal as it would pose uncertainties on the overall planning of the Harbour. As regards public participation, he emphasized that it had to be

conducted before the launching of the IFP exercise.

4.4 In response, **Ms Eva Cheng** said that the Government would need to be open and be prepared to look at innovative proposals from the private sector which could enable timely development of cruise facilities. It would be necessary for Hong Kong to take forward the IFP exercise as soon as possible, otherwise Hong Kong might miss the opportunity to benefit from the growing Asian cruise market and lose out to its competitors. By inviting proposals from the private sector, the public would have the chance to comment on the proposals received, for example, on the location and its implications to traffic and the environment. The tentative timetable was to launch the IFP exercise in around end 2004, and receive the proposals by mid-2005.

4.5 **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** enquired whether the cruise terminal was a designated project under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (“EIAO”) and what planning procedures it had to go through. **Mr Bosco Fung** explained that the proposed development of a cruise terminal would require amendments to a statutory plan. **Dr Chan** suggested that the implementation timetable should take into account the time required for the statutory planning procedures.

4.6 **Mrs Mei Ng** cautioned that consideration had to be given to the possible pollution to the Harbour, say the sewage generated by cruise ships and possible oil leakage. She suggested that the cruise terminal development had to go through the EIAO procedures. The HEC should request that the proper procedures were followed and that the public interest was protected. Separately, apart from promoting such high-end tourism facilities as the cruise terminal, she believed that the Government should also upgrade ordinary ferry services for the general public. **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that cruise ships normally comply with the stringent environmental protection requirements, as stipulated by authorities elsewhere.

4.7 **Dr Alvin Kwok** opined that a sustainable development assessment for the cruise terminal should be conducted to assess not only the economic gains but also other potential impacts the project might have on the community as a whole.

4.8 **Professor Jim Chi-yung** said that as tourism was a major pillar for Hong Kong's economy, he supported the development of high-end tourism facilities such as the cruise terminal. He suggested that the original proposed location at Kai Tak should be revisited and processed in a "fast-track" manner. **Mrs Mei Ng** cautioned that whatever approach was adopted, a due process had to be followed and that studies should be conducted on the possible environmental and traffic impacts arising from the project. In response, **Professor Jim** said that by suggesting to adopt a "fast-track" approach, he also believed that the proper procedures should be followed.

4.9 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** appreciated the urgency to identify an interim solution for the cruise terminal and that the project would create a significant number of jobs. Having said so, he noted that the cruise terminal might take up a sizeable area along the harbour-front and might restrict accessibility to the waterfront. While the project might require supporting facilities, he objected to property development as the sole focus. Believing that tourism and leisure activities such as sailing, fishing, rowing and dragon boat racing would be important users of the Harbour, he tabled a suggestion by the Business Environment Council to carry out a "Living Harbour Review" to determine the future marine users of the Harbour, their demand pattern and their needs for facilities and space. He added that the review should also recommend the implementation strategies.

4.10 **Mr Patrick Lau** said that attention should be paid to the design of the cruise terminal as it would take up a premium site along the harbour-front and become an important point of tourist attraction.

4.11 In view of the already congested waterfront and the competing uses alongside the harbour-front, **Ir Dr Greg Wong** questioned whether it was necessary to locate the cruise terminal within the Harbour. In response, **Ms Eva Cheng** said that feedback from cruise operators had indicated preference to locate the cruise terminal in the core area of Victoria Harbour. She added that for cruises coming to Hong Kong, entering and berthing at the Harbour would be a main attraction in itself.

4.12 **Mr Vincent Ng** said that relevant parties should ensure that the exercise would improve the overall design of the

Harbour. Before the IFP exercise, relevant departments should have conducted a baseline study to assess the potentially feasible locations of the cruise terminal. Furthermore, he emphasized that the cruise terminal should not compromise public accessibility to the harbour-front.

4.13 **Dr Ng Mee-kam** expressed in-principle support to provide more tourism facilities. She believed, however, that the Government could do more research on and foster partnership in the subject. Project proponents should welcome this as they could then obtain more information to prepare their proposals.

4.14 Ms Eva Cheng responded that the Government had conducted a preliminary desktop review of the feasibility of some 30 locations for the development of cruise terminal facilities and the relevant information would be provided in the IFP document for reference by potential proponents.

4.15 In conclusion, **the Chairman** suggested that the TC should take Members' views into account. **Ms Eva Cheng** thanked Members for their comments, and indicated that the Government would carefully consider all relevant views in taking forward the project.

TC

Item 5 Harbour Area Treatment Scheme (“HATS”) Stage 2 (Paper No. 21/2004)

5.1 Upon invitation by the Chairman, **Mr Malcolm Broom** briefed Members on the paper.

5.2 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** expressed support for the project, believing that the Scheme would enhance the Harbour as well as Hong Kong's image as a world-class city.

5.3 **Professor Jim Chi-yung** asked whether the combination of Phases 2A and 2B of the Scheme would save cost and whether the ground-level permanent installation at the waterfront could be constructed underground.

5.4 In response, **Mr Raistlin Lau** said that capital cost saving of combining Phases 2A and 2B was about \$0.4 billion, whereas if the commissioning of Phase 2B could be optimized in

the light of actual needs, the recurrent cost to be saved could amount to \$0.7 billion per year. On the facilities at the Gala Point site of Central, **Mr W W Chui** explained that vertical shafts would be built underground to transfer the sewage from the central and south-western parts to join the flow from the northern part of Hong Kong Island and then convey them to Stonecutters Island for treatment. Basically, the transferal would be done through a deep tunnel system built underground. Only a small access point to the shaft chamber would be constructed on the ground level. The design would ensure that the required facilities would be constructed underground as far as possible.

5.5 In response to **Mr Roger Tang**'s enquiry on whether reclamation would be required and whether, when Stage 2 of the Scheme was implemented, the existing preliminary sewage treatment plants along the Central and Wan Chai waterfront could be removed, **Mr Raistlin Lau** replied that none of the options would involve reclamation. The Government's preferred option was to direct all sewage to the sewage treatment plant at Stonecutters Island for treatment. A site in the vicinity of the existing sewage treatment plant on Stonecutters Island had been identified for accommodating the future expansion of the treatment facilities. As regards the existing preliminary sewage treatment plants along the Central and Wan Chai waterfront, they would still need to be retained on a permanent basis for screening the sewage.

5.6 **Professor Jim Chi-yung** enquired whether, after completion of the Scheme, the water quality of the Harbour would be good enough to resume the cross-harbour swimming competition. **Mr Raistlin Lau** replied that after completion of Stage 2A of the Scheme, most area of the Harbour would be able to meet the statutory water quality objectives and the water would be good enough for organizing *ad hoc* swimming contests such as a cross-harbour swimming competition.

5.7 **Mrs Mei Ng** believed that the Scheme would set a good example for the Pearl River Delta region and said that the permanent footprint of ground level structures should be minimized. She enquired if the Scheme could cater for the need of future population growth and whether it could handle sewage discharged by mega cruise ships.

5.8 In response, **Mr Raistlin Lau** said that the total footprint of the above-ground structure at the Gala Point site of Central was only about 250 square meters and the Administration would continue to explore whether further reduction of the footprint would be possible during the detailed design stage. The Scheme was designed with reference to PlanD's forecast on future population growth and would be able to accommodate full development of the Harbour area and handle the demand arising in the next few decades. On sewage disposal by mega cruise ships, Mr Lau pointed out that following the recent extension of Annex IV of the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships to the HKSAR, the Economic Development and Labour Bureau had been planning to introduce new subsidiary legislation to regulate the disposal of sewage by marine vessels in Hong Kong waters according to the requirements set out therein. He assured Members that the Government would provide necessary assistance to cruise ships regarding the proper disposal of sewage so that they could comply with the new requirements to be introduced.

5.9 In conclusion, **the Chairman** thanked Mr Raistlin Lau, Mr Malcolm Broom, Mr David Wong and Mr W W Chui for the presentation.

Item 6 Any Other Business

A. Meeting Agenda

6.1 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** asked why the Tsim Sha Tsui Area Improvement Study item did not appear in the agenda. **Mrs Mei Ng** also questioned whether the item on cruise terminal was intended to replace the Tsim Sha Tsui item. She asked whether Government departments had priority over other HEC Members in proposing agenda items.

6.2 Upon invitation by the Chairman, **the Secretary** explained that it was an established practice to circulate the draft agenda to Members for comments. Members were always welcomed to propose items for discussion. The item on cruise terminal was initiated by the TC and was included in the agenda as a response to Members' request at the last HEC meeting that the Government should keep the HEC informed of the progress

of the major projects. As regards the Tsim Sha Tsui Area Improvement Study, she explained that a Legislative Council (“LegCo”) Panel on Planning, Lands and Works Information Paper was submitted to the LegCo by HPLB and PlanD on 21 October 2004. This information paper had been distributed to Members for information. The item could be further discussed by the Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review if Members so wished.

**Sub-committee
on Harbour
Plan Review**

B. Date of Next Meeting

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:05 p.m. The next HEC meeting would be held on 13 January 2005 (Thursday).

Harbour-front Enhancement Committee

January 2005