

**Eighth Meeting of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee
held at 2:30 pm on 22 September 2005
at 3/F, 3 Edinburgh Place, Central, Hong Kong**

Minutes of Meeting

Present

Professor Lee Chack-fan	Chairman
Dr Andrew Thomson	Representing Business Environment Council
Dr James Wang	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Dr Ng Mee-kam	Representing Citizen Envisioning@Harbour
Mr Vincent Ng	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Leslie H C Chen	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Mr Chan Kwok-fai, Bernard	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
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 Chan Chit-kwai, Stephen	
Dr Chan Wai-kwan	
Mr Lau Hing-tat, Patrick	
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, Environment, Transport and Works Bureau
Mr Bosco Fung	Director of Planning
Mr Lau Ka-keung	Deputy Commissioner for Transport/Planning and Technical Services
Mr Patrick Li	Assistant Director of Home Affairs
Miss Wong Yuet-wah	Secretary

In Attendance

Mrs Ava Ng	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau (HPLB)
Mr Robin Ip	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1 (Des), HPLB
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 Raymond Wong	Chief Town Planner/Sub-Regional Planning, PlanD
<u>For item 5</u>	
Mr Roy Li	District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (Acting), PlanD
<u>For item 6</u>	
Mr Paul Zimmerman	Representing Hong Kong Harbour Day Organizing Committee
<u>Absent with Apologies</u>	
Dr Kwok Ngai-kuen, Alvin	Representing Conservancy Association
Mrs Mei Ng	Representing Friends of the Earth
Ms Pong Yuen-yee	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners (HKIP)
Ir Dr Greg Wong Chak-yan	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke	
Mr Chan Yiu-fai, Steve	
Professor Jim Chi-yung	
Mr Kwok Chun-wah, Jimmy	
Professor Lam Kin-che	
Ms Lee Wai-king, Starry	
Mr Tsao Tak-kiang	Director of Civil Engineering and Development

Action

Welcoming Message

The Chairman welcomed all Members to the eighth meeting of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC). He said that Ms Pong Yuen-yee had replaced Mr Roger Tang to represent the HKIP as their regular member of the HEC. Mrs Ava Ng would be leaving the HPLB on 3 October 2005 and Mr Robin Ip would take over her post from that date. **The meeting** thanked Mrs Ng for her contribution to the HEC and welcomed Mr Ip to join the committee. **The meeting** also welcomed Miss Wong Yuet-wah who had taken over the work of Secretary of the HEC since 1 September 2005.

Item 1 Confirmation of minutes of the seventh meeting

1.1 The draft minutes of the seventh meeting were confirmed without amendments.

Item 2 Progress reports from the three Sub-committees (Paper Nos. 20 – 22/2005)

A. Sub-committee on South East Kowloon Development (SEKD) Review (Paper No. 20/2005)

2.1 **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** presented the progress report.

2.1.1 **Members** noted that with the suggestions received from the collaborators meeting on 4 June 2005 and the working session on draft Outline Concept Plans (OCPs) on 12 September 2005, the consultants were revising the draft OCPs and would present them to the Sub-committee at the coming meeting scheduled for 25 October 2005. Subject to the discussion by the Sub-committee at that meeting, the OCPs, with further revision as appropriate, would be used at Stage 2 Public Participation Programme commencing later this year. He anticipated that the Home Affairs Bureau would provide further details on the proposed multi-purpose stadium during Stage 2 Public Participation.

**Sub-committee on
SEKD Review**

2.1.2 On the recent public discussions of the location of the government headquarters, the Sub-committee was open-minded and would keep in view the development of the matter.

B. Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review (HPR) (Paper No. 21/2005)

2.2 **Mr Vincent Ng** presented the progress report.

2.2.1 **Mr Ng** was pleased to inform the meeting that the West Kowloon Waterfront Promenade (WKWP) was open to the public on the eve of Mid-Autumn Festival. Adopting an environmentally friendly design, the WKWP was a refreshing public space created in the

most cost-effective and sustainable way. Some facilities such as the handprints and lanterns on the promenade reflected the element of public participation.

2.2.2 On the Hung Hom Waterfront, the government departments concerned had agreed to take necessary steps to facilitate the early provision of a waterfront promenade.

2.2.3 As regards the proposed pumping station in the proposed open space at Sheung Wan Gala Point, the Sub-committee had examined the proposal against the Harbour Planning Principles (HPPs). In response to the Sub-committee's suggestion to minimize the footprint of the structures and to maintain the visual and physical access to the waterfront, the Drainage Services Department already revised the scheme and also agreed to examine ways to further improve these two aspects.

2.2.4 On the former Government supplies depot at Oil Street, after discussing an application to rezone the site submitted by the Designing Hong Kong Harbour District to the Town Planning Board (TPB), the Sub-committee had made written representation to the TPB setting out the views that (i) the Sub-committee welcomed the initiative behind the proposed rezoning request; and (ii) the Sub-committee urged the TPB to review the planning brief prepared to guide the development at the subject site, particularly with regard to the HPPs. The TPB would consider the application on 28 October 2005.

2.2.5 In respect of the Central Ferry Piers Participatory Programme, a workshop would be held on 8 October 2005 and a proposed out-door public forum and exhibition would be held from mid to late November 2005.

C. Sub-committee on Wan Chai Development Phase II (WDII) Review (Paper No. 22/2005)

2.3 **Dr Ng Mee-kam** presented the progress report on behalf of Mr Leung Kong-yui, who could not attend the meeting.

2.3.1 **Members** noted that after a special meeting on 21 July 2005 to discuss the Trade Development Council (TDC)'s planning application to the TPB to extend the atrium link at the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre (HKCEC), the Sub-committee made a submission, which included the views expressed by Sub-committee Members, the draft minutes of the special meeting and a copy of the letter from the SPH on the atrium link extension, to the TPB on 26 July 2005.

2.3.2 On the Hong Kong Regional Heliport Working Group's proposal for developing a heliport at the HKCEC, the Sub-committee decided not to include this proposal in the concept plans to be formulated at the Realization Stage of the Harbour-front Enhancement Review – Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Areas (HER). This was because the proposal would involve covering part of the Victoria Harbour, and the immediate need for commercial helicopter services between Hong Kong and the Pearl River Delta had yet to be established. The Sub-committee had also suggested including another site at the existing temporary helipad at the former Wan Chai public cargo working area (PCWA) for permanent use for Government's proposed helipad.

2.3.3 An Expert Panel Forum on Sustainable Transport Planning and Central-Wan Chai Bypass (CWB) was held on 3 September 2005. The Panel received a total of 19 submissions from the public and one submission from the Transport Department. Over 100 persons attended the Forum. The Expert Panel would produce a report by end September 2005 for the Sub-committee to consider. Making reference to the Kai Tak Planning Review, the Sub-committee would convene a "Stage 1.5" forum after the report of the Expert Panel Forum was available, for presenting to the public the comments and proposals received at the Envisioning Stage prior to commencing the Realization Stage.

2.3.4 As for the "quick-win" projects, the CEDD would explore further the possibility of opening the former Wan Chai PCWA site for public enjoyment before the construction works of the WDII project

commenced.

2.4 With regard to the Sub-committee's submission to the TPB on the TDC's planning application to extend the atrium link at the HKCEC, **Mr Hardy Lok** said that some parts of the submission had not been highlighted to the TPB. On the Expert Panel Forum held on 3 September 2005, he suggested attaching the transcript of the Forum to the Expert Panel report for completeness of record. **Dr Ng Mee-kam** said that the HER Task Force had previously concluded that the Expert Panel would decide on the content of the Expert Panel report themselves. For the record of the Forum, which was not a task assigned to the Expert Panel, the HER Task Force needed to further discuss and consider the various format including minutes, transcript or audio tape. **The Chairman** suggested and **Mr Lok** agreed that the Sub-committee should consider the matter at its coming meeting.

**Sub-committee on
WDII Review**

2.5 On the Expert Panel report, **Mr L T Ma** said that it would be submitted to the Sub-committee for consideration after endorsement by the HER Task Force. The Sub-committee would consider the preparation of the record of the Forum with the advice of the consultant and reference to the practice of other Sub-committees.

2.6 Regarding the Sub-committee's submission to the TPB on the TDC's proposal to extend the HKCEC atrium link, **Mr Ma** said that the Sub-committee secretariat had circulated the whole submission to all Sub-committee Members and sought their agreement before submitting it to the TPB. **Mr Bosco Fung** said that he understood that the Sub-committee's whole submission had been submitted to the Metro Planning Committee of the TPB for consideration. As discussed at the HEC retreat, there was a need for the HEC and its Sub-committees to express their views and recommendations to the TPB in clearer and more specific terms.

Item 3 Matters arising

A. Collaborators meeting on 4 June 2005

3.1 **The meeting** noted that the item had been covered under the progress report from the Sub-committee on SEKD Review.

B. Temporary land use along waterfront

3.2 **The meeting** noted that the WKWP, the Hung Hom Bay Waterfront and the former Wan Chai PCWA working area which involved temporary enhancements along waterfront areas had been covered under the progress reports from the Sub-committees on HPR and WDII Review.

C. Hung Hom Bay waterfront

3.3 **The meeting** noted that the item had been covered under the progress report by the Sub-committee on HPR.

D. Suggestions for future public engagement activities

3.4 **The meeting** noted that various suggestions would be taken into account in the future public engagement activities under the respective Sub-committees.

**three
Sub-committees**

E. 3D computer models for HER

3.5 **The Chairman** said that 3D computer models had been used for the public engagement activities under the Envisioning Stage of the HER project. **Mr L T Ma** said that both physical and 3D computer models had been adopted for the public engagement activities under the HER project. He supplemented that physical models could provide the participants with a bird's eye view of the whole project, while 3D models could enable the participants to have selective views from different angles in various enlargements.

F. Checklists on items presented to/discussed at the HEC or Sub-committee meetings

3.6 **The meeting** noted the checklists prepared by the HEC and respective Sub-committee secretariats.

G. HEC retreat

3.7 **The Chairman** said that the item would be discussed under agenda item 4.

H. Sustainability indicators for the Kai Tak and WDII Reviews

3.8 **The Chairman** said that sustainability indicators would be made under the two reviews for the relevant professions and the community to comment. **Dr Ng Mee-kam** said that under the Envisioning Stage of the HER project, a set of preliminary sustainability indicators had been prepared with the collaborators and had then been revised with the suggestions of the public received during the public forums. A set of revised sustainability indicators was ready for use under the Realization Stage of the HER project.

Sub-committees on SEKD Review and WDII Review

I. Hung Hom district review

3.9 **The meeting** noted that the item had been covered under the progress report from the Sub-committee on HPR.

J. Institutional mechanism and HEC retreat

3.10 **The Chairman** said that the item would be discussed under agenda item 4.

K. Effective PR strategy and HEC retreat

3.11 **The meeting** noted that the item would be covered under agenda item 4.

L. Oil Street site

3.12 **The Chairman** said that the item had been covered under the progress report by the Sub-committee on HPR.

M. Motion on temporary harbour-front land use strategy

3.13 **The Chairman** said that the item would be discussed under agenda item 7.

Item 4 Summary of discussions of the HEC retreat held on 27 August 2005 (Paper No. 23/2005)

4.1 **The Secretary** presented the paper and invited

Members' further views in relation to the summary of discussions. **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** suggested that the HEC start taking forward the suggestions on institutional structure and formulation of procedures for motions. **Mr Vincent Ng** proposed that a working group with Members including Dr Chan, Dr Andrew Thomson and Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke be formed under the HEC to study the institutional mechanism and report their findings to the HEC. **Dr Thomson** supported Dr Chan's suggestions and the formulation of a harbour-front enhancement strategy setting out systematically the goal, time frame and areas to be addressed.

4.2 **Mrs Rita Lau** said that in view of the significant implications of a harbour institutional mechanism and the absence of some Members in the retreat, the HEC should fully grasp the relevant background information before starting the study. As mentioned in previous meetings, the Government already had plans to gradually review the issue. On the development and management of harbour-front areas, the Government would implement various proposals step by step with reference to experience accumulated, including that on the West Kowloon development.

4.3 **Mrs Lau** also said that many overseas experiences had their unique cultural background, development history and land use planning considerations, which were entirely different from those of Hong Kong. Besides, relevant Government bureaux/departments had already exhausted their existing resources in providing support to the HEC, its Sub-committees and the various task groups. Therefore, the HEC needed to seriously consider the priority of all the tasks in hand given the limited and stringent resources. **The Chairman** agreed that the HEC and its Sub-committees were already overloaded and that it was necessary for Members to set priority for their tasks.

4.4 **Dr Ng Mee-kam** appreciated the contribution of the Government bureaux/departments concerned. With reference to overseas experience on regenerating harbour, she said that it was important for Hong Kong to have a common vision for the harbour, based on which an effective institutional structure could be established to achieve the vision. **Mr Vincent Ng** suggested that the HEC should accord a higher priority to the study on institutional mechanism. **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** said that a small

working group with minimal secretariat support under the HEC comprising interested Members and representatives from the PlanD could be formed quickly to kick-start the study.

4.5 **Dr Ng** suggested that consideration be given to partnering the study with other organizations like the Harbour Business Forum (HBF). **Dr Andrew Thomson** said that the HBF had already expressed their interest in partnering with other interest groups including the HEC to conduct the study in order to solve the problem of resource constraint. On resources, he said that the Government should enhance its budget commensurate with the tasks to achieve.

4.6 **Mrs Rita Lau** said apart from the annual allocation of \$5 million and the Government staff cost involved in the HEC and its Sub-committees, about \$10 million had been spent for the WKWP. To plan for bidding more funds for harbour-front enhancement in particular those “quick-win” projects, she suggested that Mr Vincent Ng provide the Government with concrete financial requirements in connection with Central Ferry Piers and Hung Hom area. The HPLB would co-ordinate with related bureaux/departments to bid for more resources for the HEC in the annual exercise as far as possible. On the proposed study on institutional mechanism with the HBF, while the Government would provide assistance as appropriate, **Mrs Lau** suggested that Members should formulate a clear objective and time-table for it.

4.7 **Mr Raymond Wong** said that according to the Harbour Plan Study completed in early 2003, an independent harbour authority was not necessarily a prerequisite for successful harbour-fronts. Similarly, many overseas countries had successful and attractive harbour-fronts without an independent harbour authority. The current Harbour Plan Review would nonetheless include a task to review the institutional mechanism at a later stage when the district reviews had put forth more specific recommendations on the land use and developments along the harbour-fronts. As such, the HEC needed to consider the appropriate timing for the review on institutional mechanism.

4.8 **The Chairman** suggested that Dr Chan, Dr Thomson, Mr Brooke, and PlanD’s representatives could form an informal group to find out a common ground and map out the way

forward. **The Chairman** would attend the informal group's meeting when it was formed. Other Members might also join if they were interested.

Secretary

Item 5 Rezoning requests to the approved Central District (Extension) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H24/6 and draft Wan Chai North OZP No. S/H25/1 (Paper No. 24/2005)

5.1 **Mr Roy Li** presented the paper. **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** said that after the TPB's decision on 5 August 2005, the boundary of the reclamation works was finalized. He enquired if it was possible to re-plan the land use in the area instead of only looking at the design of the developments thereon. **Mr Vincent Ng** said that the HEC should express its views on the land use, building density, landscape design and open space of the area. **Dr Ng Mee-kam** suggested that the HEC should further consider the land use and planning of the area, having regard to the CWB and transport system along the northern shore of the Hong Kong Island.

5.2 **Mrs Rita Lau** clarified a point in the paper that whether adopting the Electronic Road Pricing (ERP) to resolve traffic problems was a transport policy and outside the purview of the TPB. However, the TPB had great concern on the transport and traffic problems including air pollution resulting from the land use of an area. With the TPB's decision on the three rezoning requests, the land use covered under the Central District (Extension) OZP No. S/H24/6, which had gone through a due statutory planning process during which all views and objections had been considered thoroughly, was re-confirmed. The coming task was to implement the development items of that approved statutory OZP step by step. She pointed out that the plan-making process had already taken more than 10 years, and the community would expect implementation of the planning proposals, instead of never-ending re-planning and studies.

5.3 As far as refinement of the design of the waterfront developments was concerned, **Mrs Rita Lau** said there was established mechanism to cater for this. For example, for the "Comprehensive Development Area" site under the approved OZP, there were clear and stringent statutory procedures under which developers were required to submit Master Layout Plan

(MLP) for consideration and approval of the TPB. The public would have sufficient opportunity to comment on the proposed development schemes. Any change to the approved MLP would also require the TPB's approval. In addition, the HEC's HPPs would be applied when designing the harbour-front facilities, including the footprint of infrastructure, open space, etc.

5.4 **Mr Stephen Chan** said that at the Expert Panel Forum held on 3 September 2005, the Panel, the Central & Western District Council and the Wan Chai District Council confirmed the need to construct the CWB. However, they considered at the same time that the CWB itself was not sustainable and that it would be saturated in five to 10 years' time. Therefore, there was a need to consider implementing the ERP as well in order to achieve a sustainable transport system. There was also a suggestion that the tunnel section leaving the HKCEC heading for the eastern part of the Hong Kong Island be constructed by means of immersed or semi-immersed tunnel in order to reduce the extent of reclamation and at the same time to provide land for building a promenade and open space to enhance the area. The HEC should factor in the CWB, the ERP and the public's proposed use of the waterfront area in a sustainable way when taking forward the HER project.

5.5 **Dr Andrew Thomson** said that there was a need to develop expeditiously the sustainability indicators in alignment with the HPPs and the experience gained from the public engagement activities under the Kai Tak Review, the HER project and the Central Ferry Piers Participatory Programme, before moving forward a harbour-front enhancement review on Central.

5.6 **Mr Bosco Fung** said that Paper No. 24/2005 was a response to Dr Chan Wai-kwan's request for briefing Members on the TPB's decision on 5 August 2005 on the three rezoning requests. The minutes of the TPB's meeting had been attached to the paper from which Members would note that the TPB had thoroughly deliberated the three requests before re-confirming the reclamation extent and land use proposals on the approved Central District (Extension) OZP. He recalled that in 1999 when considering the 70 objections to the OZP, the TPB formulated a set of vision and goals for Victoria Harbour which was in line with the HPPs developed by the HEC subsequently.

5.7 **Mr Fung** further said the TPB considered that there were some good design concepts in the proponents' suggestions, in particular those relating to accessible and vibrant harbour-front enhancement. The TPB had therefore requested the PlanD to enhance the design of those facilities including the promenade, open space, commercial areas, etc along the Central harbour-front through the preparation of a design brief taking account of the HEC's HPPs. The TPB had not requested the PlanD to revise the approved Central District (Extension) OZP, though it had mentioned that it would re-consider the eastern part of the plan near the HKCEC, which fell within the area of the HER project, once the WDII Review was completed.

5.8 **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** saw the need of conducting a harbour-front enhancement review on Central. When conducting the review, the question of re-planning or designing would arise again. He said that planning was an on-going process and that if there was an administrative decision to locate the Government headquarters outside Central or a transport policy decision to implement both the CWB and the ERP to resolve transport and traffic problems, a land use review of the area could be considered.

5.9 **Dr Ng Mee-kam** said that the Government should explain to the public that the planning and development of Central would have an impact on the adjoining areas. As users, the public should also be encouraged to participate in the design of the Central harbour-front.

5.10 **Dr James Wang** said that if the approved Central District (Extension) OZP had already taken into account the implementation of the ERP, it was a good plan. Otherwise, there was a need for further enhancing the OZP by factoring in this element. **Mr Hardy Lok** said that the SPH was disappointed about the TPB's decision on SPH's rezoning request and that it would have no alternative but to accept such a decision. **Dr Andrew Thomson** said that the HEC should keep an open mind in the proposed harbour-front enhancement review on Central and that the business sector was concerned about the planned land use on the approved Central District (Extension) OZP.

5.11 **Mr Thomas Chow** said that when reviewing the need

of new roads and other transport measures, volume/capacity (V/C) ratio would be used. Under the existing transport policy, if the ratio exceeded 1.2, the traffic congestion would be considered unacceptable and specific measures would be required. As mentioned in the Expert Panel Forum, assuming the existence of the CWB, in 2016 the V/C ratio of the Gloucester Road corridor would be 0.8 to 0.9. The traffic condition would still be much better than that at present. However, to ensure that the traffic arrangement would be sustainable, the Panel considered that, in addition to building the CWB with the two proposed slip roads, the Government should consider implementing traffic management measures such as ERP. The Government agreed to that. The purpose of a multi-pronged approach was to keep the V/C ratio at an acceptable level in the long term. However, he did not expect that introduction of ERP in the Central Business District would have such an impact as would change the land use in the area.

5.12 **The Chairman** concluded that as an advisory committee to advise the Government on planning along the existing and new harbour-front of the Victoria Harbour, the HEC should respect the statutory role of the TPB in connection with the preparation of OZPs in the planning process. He proposed that in future, the Government bureaux/departments concerned should actively engage the community including the HEC and its Sub-committees for their views on enhancing the design of the Central harbour-front.

5.13 In response to the request of Mr Vincent Ng and Mr Hardy Lok, **the Chairman** suggested and **Mr Bosco Fung** agreed that the PlanD would present the planning concepts of the approved Central District (Extension) OZP to the HEC with 3D animations at the next HEC meeting.

PlanD

Item 6 Hong Kong Harbour Day

6.1 **Mr Paul Zimmerman**, in the capacity of the Harbour Day Organizing Committee, tabled a news release of 18 September 2005 and made a presentation on the Hong Kong Harbour Day, which would be held on 13 November 2005. He said that the Secretary for Home Affairs had agreed to be Patron of the Harbour Day. Major events on that day included the Round the Island Race and the Harbour Parade.

6.2 **Mr Mason Hung** said that as the events would involve the public, the Harbour Day Organizing Committee might wish to take note of the insurance and liability issues. Since there was no fencing along the waterfront of the former Wan Chai PCWA, it would be dangerous for the public to view the events at the area. In addition, support and co-ordination on the Round the Island Race and the Harbour Parade from the Marine Police and the Marine Department would be required.

6.3 **Mr Zimmerman** said that there was a Co-ordinating Committee with representatives from the Yacht Club, the Marine Police, the Marine Department and the Leisure and Cultural Services Department looking after the safety and sailing instructions of the events. Insurance would be dealt with on an individual basis.

6.4 **Dr Andrew Thomson** said that the HBF was one of the supporting organizations and that the HEC might consider putting across its messages that day as part of its communication strategy in view of the public attention to the events.

6.5 **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** enquired about the possibility of using the WKWP during the day, like a sunset cocktail. **Mr Zimmerman** said that the sailing race and windsurfing would pass by the sea area of the promenade but the timing of the pass-by would depend on the weather condition and therefore it would be difficult to guarantee the timing.

6.6 **Mr Patrick Lau** suggested that the Organizing Committee present their ideas to all the District Councils and get them involved. District Councils' advice on what kind of the activities they would prefer to see would make the Harbour Day more popular with the general public. **Mr Stephen Chan** supported Mr Lau's suggestion.

6.7 **Dr Ng Mee-kam** suggested that in order to increase the attractiveness, more activities that could bring about more interaction between the land and the water should be arranged. **Mr Zimmerman** said that in view of the limited time and manpower resources, the Organizing Committee had to rely on the supporting organizations to organize events on their own and the Organizing Committee would publish the information of the

events.

6.8 **Mrs Rita Lau** said that the Government departments concerned would look into the possibilities of making the waterfront sites temporarily available for the events. In response to Mrs Lau's question, **Mr Zimmerman** said that the Tourism Board had agreed to fully support the events by publishing the relevant materials provided by the Organizing Committee on their website.

6.9 **The Chairman** concluded that the HEC had a consensus view of supporting the Harbour Day.

Item 7 Any Other Business

A. Urban Land Institute (ULI) International Waterfront Development Conference in Singapore on 3 - 4 October 2005

7.1 **The Chairman** said that the HEC should establish a mechanism to endorse proposals for Members to attend and speak at overseas conferences on behalf of the HEC. On the ULI International Waterfront Development Conference in Singapore on 3 - 4 October 2005, he understood that Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke would attend the Conference and invited him to be observer and to share his experience with Members afterwards.

HEC secretariat

B. Design competition for enhancement of waterfront in Eastern District

7.2 After some discussion, **Mr Stephen Chan** volunteered and **the meeting** agreed that he would join the Working Group for Waterfront Development in Eastern District meeting in early October 2005 to discuss the detailed arrangement on behalf of the HEC. **Mr L T Ma** said that Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter was one of the target sites. It fell within the study area of the HER project. The HER Task Force would have to closely liaise with the Working Group on its design competition so as to tie in with the Realization Stage of the HER project.

**Sub-committee
on WDII Review
secretariat**

C. Motion on temporary harbour-front land use strategy

7.3 **The Chairman** said that as the Lands Department

(LandsD) was responsible for the land administration policy, including temporary land use, he suggested inviting the LandsD to present a paper to the HEC on the subject.

7.4 **Mr Vincent Ng** said that the Sub-committee on HPR had taken up the discussion of temporary harbour-front land use strategy from the last HEC meeting when the quorum had lost. After discussion, the Sub-committee supported the broad principle that “Hong Kong Government should be committed to a harbour-front enhancement and greening strategy of harbour-front land available for lease under short term tenancy.” For the remaining items of the motion which were good practices under the broad principle, the Sub-committee suggested that its HPP Task Group consider the matter with a view to developing them into detailed guidelines and practice on the basis of the HPPs. As the motion had been submitted to the HEC, the Sub-committee referred the motion with its recommendations back to the HEC for further deliberation.

7.5 **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** said that the Government should seriously respond to the motion on temporary harbour-front land use strategy which he considered reasonable and enquired whether the HEC should pass the motion. **Dr Andrew Thomson** opined that the motion was reasonable and suggested that it be passed immediately. **Mrs Ava Ng** said that there was a need for Members to understand the existing LandsD’s land administration policy and be provided with a chance to debate on the motion before it was putting to vote.

7.6 **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** said that the motion was resulted from the CEDD’s presentation on Greening Master Plan to the HEC in March 2005 and subsequent discussion of the issue by Members. He suggested putting the motion as an agenda item instead of under AOB so that a more thorough deliberation could be conducted. **Mr Patrick Lau** said that the motion had undergone some rounds of discussion and that it was not controversial as some measures were being implemented by the respective Government departments. **Mr K K Lau** supported that further discussion was required.

7.7 On the provision of bicycle paths at temporary waterfront sites, **Mr K K Lau** said that the existing road network in the urban area consisted of many steep, narrow and elevated roads.

It was not entirely satisfactory in terms of bringing cyclists to the waterfront areas. The provision of bicycle paths at waterfront sites needed a holistic consideration and it was immature at the moment to provide such facilities.

7.8 **Mr Vincent Ng** said that the HEC should first decide whether there should be a motion mechanism for the HEC. **Mrs Rita Lau** also saw the need of a set of clear procedures for HEC motions. She considered that the Government should first provide Members with more background as well as its policy considerations and responsibility in relation to a topic so that Members could debate on the matter before voting the motion. **Dr Ng Mee-kam** agreed that for the benefit of Members, the Government should present more information to the HEC before further exchanging views on the subject.

HEC secretariat

7.9 As regards temporary sites, **Mr Mason Hung** said that different time spans of their availability could result in different usage patterns. It would be more meaningful to enhance the activities at the temporary sites rather than greening them. He agreed to invite the LandsD to present information on sites available and the respective time spans. **The Chairman** concluded that the LandsD should be invited to present the subject to the HEC.

Date of next meeting

7.10 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:40 p.m. The next HEC meeting would be held on 24 November 2005 (Thursday).

**Harbour-front Enhancement Committee
November 2005**