

**Fifth Meeting of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee
held at 2:30 pm on 13 January 2005
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 ("BEC")
Mr Leung Kong-yui	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Dr Ng Mee-kam	Representing Citizen Envisioning@Harbour ("CE@H")
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 Kim O Chan	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
Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke	
Mr Chan Tak-chor	
Dr Chan Wai-kwan	
Mr Chan Yiu-fai, Steve	
Mr Kwok Chun-wah, Jimmy	
Professor Lam Kin-che	
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) 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
Mr Patrick Li Assistant Director of Home Affairs
Miss Christine Chow Secretary

In Attendance

Mr Thomas Tso Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1,
Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau (“HPLB”)
Mr Andrew Cheung Assistant Secretary (Planning)2, HPLB
Mr L T Ma 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

For item 5

Mr Wilson Fung Deputy Secretary (Economic Development)2,
Economic Development and Labour Bureau
 (“EDLB”)
Mr Darryl Chan Principal Assistant Secretary (Economic
Development)A2, EDLB
Miss Priscilla Lam Chief Operations Officer (Technical
Administration), Civil Aviation Department
 (“CAD”)
Miss Alison Wong Senior Operations Officer (Statistics),CAD
Ms Christine Tse District Planning Officer/Hong Kong, PlanD

Absent with Apologies

Professor Jim Chi-yung
Mr Lau Hing-tat, Patrick

Action

Welcoming Message

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

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the fourth Meeting

1.1 **The Secretary** had circulated the revised draft minutes of the fourth HEC meeting held on 4 November 2004 incorporating comments received. There being no further comments, the revised draft minutes were confirmed.

Item 2 Progress reports from the three Sub-committees (Paper Nos. 1 – 3/2005)

A. Sub-committee on South East Kowloon Development (“SEKD”) Review (Paper No. 1/2005)

2.1 Upon invitation by the Chairman, **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** presented the progress report. Members noted that the views collected during the public participation sessions were diverse. For instance, there were views both supporting and objecting to reclamation to the Kai Tak Approach Channel.

2.2 In response to Mr Paul Zimmerman’s question as to how the findings of the SEKD Review could dovetail the findings of other development projects inside the Harbour, **the Chairman** said that the issue could be discussed under agenda item 7 “Integrated planning for Victoria Harbour”.

**Sub-committee
on Harbour
Plan Review**

B. Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review (Paper No. 2/2005)

2.3 Upon invitation by the Chairman, **Mr Vincent Ng** presented the progress report. Members noted that the framework of the Harbour Plan Review would be further discussed by the Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review on 26 January 2005 and would be presented to the HEC in due course. The beautification work of the hoarding outside the Central Ferry Piers carried out by CEDD was reported to be completed. Separately, CEDD and Architectural Services Department were finalizing the design of the temporary waterfront promenade at the site of West Kowloon Cultural District.

C. Sub-committee on Wan Chai Development Phase II (“WDII”) Review (Paper No. 3/2005)

2.4 Upon invitation by the Chairman, **Mr Leung Kong-yui** presented the progress report. Members noted that preparatory

work was largely completed for the Envisioning Stage of the public engagement exercise “Harbour-front Enhancement Review (“HER”) – Wan Chai and Adjoining Areas” and the specialist consultant had suggested to the Sub-committee on how to collect public views on the design of the harbour-front they wished to have. The specialist consultant had also prepared a framework on how to work with collaborators to develop a list of sustainability indicators to assess the various options to be proposed by the public. The meeting noted that a workshop with the collaborators would be held on 23 January 2005 and that Mr Leung would meet the press on the same day to mark the launching of the Envisioning Stage. Questionnaire surveys, public forums, and charettes would also be arranged. A summary of the public views collected would be reported to the HEC at its meeting on 5 May 2005.

**Sub-committee
on WDII
Review**

2.5 **Mr Leung** added that some suggested amendments to the scope of the HER project were considered at the Sub-committee meeting of 14 December 2004 but the meeting voted that no change was required. **Paul Zimmerman** noted that it was in fact the official members who blocked a recommendation made by unofficial members to amend the scope of HER. As it is the mandate of the HEC to make recommendations, he recommended that HEC re-thought its operating procedures – as the Government could effectively stop recommendations to be made to itself.

Item 3 Matters arising

A. The Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review to discuss the district-based approach to the review of the Harbour Planning Framework (para. 2.3 of the revised draft minutes of the 4th HEC meeting refers)

3.1 The meeting noted that the issue was covered by the progress report of the Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review.

B. The Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review to discuss the Harbour Planning Principles (para. 2.4 refers)

3.2 The meeting noted that the issue would be discussed under agenda item 4 “Review of Harbour Planning Principles”.

C. The Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review to discuss the beautification of hoarding outside the works sites of Central Reclamation Phase III (para. 2.5 refers)

3.3 The meeting noted that the issue was covered by the progress report of the Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review.

D. The Sub-committee on WDII Review to conduct the HER project (paras. 2.7 and 2.8 refer)

3.4 The meeting noted that the issue was covered by the progress report of the Sub-committee on WDII Review.

E. PlanD to prepare, update and inform Members of the inventory of harbour-front land use by districts (para. 3.2 refers)

3.5 The meeting noted that the issue was covered by the progress report of the Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review.

F. HEC to arrange briefings (paras. 3.7 to 3.15 refer)

3.6 The meeting noted that the first HEC briefing took place on 5 January 2005.

G. The Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review to further discuss the Tsim Sha Tsui Area Improvement Study (para. 6.2 refers)

3.7 The meeting noted that the issue was covered by the progress report of the Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review.

3.8 On paragraphs 3.27 and 3.28 of the revised draft minutes of the 4th HEC meeting, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested that the HEC should be allowed to provide comments to the Town Planning Board (“TPB”) on rezoning requests it had received or otherwise at any time it wished to do so. **The Chairman** reminded the meeting that this issue had been discussed in previous HEC meetings.

3.9 Regarding the rezoning request on the Central District (Extension) Outline Zoning Plan (“OZP”) submitted by the

Society for Protection of the Harbour Limited (“SPH”) to the TPB, **Mr Hardy Lok** expressed disappointment that the TPB had refused the SPH’s request to hear the rezoning request through an open session. The reason cited by the TPB secretariat was that the Amendment Ordinance had yet to come into effect.

3.10 In response, **the Chairman** noted that the TPB’s procedures of work were not relevant to the discussion of the HEC. He believed, however, that the rezoning request submitted by the SPH would be processed by the TPB in accordance with the established procedures. **Mr Bosco Fung** said that the rezoning request would be duly considered by the TPB. From the legal perspective, it was not appropriate for the TPB to accede to the SPH’s request for open hearing before the Amendment Ordinance came into effect. Rezoning requests received by the TPB prior to the Amendment Ordinance coming into effect would be processed under the existing procedures.

3.11 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** said that the HEC was still on a learning curve and that he would have no objection to revisit the SPH’s rezoning request by applying the Harbour Planning Principles to be discussed under agenda item 4, after the TPB had come to a decision on the SPH’s rezoning request. **Dr Ng Mee-kam** said that the HEC could consider the SPH’s rezoning request separately at the same time when the TPB considered the case. While wishing that the TPB’s decisions on the rezoning requests submitted by the SPH and Save Our Shorelines could come sooner rather than later, **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** said that he would respect the TPB’s decisions following the due process.

3.12 **Mrs Rita Lau** acknowledged that this might not be an appropriate occasion to respond to the subject. Nevertheless, since Mr Hardy Lok had initiated the discussion, she commented that the TPB had to be extremely careful in exercising discretion for the reason of parity. As a statutory body, the TPB had to act lawfully. In the SPH’s case, it was up to the proponent to decide whether they wished the TPB to process their rezoning request according to the existing procedures or to re-submit a fresh application under the Amendment Ordinance.

Item 4 Review of Harbour Planning Principles (Paper No. 4/2005)

4.1 **Mr Vincent Ng** said that the Harbour Planning Principles were endorsed by the Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review at its meeting on 24 November 2004. Upon his invitation, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** presented the paper.

4.2 **Dr Ng Mee-kam** said that some of the principles appeared more like aspirations or desired outcomes rather than principles *per se*. If there was to be a priority among the principles, she would rank the sustainability principle first in the order. She undertook to bring the principles back to CE@H for further discussion. In response, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the Task Group on Harbour Planning Principles had met many times to consider the principles and visions on the Harbour advocated by other organizations including the vision statement promulgated by the TPB. The Task Group had gone through a “filtering” process to arrive at the principles in their present form. He agreed that indeed some principles were related to visions and aspirations and others more to mission and process.

4.3 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** suggested that more parties should be involved in the consultation of the principles, apart from the organizations mentioned in the paper. The public should also be engaged before the principles were finalized. Separately, he wished that the HEC would only “accept” but not “adopt” the principles at this stage so that he could consult the member organization he represented. **Mr Paul Zimmerman** agreed, saying that the principles could be consulted and tested through the on-going consultancy studies to help the public to have a better understanding of the principles.

4.4 **Dr Ng Mee-kam** suggested that the principles should be uploaded to the HEC website and diffused in the community to get public views and that the principles should be made easily comprehensible to the general public.

**Sub-committee
on Harbour
Plan Review**

4.5 **Mr Chan Tak-chor** said that many areas along the Central & Western waterfront had been occupied for uses not preferred by local residents and agreed that public consultation on the principles was needed.

4.6 In response, **Mr Vincent Ng** recapped the preparatory and discussion work that the Task Group had gone through, and

said that the Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review had accepted that the principles would be a “living” document that was subject to amendments when necessary. He recommended that the principles be accepted by the HEC as a draft document for further consultation with the member organizations of the HEC and the general public.

4.7 **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** noticed that the proposed principles were similar to the TPB’s Vision Statement for Victoria Harbour and agreed that they should be accepted, rather than adopted, by the HEC for further public consultation. He said that the principles were dynamic and living in nature and could be further developed and improved in the future.

4.8 **Mrs Mei Ng** said that some of the principles were more like “core values” than “principles”. There appeared to be omissions in such aspects as the quality of life, biodiversity and greening. She believed that the principles should first be applied and tested in the relevant Sub-committees before they went through the process of public consultation.

4.9 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** said that the principles were very important as they could provide a framework for the HEC to consider issues related to harbour-front development in the future. He also agreed that the principles could be accepted by the HEC as a “working draft” before they were released for public consultation.

4.10 **Professor Lam Kin-che** suggested that there should be a trial period during which the principles could be applied and tested. After the trial period, the principles could be amended before they were considered for formal adoption by the HEC.

4.11 **Mr Jimmy Kwok** said that the principles should be perceived as a draft and a basis for public consultation and consensus-building rather than as the end product. **Mr Chan Tak-chor** agreed, saying that he would forward the principles to the Central & Western District Council for consideration. **Mr Vincent Ng** agreed to the suggestions made and remarked that the acceptance of the principles as a working draft would provide a basis to start the public consultation process.

4.12 In conclusion, **the Chairman** said that a set of Harbour

Planning Principles was needed to guide the work of the HEC. He agreed that the HEC should accept the principles as a working draft and that they should go through public consultation with the District Councils, the TPB and other concerned bodies. He also agreed to Mr Steve Chan's suggestion of having a Chinese version of the principles to facilitate consultation. Comments should be directed to the Secretary of the Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review.

4.13 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** suggested that the principles could be tested in the public participation activities to be staged in February and March 2005 under the HER project to be steered by the Sub-committee on WDII Review. The results would be reported back to the HEC at its meeting of May 2005. **Mr L T Ma** said that the planning specialist hired for the "HER" project would work with a number of collaborators to prepare a set of sustainability indicators for the public engagement process. He believed that the principles and the sustainability indicators could provide cross reference to one another.

Item 5 Proposed Domestic Heliport Development (Paper No. 5/2005)

5.1 Upon invitation by the Chairman, **Mr Wilson Fung** briefed Members on the Government's proposal to establish a permanent heliport for domestic helicopter services near the Central Business District ("CBD").

5.2 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the BEC supported the development of a heliport for domestic services. However, instead of earmarking more than one heliport for different uses, he believed that there should be a single heliport for Government Flying Service ("GFS"), domestic and cross-boundary commercial uses. He believed that the Government should first carry out an integrated study to determine a long term and comprehensive plan for all helicopter facilities required around the harbour and a clear set of principles for the placement and design of the necessary facilities.

5.3 **Mr Chan Tak-chor** said that the Central & Western District Council had considered the Sheung Wan proposal but found that the location was not ideal as it was next to the Sun Yat

Sen Memorial Park and in close proximity to residential areas. The proposed heliport at Sheung Wan might have flight path problems with regard to the existing cross-boundary heliport at Macau Ferry Terminal. Mr Chan suggested that the temporary heliport at the WKCD site should be turned into a permanent facility.

5.4 **Dr Alvin Kwok** said that he had great reservation about the proposal. It reflected that the Government had adopted a “linear thinking” approach to handle the heliport issue and had failed to use a “lateral thinking” approach to consider if other economic activities could better suit the Sheung Wan site. Apart from depriving the public of the opportunity to enjoy the harbour-front, the heliport development would only benefit a small group of people and was not in line with the mass transport mode proposed by the Government to meet the future transport needs. He opined that the heliport could be located at other sites, such as next to the Disneyland, where the tourists might not find it unacceptable.

5.5 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** recognized the need to develop cross-boundary helicopter services. For domestic services, he doubted if it was necessary to locate the heliport close to the CBD and whether there was a need to provide the “Airport-to-CBD” helicopter service. He was sympathetic to the Central & Western District Council’s objection to the Sheung Wan proposal considering that the cross-boundary heliport was already located at the Macau Ferry Terminal.

5.6 **Mr Jimmy Kwok** agreed that there was a need to provide cross-boundary helicopter services. He opined that the commercial operators should switch to twin-engine helicopters so that they could land on elevated structures or rooftops instead of ground-level sites along the waterfront.

5.7 **Mr Vincent Ng** said that the Sheung Wan site was not a good one in terms of urban design as the possibility of providing for a continuous promenade or other good designs along the waterfront might be compromised.

5.8 Believing that there was a need to have a permanent site for domestic helicopter services and that no residents would welcome a heliport inside their own district, **Mr Nicholas**

Brooke said that the Government should try to work out a development proposal that was least intrusive to the harbour-front.

5.9 **Dr Ng Mee-kam** suggested that the heliport could be built on top of a sightseeing tower in the Kai Tak area.

5.10 **Mr Hardy Lok** said that his personal experience of the heliports in many other cities was that they were close to their CBDs and were located along the waterfront. He believed that the proposed heliport should also be located close to the CBD along the waterfront.

5.11 In response, **Mr Wilson Fung** said that the Government had always been trying to find a development proposal that was least intrusive to the harbour-front. The Sheung Wan site was the best proposal as it could meet various requirements and was the best outcome of a thorough site search exercise. It was close to the CBD and should be acceptable to the commercial operators. The Legislative Council (“LegCo”) Panel on Economic Services had indicated clearly that there was a need to develop a permanent heliport for domestic services in the CBD. He said that the existing heliports at the ex-Wan Chai Public Cargo Working Area and WKCD site were only temporary ones. The proposed heliport in Sheung Wan would be the only domestic heliport for commercial operation in the Harbour area. If the LegCo and the HEC supported the Sheung Wan proposal, the Government would conduct the statutory environmental impact assessment to ensure compliance with all relevant requirements. According to both overseas and local experiences, single-engine helicopters were used for domestic services as they were less noisy and less expensive. Mr Fung hoped that the HEC would support the proposal.

5.12 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the Government had not provided the HEC with sufficient information on the subject. He suggested that the Government should prepare an integrated heliport plan for the harbour as a whole, and for each site it should demonstrate how it meets the harbour-front enhancement principles.

5.13 **Mrs Mei Ng** said that the Government should pay regard to the safety of providing helicopter sightseeing service. On the

other hand, the heliport should be developed in the larger context of tourism development taking into account such factors as the location of the future cruise terminal.

5.14 In response, **Mr Wilson Fung** said that more than 10 sites had been carefully considered by the Government in various site search exercises. He undertook to provide the HEC with these findings. While the Government was open to consider locating the heliport at the HKCEC Extension site, he reminded Members that reclamation might be needed, and cautioned that this might not meet the “overriding public need test” specified by the Court of Final Appeal, particularly when there was an alternative site at Sheung Wan that did not require any reclamation.

EDLB

5.15 In response to Mr Leung Kong-yui’s question on the number of heliports planned to be located inside the Harbour and whether GFS would use the HKCEC Extension site, **Mr Wilson Fung** said that only one heliport – the one at Sheung Wan – had been planned for domestic services. The HKCEC Extension site, given its proximity to the Police Headquarters, was intended for GFS use for emergency and security operation. Separately, the Government was considering the possibility of developing a cross-boundary heliport at the future cruise terminal at Kai Tak to make use of the CIQ facilities and create synergy with the tourism function of the area.

5.16 In response to Mr Paul Zimmerman’s request for shared use of the proposed HKCEC Extension heliport by both the GFS and commercial operators, **Mr Wilson Fung** said that in response to the concerns of the LegCo, the Government had committed that the proposed heliport was only intended for emergency and security uses and that the number of movements would be kept to the minimum. Given the limited scale of the heliport, it would not be able to provide the level of service and facilities required for commercial domestic services.

5.17 In conclusion, **the Chairman** said that the concern of the HEC was how the heliport proposal would affect the design and development of the harbour-front. In response to the Chairman’s invitation, **Mr Wilson Fung** agreed to revert to the HEC on the heliport issue after it had consulted the Central & Western District Council and the LegCo.

EDLB

Item 6 Living Harbour Review by CE@H (Paper No. 6/2005)

6.1 Upon invitation by the Chairman, **Dr Ng Mee-kam** presented the paper.

6.2 **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** supported the proposed Living Harbour Review by CE@H and enquired about the possibility of designating different “water zones” in the Harbour similar to OZP zonings. He opined that the review should include a public participation process and that the findings of the review could facilitate further studies on the use of the Harbour for various purposes, in particular the tourism-related activities. **Mr Nicholas Brooke** said that interface between the land and water areas of the Harbour should be carefully considered and suggested that the Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review could follow up on the matter.

6.3 In response, **Mr Bosco Fung** explained that PlanD had previously conducted a number of studies and consulted the public on various marine-related planning and uses, including the Hong Kong 2030 Study, the Harbour Plan Study, and the South East and South West New Territories Development Strategy Reviews. He suggested that before deciding whether to initiate yet another study, PlanD could first present the findings of these studies to the Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review to facilitate Members to consider the way forward. In response to Mr Vincent Ng’s enquiry on the timing of the presentation, **Mr Raymond Wong** said that the presentation would be conducted as soon as possible at the Sub-committee’s forthcoming meeting, having regard to the time required for the necessary preparatory work.

PlanD

6.4 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested that marine users and representatives from Marine Department should be invited to attend the Sub-committee meeting. He doubted if there were many marine users and sufficient understanding of marine issues within the HEC membership itself. **Mr Bosco Fung** suggested that the Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review could first revisit the findings of the previous studies conducted by PlanD before making a decision on the way forward.

**Sub-committee
on Harbour
Plan Review**

6.5 Regarding Dr Chan Wai-kwan's suggestion of formulating an OZP especially for the water area of the Harbour, **Mr Raymond Wong** considered that as buildings and other forms of construction were involved on land for different development purposes, a more explicit land use should be defined for better planning coordination and a stricter control was thus required. The use of waterbodies was far more flexible as no building works were involved on water. He was doubtful on the need for and suitability of providing statutory planning control on the use of water in the same manner as that applied on land.

Item 7 Integrated Planning for Victoria Harbour by BEC (Paper No. 7/2005)

7.1 Upon invitation by the Chairman, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** presented the paper.

7.2 **Mr Bernard Chan** said that the various land uses developed in the past might not satisfy the current aspirations of the community. He opined that the feasibility of a project was very important and that there was a need to take the sustainability approach in planning and development. While noting Mr Paul Zimmerman's proposed integrated planning for Victoria Harbour, Mr Chan opined that it was equally important to formulate an implementation strategy on the development along the waterfront.

7.3 **Mr Bosco Fung** said that PlanD had already formulated an integrated harbour plan. PlanD completed and promulgated the Planning Study on the Harbour and its Waterfront Areas in early 2003 and extensive public consultation was carried out during the study process. As planning was a continuous process with a view to meeting the economic, environmental and social needs of the changing community, he agreed that the Harbour Plan needed to be reviewed in light of the Court of Final Appeal's judgment on reclamation and the community's new aspiration for the Harbour. In fact, PlanD had conducted many planning reviews with a view to providing a framework to integrate different land use proposals. While noting Mr Paul Zimmerman's idealistic approach of overhauling all existing plans and drawing up grand master plans afresh, Mr Fung

remarked that in reality we needed to do things in an incremental way. He suggested that the Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review should first stock-take existing and planned developments along the harbour-front and then focus on the constraints and development opportunities for the various districts.

**Sub-committee
on Harbour
Plan Review**

7.4 **Mr Thomas Tso** echoed Mr Fung's views that the Government had always adopted the mindset of integrated planning. Given the limited supply of land along the harbour-front and the competing uses, it was understandable that there were mixed uses at waterfront locations as a result of balancing of demands from various users and the needs of the community. He expressed strong reservation over the proposal of a total "overhaul" of the existing uses, as the existing activities in the Harbour could not be simply brushed aside, and over the idea of holding up all proposed developments before a new consensus in the community was secured. He agreed to the Chairman's proposal that the matter should first be discussed at the Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review.

**Sub-committee
on Harbour
Plan Review**

7.5 **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** said that the implementation of harbour-front planning would touch upon the issue of institutional mechanism as the review progressed. He considered it appropriate for the HEC to provide a platform for such discussion in the future, and that the format should include both large-scale conferences and small-scale expert groups. In response, **Mr Vincent Ng** said that the issue of institutional mechanism was already included in the task list of the Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review and that the Sub-committee would consider this issue in due course.

**Sub-committee
on Harbour
Plan Review**

7.6 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** said that the overseas models might not be directly relevant to Hong Kong, and that a model should be "tailor-made" taken into account our special situation. **Dr Ng Mee-kam** agreed that a tailor-made framework should be carefully worked out. She said that the suggestion to conduct a total re-planning of the harbour-front might be based on the assumption that large areas of the land along the waterfront was owned by the Government.

7.7 **Ir Dr Greg Wong** advised that the proposed establishment of a harbour authority would involve a lengthy

preparatory process and community debate as well as legislative amendments, so any proposals for major changes should be considered with care before implementation. He believed that a thorough analysis of the existing establishment should first be conducted before deliberating on the way forward.

7.8 **The Chairman** noted that the Harbour Plan Study had also examined overseas harbour authorities. He suggested that PlanD should first provide a summary of the previous studies on the subject for consideration by the Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review. **Mr Bosco Fung** agreed.

PlanD

7.9 In response, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** thanked the Chairman and Members for the views expressed. He believed that the Government should consider the institutional arrangement, to adopt an integrated planning process, and to develop an enhancement strategy on all the land and facilities adjacent to the harbour-front. He considered that PlanD should identify all land uses and review the entire inventory of known waterfront developments and then work with the community to develop an implementation strategy. In response, **Mr Raymond Wong** said that PlanD was developing an inventory in the Harbour Plan Review, but he considered that Mr Paul Zimmerman's suggestion was virtually a "top-down" approach, which tended to overlook the historical factor of development and the development forces at the district level. It might also fail to capture on the demands of local residents and the community. He considered that a balanced and interactive approach, as currently practiced, to blend both territorial planning and district planning, should continuously be adopted to respond to both the district and community demands.

7.10 **Mr Vincent Ng** said that the Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review would endeavour to gradually steer for a consensus between integrated planning and planning of individual projects. In conclusion, **the Chairman** said that the HEC did not argue with the need for integrated planning for Victoria Harbour and suggested that PlanD should look into Mr Paul Zimmerman's proposal and take forward further discussions at the forum of the Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review.

**Sub-committee
on Harbour
Plan Review**

Item 8 Any Other Business

A. Invitation to the tertiary institutions to sit in HEC meetings/briefings

8.1 **The Secretary** reported to the meeting that Mrs Mei Ng had suggested to extend invitation to the heads and students of the planning and architectural faculties of tertiary institutions to attend the future HEC meetings and briefings. Upon invitation of the Chairman, **Mrs Ng** said that this would add value to the HEC meetings by enhancing its educational and public relation dimensions.

8.2 In response, **the Chairman** invited the Secretary to inform the heads of the faculties concerned of the HEC website and encourage the staff and students to visit the website to better understand the operation of the HEC. Consideration could be given to engaging students of the tertiary institutions to participate in the public forums and charettes arranged by the respective Sub-committees.

Secretary

Sub-committee Secretariats

8.3 In response to the suggestion to explore the possibility to apply for the additional \$20 million mentioned in the Chief Executive's Policy Address to fund studies related to the harbour-front, **Mr Thomas Tso** invited the Secretariat to find out the nature of the funding in question. **Mr Paul Zimmerman** reminded that the budget for harbour-front enhancement was miniscule in comparison with the funding for West Kowloon Cultural District Development promotions – whereas the harbour-front was about 1 800 hectares and the West Kowloon Cultural District was only 40 hectares – and that more should be done to develop a budget for the HEC work.

Secretariat

(Post-meeting note: The additional funding was meant to be allocated to the University Grants Committee's Research Grants Council to promote public policy research in higher education institutions.)

B. Schedule of the HEC regular meetings for July 2005 – May 2006

8.4 **The Chairman** noted that the Secretariat had issued the schedule of the regular HEC meetings from July 2005 to May 2006 and invited Members to mark their diaries accordingly.

C. Presentation of the Greening Master Plan Committee (“GMPC”) to the HEC

8.5 Mrs Mei Ng suggested inviting the GMPC to do a presentation to the HEC on its greening master plans which might have an impact on the development of the harbour-front before implementation. Mr Thomas Tso agreed that the GMPC could be invited to present the plans to the HEC at its next meeting.

Secretary

Date of next meeting

8.6 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:20 p.m. The next meeting would be held on 3 March 2005 (Thursday).

**Harbour-front Enhancement Committee
March 2005**