

**Seventh Meeting of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee
held at 2:30 pm on 26 May 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 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 (SPH) |
| Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke | |
| Mr Chan Chit-kwai, Stephen | |
| Dr Chan Wai-kwan | |
| Mr Kwok Chun-wah, Jimmy | |
| 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 Lau Ka-keung | Deputy Commissioner for Transport/Planning and Technical Services |
| Miss Christine Chow | Secretary |

In Attendance

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Mr Thomas Tso | Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau (HPLB) |
| Mr John Chai | Deputy Director of Civil Engineering and Development |
| Mr L T Ma | Project Manager/Hong Kong Island and Islands, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) |
| Mr Talis Wong | Chief Engineer/Kowloon, CEDD |
| Mr Raymond Lee | District Planning Officer/Kowloon, Planning Department (PlanD) |
| Mr T W Ng | Chief Town Planner/Sub-Regional Planning (Acting), PlanD |

Absent with Apologies

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Mr Leslie H C Chen | Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects |
| Mr Chan Yiu-fai, Steve | |
| Professor Jim Chi-yung | |
| Mr Wu Man-keung, John | |
| Mr Tsao Tak-kiang | Director of Civil Engineering and Development |
| Mr Patrick Li | Assistant Director of Home Affairs |

Action

Welcoming Message

The Chairman welcomed all Members to the seventh meeting of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC). He welcomed Mr Chan Chit-kwai, Stephen, who had been appointed as a new member of the HEC. **The Chairman** thanked Mr Chan Tak-chor, who had resigned from the HEC, for his contributions to the HEC in the past year. **The Chairman** also thanked Mr Thomas Tso, Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, who would be leaving the Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau on 1 June 2005, for his contributions to the HEC.

Item 1 Confirmation of minutes of the sixth meeting

1.1 Members noted the revised draft minutes of the sixth HEC meeting 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. 14 – 16/2005)

A. Sub-committee on South East Kowloon Development (SEKD) Review (Paper No. 14/2005)

2.1 Upon invitation by the Chairman, **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** presented the progress report. **Members** noted that the Kai Tak Planning Review would soon reach Stage 2 of the review and the community response to the Kai Tak Forum on 19 March 2005. He believed that the forum was useful in engaging the public in the planning review. With the public opinions received in Stage 1 Public Participation and the Kai Tak Forum, the consultants would prepare the Outline Concept Plan for Stage 2 Public Participation Programme. To strengthen community participation in the preparation of the Outline Concept Plan for Stage 2 Public Participation Programme, a collaborator meeting would be held on 4 June 2005.

**Sub-committee
on SEKD
Review**

2.2 **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** noted from the media the suggestion for a sports city in Kai Tak. He welcomed all stakeholders, including the relevant Government bureau and the sports community, to actively participate in the planning process to consider the concept in the Kai Tak Review. He continued to say that the Sub-committee had discussed the temporary uses of the Kai Tak site and expressed concern on the temporary uses, particularly the stockpiling of excavated materials which was expected to be removed by end 2006. He considered that the principle of public enjoyment should be adopted as the primary consideration in allocating temporary uses at the harbour-front sites.

2.3 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that as several sub-committees were examining uses at different parts of the Harbour, a better mechanism had to be in place to facilitate the making of choices amongst different uses. He cited the cruise terminal as an example as it appeared from the discussion at the last Sub-committee meeting that the cruise terminal would require reclamation. However, one of the reasons put forward by the Administration for not considering West Kowloon for siting the cruise terminal was the need for reclamation. He asked how the most sustainable choice could be made to ensure the least reclamation for the cruise terminal. In response to the

siting of the cruise terminal, **Mrs Rita Lau** said that the Secretary for Economic Development and Labour had made it very clear in replying to a Legislative Council (LegCo) question that it was concluded that West Kowloon was not suitable for a cruise terminal. Reclamation was only one of the many reasons for its unsuitability, in addition to marine safety. As regards Kai Tak, any need for reclamation to provide berthing space for the cruise terminal had to be further examined, but this would depend on the final design which the Government had not yet had any concrete proposal at the moment. **Mr Zimmerman** thanked Mrs Lau for pointing out that marine safety was another sustainability principle that had to be taken into account when deciding where to site the various items around the harbour in addition to reclamation, land use, infrastructure and other aspects for sustainability.

2.4 As regards the short and medium term land uses of Kai Tak, **Mr Nicholas Brooke** said that members of the Sub-committee were concerned about the current temporary uses when they had a site inspection to the area. He added that the HEC should look at the problems and that there should be a master plan for the short and medium land uses for the land around the harbour, so that the public could use the area for public enjoyment. In response, **Mr Bosco Fung** said that there was a division of responsibilities within the Government regarding uses of land. PlanD was responsible for long term planning and was therefore conducting the Kai Tak Planning Review. Temporary uses were within the purview of Lands Department (LandsD) and as far as Kai Tak was concerned, he understood that LandsD was co-ordinating with the concerned departments including CEDD on the optimization of its usage. He suggested that the matter be further discussed at the Sub-committee at which representatives from LandsD could be invited to participate in discussion. **Mr Brooke** said that at the last Sub-committee meeting, Members got the impression that consideration of optimizing the land use and revenue returns was the main driving factor in allocating land for temporary uses. He suggested that a co-ordinated land use strategy with inter-departmental input should be mapped out.

B. Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review (HPR) (Paper No. 15/2005)

2.5 Upon invitation by the Chairman, **Mr Vincent Ng** presented the progress report. On the Living Harbour Review, he said that a special meeting open to all HEC Members and the public was held on 9 March 2005. The meeting concluded that there was no urgency for conducting another living harbour review as a comprehensive study had already been completed only two years ago. He suggested PlanD to liaise with the concerned departments to keep the Sub-committee informed of the progress of the development and arrange site visits to the typhoon shelters and the foreshore areas as necessary, so as to enable the Sub-committee to familiarize the operation of typhoon shelters. On the Harbour Planning Principles, he said that the most updated version was being applied to the Kai Tak Review and the WDII Review and in fact the principles were now part of the “Harbour-front Enhancement Review - Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Areas” (HER) Engagement Kit. In response to Dr Ng Mee-kam’s enquiry about CE@H’s earlier comments on the principles, **Mr Ng** said that the comments would be reviewed together with all other comments, including those from the Town Planning Board (TPB) and the LegCo, as well as those from the DCs after holding a working session with them. In respect of the temporary enhancement of the Hung Hom Bay waterfront, **Mr Ng** said that the Sub-committee would discuss the matter at the next Sub-committee meeting on 15 June 2005. He suggested, and **Ms Starry Lee** agreed, that the Secretary of the Sub-committee should invite representatives from the Kowloon City DC to attend the meeting. On the first line of paragraph 8 of the progress report, **Mr K Y Leung** suggested and **Mr Ng** agreed that “April” be revised to read as “March”.

**Secretary,
Sub-committee
on HPR**

2.6 Upon invitation by Mr Vincent Ng, **Dr Alvin Kwok** said that some 70 attendees including DC representatives, local groups, transport operators, representatives from Government departments and professional bodies attended the brainstorming session on the Central Ferry Piers Participatory Programme on 21 May 2005. He said that the results of the brainstorming session would be used for preparing the questionnaire survey for the next task of the programme.

C. Sub-committee on Wan Chai Development Phase II (WDII) Review (Paper No. 16/2005)

2.7 Upon invitation by the Chairman, **Mr K Y Leung**

presented the progress report. **Members** noted that after the consultation with the Eastern DC, the public engagement kit of the project had been re-titled to “Harbour-front Enhancement Review – Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Areas” to take into account the DC’s views. TPB and DCs’s response to the HER project was also positive. The TPB supported the HER project and suggested it be kept informed and briefed of the public views collected and the proposed way forward for each stage of the public participation. The Wan Chai DC’s active participation in the first public forum on 23 May 2005 was very encouraging and **Mr Leung** anticipated similar active participation from other concerned DCs in the remaining public forums and community design charrettees to be held from end May to end June 2005.

2.8 **Mr Leung** continued to say that to launch the Envisioning Stage of the HER project, the HER Task Force briefed the press on 22 May 2005. It was followed by a walk along the Wan Chai harbour-front, during which members of the Sub-committee noted that the temporary use at the ex-public cargo handling area would expire in mid-September 2005. He suggested that consideration be given to enhancing the place for public enjoyment, though there might be access constraint. With respect to the report on the Envisioning Stage, he said that the consultant was expected to complete it by end August 2005 and that the Sub-committee would report to the HEC in the September 2005 meeting.

2.9 On membership of the Sub-committee, **Mr Leung** said that Mr Chan Chit-kwai had indicated his interest to join the Sub-committee whilst the Sub-committee also agreed to recommend his appointment to the Sub-committee for the HEC’s endorsement. **The meeting** agreed.

2.10 **Mrs Mei Ng** said that she had received comments on the HER Engagement Kit from members of the public who opined that the kit looked like a “typical” government consultation document and that there was room for improvement in the logic of the presentation. For example, on the one hand the kit listed out the existing constraints and sustainability principles and indicators but on the other hand it asked about the public wish on the harbour-front areas. Besides, there were no reference to who had set the sustainability principles, indicators and their

application. The kit had also not explained in detail the development opportunities of the harbour-front areas, and the role of HEC in the exercise was also unclear. For comparison purpose, she gave high credits to the brainstorming session on the Central Ferry Piers which had provided participants with a simpler and clearer objective and posed no limit to the public thoughts on enhancing the pier area. She also enquired if recycled paper was used for publishing the kit and further suggested the following in future public engagement activities -

Three Sub-committees

- (a) The size of engagement kits should be reduced to make them easily portable;
- (b) The scope and the amount of information should be manageable;
- (c) There should be better co-ordination among the Sub-committees on the engagement programmes including participants, dates, times, etc;
- (d) Venues should be selected to suit target participants;
- (e) To use specific channels like the DCs to spread out the public engagement exercises; and
- (f) Capabilities and style of the contractor in public engagement exercises should be taken into account in the tendering exercise.

2.11 **The Chairman** thanked Mrs Ng for the views. He noted that the current public engagement approach was new to the HEC and understandably there was room for improvement. However, the efforts spent by the HER Task Force in the exercise deserved commendation. **Mr K Y Leung** agreed that since the Task Force was in a learning process, there was room for improvement for the HER project and that they would accept all comments so as to improve. On the sustainability principles and indicators, they were prepared after the collaborator meeting on 23 January 2005 and would be updated with comments received during the Envisioning Stage. They would be used to evaluate the ideas and suggestions received from the public and cross-reference with the Harbour Planning Principles could be made where appropriate. **Dr Ng Mee-kam** said that the HER project,

the Kai Tak Review and the Central Ferry Piers were three different projects of different scopes at different stages, hence direct comparison might not be appropriate. She said that if necessary, the Task Force could discuss with the public on their views on the kit. **Mr Jimmy Kwok** agreed that the target participants and the scales of the three projects were different. He understood that all DC members had received a copy of the kit and noted that the font sizes of the words of the questions were enlarged to facilitate public engagement. He suggested that each DC be encouraged to provide their views on the project.

2.12 After some discussion, **the Chairman** suggested and **the meeting** agreed to put on record their appreciation to the great efforts of the Task Force for the preparation of the HER Public Engagement Kit.

2.13 **The Chairman** said that in response to Members' request, the Sub-committee on WDII Review had arranged to produce a physical model for the whole Victoria Harbour. The cost of the model was estimated to be \$250,000, which would be equally shared among CEDD, PlanD and HEC. **Mr L T Ma** said that the model had been displayed at the first HER public forum and would be displayed at the coming public forums and community charrettes. **Mrs Mei Ng** said that the physical model posed quite a challenge to transport, storage and space for exhibition. Furthermore, planning was a dynamic subject and it would be costly to keep on updating the model. She suggested that three-dimensional computer models similar to those used by Environmental Protection Department should be developed in the HER project, in addition to the physical model.

**Sub-committee
on WDII Review**

Item 3 Matters arising

A. Checklist on follow-up to subject items presented at HEC meetings

3.1 **The Chairman** noted that the HEC Secretariat had circulated to Members before the meeting an updated checklist on follow-up to subject items presented at the HEC meetings. **Mr Paul Zimmerman** proposed that the Administration report progress on harbour-front enhancement regularly to cover in particular the West Kowloon waterfront promenade, Hung Hom waterfront, proposed quick-win project at Sheung Wan, hoardings

in Central, overriding public need (OPN) test, etc. **Mr Hardy Lok** supported that the progress on these items be reported at each meeting, while **Mr Nicholas Brooke** considered that the report be made every six months. **Mr Vincent Ng** suggested and **the Chairman** agreed that all the three Sub-committees would prepare checklists to follow up on relevant items respectively. **The meeting** noted that the action parties, i.e. the relevant Government departments, had received the checklist already and would report progress to HEC and the Sub-committees as appropriate. The Sub-committee Secretariats would submit their respective checklists to HEC for reference.

**Three
Sub-committees**

B. Transport issues relating to the WDII Review

3.2 **The Chairman** said that under the HER project, views and ideas on all issues (including transport) received during the Envisioning Stage would be considered and examined when preparing the Concept Plans under the Realization Stage. **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested that, similar to the workshop with Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) on the management of open spaces, a workshop with Transport Department (TD) be arranged to discuss transport issues. **Mr Nicholas Brooke** concurred that a dialogue with TD either at the HEC or Sub-committee levels would be useful. **Mr K K Lau** said that TD would be happy to provide any transport information for the HEC, like their presentation on Central-Wan Chai Bypass at the July 2004 HEC meeting and their active participation at the various Sub-committees. He also agreed that if necessary, TD could enhance the communication at the Sub-committee level.

TD

3.3 **Mr K Y Leung** said that unlike LCSD, TD was a member of the Sub-committee on WDII Review and that the Sub-committee was an appropriate venue to discuss regional and district transport matters. **Mr Vincent Ng** said that TD was also a member of the Sub-committee on HPR and that transport issues relating to areas other than Wan Chai and South East Kowloon could be discussed at this Sub-committee. **The Chairman** concluded that the various Sub-committees could discuss specific transport matters with the support of TD and that if necessary, TD could brief the main HEC on strategic transport issues.

TD

C. HEC retreat camp

3.4 The Chairman said that **the HEC Secretariat** proposed to hold a one-day retreat camp on Saturday, 20 or 27 August 2005 at Robert Black College of the University Hong Kong. The HEC Secretariat would check with Members on the more appropriate date and would promulgate details of the retreat in due course.

HEC Secretariat

(Post-meeting note : The retreat took place on 27 August 2005.)

D. Invitation to DC Chairman and Members for attending meetings/briefings of HEC and its Sub-committees

3.5 The Chairman said that **the Secretary** had sent the invitation to the DCs through Home Affairs Department.

HEC Secretariat

E. Proposal for setting up OPN Panel

3.6 **The Chairman** said that the OPN was project and site specific and that instead of setting up another advisory body to examine the OPN at this stage, in the course of development of the next stage of the public engagement of the HER project and Kai Tak consultation, consideration could be given by the relevant Sub-committees to including relevant members of the professions and the community to evaluate the sustainable indicators together, which would be useful to supporting the OPN test.

3.7 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** cautioned that issues relating to reclamation in other parts of the harbour, such as Tourism Commission's proposal for a pier in Lei Yue Mun, should not be overlooked. He was of the view that the proposed location of the pier was outside the harbour area to avoid reclamation in the harbour and hence the OPN test. There was therefore a need to come to an understanding on whether there was a different treatment for reclamation for the purpose of land formation and reclamation for harbour-front enhancement. **Mrs Mei Ng** said that sufficient background information should be provided to facilitate the OPN discussion and evaluation and that there should be a co-ordination between the need and wish of the Government and the public.

3.8 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** said that it would be unwise for the HEC to involve in the general debate on reclamation at this stage, which was largely hypothetical without specific reference

to any particular projects/cases at hand. Instead, the HEC should revisit its role on harbour-front enhancement. **Mr K Y Leung** said that at a later stage there would be a need for meeting the OPN test in relation to a specific project and that the HEC should be prepared to embrace a due process to meet such test in due course. **Mrs Rita Lau** said that the Government would fully comply with the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (PHO) and the Court of Final Appeal's (CFA) judgement on overriding public need test and welcome views and suggestions of the HEC which was working hand-in-hand with the Government in the Kai Tak and WDII Reviews. She assured Members that during the review process, Government would fully consider and follow the legal requirements and CFA's principles to come up with recommendations with strong legal foundation and community support. **Mr Zimmerman** said that if the demand for harbour-front land were to continue incessantly, we would need to meet the insatiable demand. He considered that the HEC should express its attitude on an integrated harbour-front so that the consultants and designers concerned could have a better guidance. **Mr Hardy Lok** said that as long as reclamation could fully comply with the PHO and CFA judgement, the SPH would not object to such reclamation.

3.9 **Dr Ng Mee-kam** said that there were three ways to identify public need –

- (a) An authority to decide upon the public need but this had been proven unsuccessful in many cases;
- (b) One person one vote and simple majority – but this might have the disadvantage of inconsistent results from time to time; and
- (c) Common interest identified by discussion among various stakeholders - this was the ideal approach and the Kai Tak and WDII Reviews were following this mode.

3.10 **Mr Patrick Lau** said that in order to protect and preserve the harbour, it should be managed as a valuable resource, instead of being used as a utility. **The Chairman** concluded that at the later stage of the Kai Tak and WDII Reviews, members of the relevant professions and the community should be invited to evaluate the sustainability indicators which

**Sub-committees
on SEKD
Review and
WDII Review**

were essential to supporting the OPN test.

Item 4 Harbour Planning – Approach and Process (Paper No. 17/2005)

4.1 Upon invitation of the Chairman, **Messrs Vincent Ng and Paul Zimmerman** presented the paper with an aid of the powerpoint. To conclude, **Mr Ng** said that the proposed approach and process for the Hung Hom study was similar to those for the Kai Tak and WDII Reviews, and that this proposal had been endorsed by the Sub-committee on HPR at its meeting on 30 March 2005.

4.2 **Mr Bosco Fung** said that PlanD was fully involved in the review of the study methodology and the preparation of the paper, upon the advice from the Sub-committee on HPR. Subject to the views of the HEC, PlanD would take forward the proposal step by step, involving both top-down and bottom-up approaches in the process, and present the paper to the Town Planning Board shortly. **Mrs Mei Ng** said that it might be more desirable to launch the proposed Hung Hom study at a later stage having regard to the progress of the Kai Tak Review, the HER project and the Central Ferry Piers project. **Mr Nicholas Brooke** supported the proposed study approach and stated that implementation and management of the recommendations would be a challenge to the HEC and should be given further thought in due course.

Item 5 Work of the Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review (Paper Nos. 18/2005)

5.1 Upon invitation of the Chairman, **Mr Vincent Ng** presented the paper. **Mr Ng** said that the Sub-committee on HPR was assigned with increasing harbour planning matters and waterfront enhancement projects, both existing and proposed. Accordingly, Sub-committee members were concerned about the growing list of tasks and a special meeting had been convened to discuss the workload issue. The Sub-committee then agreed to present a paper detailing the principles and criteria for prioritizing the tasks to the full HEC for consideration. It recommended that new district-based sub-committees be set up to deal with new specific district studies. The HEC could also consider a new institutional mechanism to deal with land use planning along the

harbour-front.

5.2 **The Chairman** agreed that the matter deserved further considering. He suggested the Sub-committee on HPR to work out a background paper or proposed scheme for further consideration and discussion in the retreat camp.

**Sub-committee
on HPR**

5.3 **Mr Greg Wong** said that the HEC could not avoid discussing institutional issues. He opined that the HEC should adopt a simple and concise structure and sub-committees should only be formed when the HEC really could not cope with the work. Alternatively, ad hoc task groups could be formed and report to the HEC for decision should there be genuine needs. He suggested that new district studies could be taken up by the existing HEC sub-committees. For example, the Hung Hom study could be dealt with by the Sub-committee on SEKD as this was the surrounding area of Kai Tak. **Dr Wong** also said that due regard should be given to time management and the cost effectiveness of too many meetings taking place at the same time involving similar members.

5.4 **Dr Alvin Kwok** said that an even distribution of duties among the HEC members might help relieve the heavy workload of individual Members, who could be already fully engaged in the work of more than one sub-committees/task groups. He said that the HEC should consider more communication with the DCs when conducting district studies. In so doing, a closer tie with the community could be built to strengthen the effectiveness of the work of the HEC.

5.5 **Mr Stephen Chan** said that decision on major issues should rest with the main HEC whereas detailed discussion should first be conducted by the Sub-committees. However, too many sub-committee meetings might not be effective. **Mr Chan** supported Dr Alvin Kwok's suggestion on fostering closer ties with the district organizations.

5.6 **Mrs Mei Ng** reiterated her earlier suggestion for reaching out more to the community to listen to their views and expectations for the harbour-front.

5.7 **Mr K Y Leung** supported Dr Alvin Kwok's suggestion. In particular, he was of the view that too many meetings might

only drain the already limited secretariat and member resources and would not be beneficial to the Administration and the people of Hong Kong as a whole.

5.8 **The Chairman** said that the efforts and time devoted by Members and the secretariat reflected their devotion to work for this Committee. The HEC and its sub-committees should consider how to optimize the deployment of available resources in a practical way so as to accomplish the duties in an efficient manner.

Item 6 The Road to Effective PR Strategy (Paper No. 19/2005)

6.1 Upon invitation of the Chairman, **Dr Alvin Kwok** presented the paper. He said that an effective PR Strategy was very important to the work of the HEC. The paper aimed at providing a framework for further discussion in the retreat.

6.2 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** agreed with the need to publicize the role and responsibilities of the HEC. However, before that, a soul searching exercise should be conducted in the retreat to revisit the structure and functions of the HEC, and the membership of the HEC.

6.3 **Dr Greg Wong** said that the HEC was different from other long-established committees as it was still relatively young. He agreed that PR was very important for the HEC and that Members should get in touch with the public more. A PR plan could help avoid misunderstanding and allegations and suggestions from both Dr Alvin Kwok and Mr Nicholas Brooke should be seriously considered. He agreed that the HEC should improve its structure and communication mechanism. For example, the HEC should consider improving its relationship with the public and the response to press enquiries in a co-ordinated manner. Such issues could be further discussed at the retreat.

6.4 **The Chairman** agreed that the basic objectives of the HEC were to advise the Government and reflect public views to the Government. He suggested considering the PR strategy in depth in the retreat with a view to arousing public awareness of the accomplishment of the HEC and better reflecting views from

the community.

6.5 **Mrs Mei Ng** said that the HEC was a new experiment and that it could promote a new form of consultation, participation and decision-making culture. She did not fully agree to reduce the presence of official Members as it would be desirable to have the presence of official members to listen to the views of the non-official members. She appealed to the HEC to hold meetings in the districts as appropriate and practicable in order to reach out to the community.

6.6 **The Chairman** said that the HEC was already involving the community in activities such as in the Envisioning Stage of the HER and Kai Tak projects. However, he said that what mattered in the eyes of the public would be the outcome of HEC's work on schedule. He said that all these concerns could be further discussed in the retreat.

Item 7 Any Other Business

7.1 Upon invitation by the Chairman, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** presented a powerpoint on harbour-front land uses at Sheung Wan, Oil Street, Quarry Bay and Hung Hom. He suggested that the HEC should help ensure that the design and development of the harbour-front would be in line with the urban design guidelines, TPB's vision for the harbour and the HEC's Harbour Planning Principles in an integrated manner.

7.2 **Mr Bosco Fung** replied that the aim of the planning studies for the harbour conducted by PlanD was very clear, i.e. to enhance the harbour-front environment. Planning and city development were however a dynamic process without an end, and thus it was not practicable or reasonable to overturn past decisions which had been approved or implemented taking into account the community views.

7.3 **Mr Zimmerman** said that the Oil Street site was included in the Application List with planning parameters prepared and adopted in 1995 to 1997 but there had been no revision since then. There was a requirement for refuse transfer station along the harbour-front and its construction could not be stopped once the land was sold. **Professor Lam Kin-che** asked about the role of the HEC and the TPB on the new developments if they

appeared to be incompatible with the Harbour Planning Principles.

7.4 **The Chairman** said that the purpose of the Harbour Planning Principles was to guide future developments along the harbour-front. **Mr Bosco Fung** said that such principles would be applied to new or uncommitted areas. He said that previous decisions had to be respected instead of being overturned as wished by some sectors. He added that it was PlanD's aim to better plan future harbour-front developments and this was why the department had actively contributed to the formulation of the Harbour Planning Principles. He continued to say that the development planning for Oil Street was completed in 1997 and the site was included in the Application List in 1999, after a due process.

7.5 **Mr Hardy Lok** said that one of the objectives of the HEC was to enhance the harbour-front. A refuse transfer station facing the harbour would not be good for harbour-front enhancement. He hoped that the HEC could improve the situation.

7.6 **The Chairman** informed Members that the quorum was lost at this juncture but informal discussion on the subject could continue.

7.7 **Mr Thomas Tso** said that although the Oil Street site was included in the Application List, the HEC could still advise on the enhancement of the harbour-front. The site was zoned a designated Comprehensive Development Area (CDA) and comprehensive planning would be required in the process. The need for providing sufficient refuse collection facilities within the development had to be met, but that was definitely far away from a refuse transfer station. Members could rest assured that the developer for any community facilities would be required to make sure that they were compatible with the harbour planning principles.

7.8 **Mr Patrick Lau** said that the case could be a good test for the HEC. He suggested bringing different views of Members to the relevant districts to see what the local community would wish for. Further discussion at the Eastern District might take place as appropriate and he would keep members informed of such

discussions, if any.

7.9 **Mrs Mei Ng** said that the emphasis should be on the process instead of the result and suggested to let the public know what the HEC had done. She also suggested using the sustainability indicators to evaluate the development proposal and communicate more with the TPB at an early stage.

7.10 **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** said that the plans for SEKD and WDII were also good plans at the time of previous planning. But both plans were now under review because of the changing public aspirations and the CFA's judgement. In view of this, there might also be a case to review the Oil Street development.

7.11 **Mr Hardy Lok** said that the current problem was that the terms and conditions of the land sale were not clear nor detailed enough. He could not understand why the terms and conditions could not be revised just because they had been included in the Application List.

7.12 **Mr Zimmerman** said that many members of the BEC were property developers and he had been reflecting the concerns of the business community about the current planning parameters of the Oil Street site. BEC supported that the parameters should be reviewed for the benefit of the entire harbour-front and better quality of life to Hong Kong people.

7.13 **Mr Bosco Fung** said that the decision to withdraw the Oil Street site from the Application List rested with the Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands. However, he supported Mr Thomas Tso's view and that he would like to clarify that there was no proposal for a refuse transfer station at the harbour-front. Under the "CDA" zoning, the master layout plan of the development would be subject to the TPB's approval.

7.14 **The Chairman** reminded the meeting that it was an exchange of information and informal discussion only as the quorum was already lost.

7.15 **Dr Greg Wong** said that if there were no such terms in the lease condition to specify that a refuse station facing the harbour would be built, the TPB would consider such a development proposal in a responsible manner when examining

the Master Plan and building design when the time came. Instead, his concern was on whether the lease conditions allowed public access to the harbour-front.

7.16 **Mr Fung** said that it was already included in the planning guidelines that there would be a harbour-front promenade for the public. The lease/land sales conditions of Oil Street were available on the website for reference.

7.17 **Mr K Y Leung** opined that it would not be fruitful to deliberate on the Oil Street development in the present circumstances. He recalled that it was agreed previously that only projects not yet approved by the Finance Committee would be discussed by the HEC. He noted that the Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review was already deliberating the list of sites along the harbour-front, which HEC could advise on their enhancement.

7.18 **The Chairman** informed the meeting that Mr Zimmerman intended to put forward a motion on harbour-front enhancement and greening for voting. However, as the quorum was lost, the matter could be further discussed at the Sub-committee on HPR or other sub-committees as appropriate. He asked Mr Zimmerman to brief Members on his intention.

7.19 **Mr Zimmerman** explained that the intention of the motion was to enhance the temporary land uses of the harbour-front. The motion called for the Government to be fully committed to harbour-front enhancement and greening for the harbour-front land available for lease in short term tenancies. The greening strategy would include landscaping with trees and grass, improved access with simple footpath and removal of unnecessary fencing. The amount of trees planted should be at least comparable with that for the approved temporary open storage developments in the New Territories. In principle, trees should be transplanted in the same site or in the vicinity when land would be developed for permanent use.

7.20 **Mr Thomas Tso** informed the meeting that there was a Steering Committee on Greening chaired by Permanent Secretary for Works which was tasked to work on greening all temporary vacant sites including those along the waterfront and a programme was already in place. He also noted that LandsD

had been already noted a similar request for greening of the sites under the short term tenancy, as a result of the previous HEC discussion.

7.21 **Dr Greg Wong** said that in Hong Kong, much of the land along the harbour-front was bare, which was left empty or used for temporary storage purposes such as the old Kai Tak Airport, West Kowloon and Sheung Wan barging point. Following the discussion at the previous HEC meeting, he commented that the motion was fair and reasonable and he reiterated the need to enhance the harbour-fronts through greening efforts.

7.22 **The Chairman** said that the relevant sub-committees such as the Sub-committee on HPR would look into the motion. He then raised the issue of time management and said that it was the second time a quorum was lost at the end of the meeting. He suggested Members to inform the Secretary in advance any suggested discussion items to be included in the agenda prior to the meeting in good advance, in order to better manage the meeting.

**Sub-committee
on HPR**

Date of next meeting

7.23 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 7 p.m. In view of the leave plan of many members, a retreat camp would be held in end August 2005. The date of the next HEC meeting would have to re-scheduled.

**Harbour-front Enhancement Committee
September 2005**