

Tenth Meeting of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee
held at 2:30 pm on 16 February 2006
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 (BEC)
Dr James Wang	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong (CILTHK)
Dr Ng Mee-kam	Representing Citizen Envisioning@Harbour
Dr Kwok Ngai-kuen, Alvin	Representing Conservancy Association
Mrs Mei Ng	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Vincent Ng	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Ms Pong Yuen-yee	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Mr Chan Kwok-fai, Bernard	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr Louis H B Loong	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Hardy Lok	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour Limited
Dr Chan Wai-kwan	
Mr Chan Yiu-fai, Steve	
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 , Environment, Transport and Works Bureau
Mr Bosco Fung	Director of Planning
Mr John Chai	Director of Civil Engineering and Development
Mr Brian Grogan	Deputy Commissioner for Transport/Planning and Technical Services (Acting)
Miss Wong Yuet-wah	Secretary

In Attendance

Mr Robin Ip	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands) ¹ , Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau (HPLB)
Ms Lydia Lam	Assistant Secretary (Planning) ³ , HPLB
Mr L T Ma	Project Manager/Hong Kong Island and Islands, Civil Engineering and Development Department

Mr Raymond Lee District Planning Officer/Kowloon, Planning Department (PlanD)
Mr Raymond Wong Chief Town Planner/Sub-Regional Planning, PlanD
Mr Lawrence Kwan Chief Engineer/Traffic Engineering (Hong Kong), Transport Department

Absent with Apologies

Mr Leslie H C Chen Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Ir Dr Greg Wong Chak-yan Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mrs Aliana Ho Representing Hong Kong Tourism Board
Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke
Mr Chan Chit-kwai, Stephen
Professor Jim Chi-yung
Mr Kwok Chun-wah, Jimmy
Mr Wu Man-keung, John
Ms Margaret Hsia Assistant Director (2), Home Affairs Department

Action

Welcoming Message

The Chairman welcomed all Members to the tenth meeting of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC). He said that Dr James Wang, the alternate member of CILTHK, attended the meeting on behalf of the Institute and that Mr Brian Grogan attended the meeting in the capacity of Deputy Commissioner for Transport/Planning and Technical Services (Acting).

Item 1 Confirmation of minutes of the ninth meeting

1.1 The revised draft minutes of the ninth HEC meeting incorporating amendments proposed by Messrs Vincent Ng and Thomas Chow had been circulated to Members. **Mr Steve Chan** proposed to replace the second part of paragraph 2.6 by “**Mr Steve Chan** requested the Government to provide a visual impact study on the harbour-front developments viewed from the Peak. This request was declined.” **The Chairman** suggested that the minutes be further revised.

Secretary

**Item 2 Progress reports from the three Sub-committees
(Paper Nos. 1 - 3/2006)**

**A. Sub-committee on South East Kowloon Development
(SEKD) Review (Paper No. 1/2006)**

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

2.1.1 **Dr Chan** informed the meeting that while the scheduled Stage 2 Public Participation Programme of Kai Tak Planning Review was completed on 6 January 2006, PlanD continued to receive written submissions from the public. The Sub-committee had discussed an initial report with a summary of comments and proposals received in that Stage and noted the diversified views in the community over various issues/proposals of the Outline Concept Plans.

2.1.2 Before the Stage 3 Public Participation Programme was launched, the Sub-committee would organize the Kai Tak Forum 2. The purpose of this forum was to enhance the transparency in the processing of comments received in the Stage 2 Public Participation by providing an opportunity for open discussion of Government's responses to the proposals and comments from the public. The outcome of the Kai Tak Forum 2 would provide input for the preparation of the Preliminary Outline Development Plan.

**B. Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review (HPR) (Paper
No. 2/2006)**

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

2.2.1 **Mr Ng** reported that the Sub-committee would consider the comments received during the public consultation and the Task Group's responses to these comments on the Harbour Planning Principles (HPPs), as well as the revised version of HPPs at its meeting to be held in March 2006 before submission to HEC for endorsement in April 2006.

2.2.2 On the Central Ferry Piers Participatory Programme, the consultants were preparing reports on the various public events and a design brief for

consideration of the Central Harbourfront and Me (CHarM) Task Group on 22 February 2006. After the agreement by the Task Group, the draft Final Report and the design brief would be submitted to the Sub-committee for consideration.

2.2.3 The Sub-committee was considering how the Hung Hom District Study could be programmed having regard to the progress of other ongoing HEC public participatory programmes in order not to overwhelm the public with consultative activities.

2.2.4 The Sub-committee had discussed the proposed amendment to the notes of the “CDA(1)” site at King Wah Road, North Point and the proposed installation of an LED screen on the roof of Central Ferry Pier Number 4. Its views were subsequently conveyed to the secretariat of Town Planning Board (TPB) and Government Property Agency respectively.

2.2.5 **Dr Alvin Kwok** suggested putting on record the CHarM Task Group’s appreciation of Mr T W Ng, the former Secretary of the Sub-committee, for his efforts spent on the Central Ferry Piers Participatory Programme.

C. Sub-committee on Wan Chai Development Phase II (WDII) Review (Paper No. 3/2006)

2.3 **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** presented the progress report on behalf of Mr Leung Kong-yui who could not attend the meeting.

2.3.1 **Dr Chan** informed the meeting that the Sub-committee had discussed the Expert Panel report on Sustainable Transport Planning and Central – Wan Chai Bypass (CWB) and endorsed the report. The Sub-committee supported the construction of a CWB.

2.3.2 The fourth draft report for the Envisioning Stage of Harbour-front Enhancement Review (HER) – Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Areas incorporating all the agreed changes had been circulated to Members of the Sub-committee for endorsement. During the HER Envisioning Stage, proposals on the planning of other areas on the Hong Kong Island had

also been received. Among these proposals, **Dr Chan** suggested that the planning of the Central harbour-front should be discussed under any other business.

2.3.3 The HER Task Force was planning to implement the Realization Stage of HER and would discuss the matter soon.

2.4 In response to Mrs Mei Ng's question on whether means to mitigate the environmental impact of CWB had been examined, **Dr Chan** said that the HER Envisioning Stage report was not a problem-solving report. Rather, it would provide recommendations on sustainable transport planning. **Mr Thomas Chow** said that before constructing the CWB, an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) would be conducted pursuant to the EIA Ordinance.

Checklists on items presented to/discussed at HEC/Sub-committee meetings (as at end January 2006)

2.5 **The meeting** noted the checklists on items presented to/discussed at HEC/Sub-committee meetings (as at end January 2006).

Item 3 Matters arising

A. Second informal group meeting on institutional mechanisms (para. 5.4 of the revised draft minutes of the ninth meeting)

3.1 **Dr Ng Mee-kam** had obtained the "Planning Study on the Harbour and its Waterfront Areas" conducted by PlanD. **Mr Nicholas Brooke** and **Dr Andrew Thomson** would forward to her their papers on overseas experience in waterfront management respectively. The second informal meeting would be arranged in due course after Dr Ng had received all these papers.

B. Procedures for endorsing Members to attend overseas conferences (para. 5.6 of the revised draft minutes of the ninth meeting)

3.2 **The meeting** endorsed the procedures for endorsing Members to attend overseas conferences that the HEC Secretariat re-circulated to Members on 17 January 2006.

(Post-meeting note: The HEC Secretariat re-circulated again the procedures to Members on 17 February 2006.)

C. Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter (para. 5.7 of the revised draft minutes of the ninth meeting)

3.3 **The meeting** noted that the HER Task Force would liaise with the Eastern District Council on the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter in the context of the HER project. On the Causeway Bay Waterfront Design Competition, **Mr Patrick Lau** thanked Mr Leung Kong-yui who joined the jury of the competition on behalf of HEC. So far the organizer had received some 80 submissions.

D. Greening/temporary use of harbour-front vacant land and HPPs (para. 6.1 of the revised draft minutes of the ninth meeting)

3.4 **The Chairman** said that Lands Department had taken into consideration the HPPs when considering the temporary use of harbour-front land. It had also asked departments concerned to consider the possibility of greening harbour-front land that would be vacant for three years.

E. Procedures for HEC motions (para. 6.2 of the revised draft minutes of the ninth meeting)

3.5 The item would be discussed under item 4.

F. 1 March 2006 HEC briefing (para. 7.2 of the revised draft minutes of the ninth meeting)

3.6 The item would be discussed under any other business.

Item 4 Motion on temporary harbour-front land use strategy

A. Motion mechanism

4.1 **The Chairman** said that **the HEC Secretariat** had circulated to Members the revised proposed procedures for HEC motions, which had incorporated Members' views expressed at the last meeting. **The Secretary** briefed the meeting on the revised proposed procedures and said that the proposed 21-day

notification period was to allow sufficient time for the circulation of the original motion and amendments to motion and for relevant Government bureaux/departments to prepare for the discussion of the motion.

4.2 **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** proposed that the revised proposed procedures be adopted and be reviewed after implementation if necessary. He suggested showing separately the numbers of non-official and official members voting for or against the motion, or abstaining if requested by Members. **Mr Steve Chan** enquired about the possibility of shortening the notification period and requested to record the names of Members voting for or against the motion, or abstaining in the respective minutes of meetings. On the proposed notification period, **the Secretary** reiterated the need for 21 days. Regarding motions on procedural matters which should not entail substantive debate, she said that they could be handled flexibly during the meeting. As to the request to record details of the voting result in the minutes of meetings, after some discussion, **Mr Chan** withdrew it and requested to put on record his concern that motions supported by some Members might not be passed if official members voted against them. **The Chairman** concluded that the revised proposed procedures were endorsed.

B. BEC's motion on temporary land use and quick-win enhancement strategies

4.3 **Dr Andrew Thomson** suggested that BEC's latest motion of 25 September 2005 should be dealt with and put to vote at the current meeting as it had been circulated to Members for a long time. **Mrs Rita Lau** said that the motion had resource implications to Government bureaux/departments concerned and might also have an impact on other public duties imposed on them. If the motion was passed, the Government bureaux/departments concerned would consider how it could be implemented, having regard to the available resources, the overall policy implications, as well as HEC's advice on and the public's aspirations for enhancing the harbour-front. On the basis of this understanding, the meeting further discussed the motion. **Dr Ng Mee-kam** understood the resource implications of the motion and suggested that if the motion was passed, the Government bureaux/departments concerned should plan the way forward and bid the necessary funding correspondingly.

4.4 After some discussion of the motion, **the meeting** put the motion to vote. Of the 21 Members¹, 15 voted for it and six abstained. The motion was passed. **The Secretary** would, after the meeting, forward the passed motion to the relevant Government bureaux/departments for follow-up action.

Item 5 Any other business

5.1 Before proceeding to specific issues to be raised, **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** said that while he understood the heavy workload of the HEC Secretariat, he considered that Members should have been given more time for suggesting agenda items, such as including items on Central HER and HEC briefings in the agenda.

A. A possible HER for Central

5.2 **The Chairman** said that PlanD was preparing a planning/design brief for the Central District (Extension) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) as directed by TPB.

5.3 **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** said that the enhancement of Central harbour-front had been discussed by HEC since 2004. Subsequent to TPB's decision on the two rezoning requests on the Central District (Extension) OZP and the one on the Wan Chai North OZP, and with the HER – Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Areas progressing well, he considered it an appropriate time for HEC to launch a review similar to the HER - Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Areas for Central Reclamation III (CRIII). He also remarked that at the last meeting on 24 November 2005, Members had discussed ways to refine certain zoning proposals on the OZP so as to provide more details on the development parameters and design guidelines for these proposals.

5.4 **Mr Bosco Fung** said that there was a major difference between the HER for Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Areas and that for CRIII. On the former, the relevant draft OZP was under review in the light of the Court of Final Appeal's judgment of 9 January 2004 with respect to the requirements of the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance. However, for CRIII, there was an approved Central District (Extension) OZP in place. If a HER were to be conducted for CRIII, its scale and approach

¹ Members include the Chairman, but exclude the Secretary.

would not be the same as those of the HER - Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Areas. Instead, the review could be undertaken in the form of preparation of planning/design brief to provide more detailed development parameters and design guidelines for the developments in the new Central waterfront as directed by TPB. PlanD would consult the public, HEC, District Councils, etc in the process. The preparation of the planning/design brief for the Central District (Extension) OZP would also take into account the progress of the HER - Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Areas and the planned completion of the CRIII reclamation works in end 2008.

5.5 **Dr Ng Mee-kam** said that though the proposed Central HER would be a simpler task than the HER – Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Areas, in view of the public concern about the relationship between transport demand and land use, there was a need to start the said planning/design brief early. **Ms Pong Yuen-ye**e suggested that the said planning/design brief for the Central District (Extension) OZP should make reference to the Expert Panel report on Sustainable Transport Planning and CWB with regard to the relationship between transport and land use. **Mr Vincent Ng** said while the approved Central District (Extension) OZP, which had undergone a due process, should be respected, there was a need for the planning/design brief to be prepared at an early stage.

5.6 **Mr Fung** said that PlanD was considering the work programme having regard to its existing staffing resources and workload and that the department would accord priority to the preparation of the planning/design brief. **Mrs Rita Lau** reiterated that the various land uses on the approved Central District (Extension) OZP had already been re-examined and re-affirmed and should therefore be implemented accordingly. When PlanD prepared the planning/design brief, the requirements as stipulated by TPB in respect of urban design, landscaping, building height, air quality, visual and physical effects of buildings, etc could be further enhanced in partnership with HEC.

5.7 **Mrs Mei Ng** suggested involving experts in public health, atmospheric quality, air ventilation and sustainability development when conducting the proposed review. **Dr Andrew Thomson** said that the proposed review was necessary and that the earlier the proposed review started in the planning and development process, the easier the implementation of the proposals. He considered that the formulation of the

sustainability principles and indicators under the HER – Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Areas was useful for the review. Given HEC's broad representation as well as valuable experience in public engagement process acquired from the Kai Tak Planning Review, the WDII Review and the Central Ferry Piers Participatory Programme, **Dr Alvin Kwok** suggested an early and ongoing engagement with HEC in the proposed review.

5.8 After discussion, **the Chairman** suggested and **Mr Bosco Fung** agreed that **PlanD** would discuss with **Mr Leung Kong-yui** on the experience from the HER – Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Areas.

PlanD

B. HEC briefings

5.9 **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** said that the HEC briefings had been introduced for a year, but two out of four briefings had been cancelled. There was a need to review the matter. He recalled that when deliberating the arrangements for HEC briefings on 4 November 2004, HEC also discussed the relationship between HEC and TPB. Following this, Members were circulated with the gist of planning applications relating to harbour-front received from TPB, albeit less frequent in the previous months. In reviewing HEC briefings, Members might give further thoughts on the relationship between HEC and TPB. To facilitate the review of HEC briefings and the relationship between HEC and TPB at the next meeting, he suggested that **the HEC Secretariat** should prepare the information regarding the work done for HEC briefings in the past year. On the circulation to Members of the gist of planning applications relating to harbour-front received from TPB, **the Secretary** said that for environmental reasons, the HEC Secretariat had revamped the HEC website to provide links to such gist and informed Members of the arrangement by email.

HEC Secretariat

(Post-meeting note: The HEC Secretariat re-circulated the email to Members on 17 February 2006 and will alert Members as and when there is a change to the listings and links.)

5.10 **The Chairman** recalled that one of the purposes of HEC briefings was to provide chances for Members to be briefed on proposals along the harbour-front. Members would discuss the proposals during the briefings and they were not required to endorse the proposals. While proponents could make presentations at HEC briefings, it was understandable that the respective Sub-committee meetings might be appropriate

avenues for presentations of certain items relevant to their work. **The Chairman** opined that whether the proponents would choose to present to HEC was a matter for them to consider.

5.11 **Mrs Mei Ng** said that HEC should play a leading role in advocating forward-looking planning and development concepts through public forums. She opined that HEC briefings should be arranged for the public, instead of solely for proposals to be heard by the TPB. **Dr Ng Mee-kam** remarked that with close communication with District Councils and other relevant organizations, the effectiveness of HEC briefings could be enhanced. **Dr Andrew Thomson** expressed that Members might wish to go through the list of harbour-front projects maintained by Sub-committee on HPR to suggest items for briefings.

5.12 **Mr Vincent Ng** said that HEC briefings had been proposed to avoid unbalanced workload among HEC and the three Sub-committees, and considered that the agreed mechanism should be maintained. **Ms Lydia Lam** said that as reported at the last meeting by the Chairman, from 3 August 2005 to 24 November 2005, the HEC Secretariat received some requests for presentation to HEC. As the presentations were related to the ambit of the respective Sub-committees, with the Chairman's agreement, the HEC Secretariat referred them to the relevant Sub-committees for consideration. **The HEC Secretariat** had recently received a request for presentation on Kai Tak and discussed the case with the Chairman of SEKD Review Sub-committee. It was considering the arrangement.

HEC Secretariat

(Post-meeting note: The proponent informed the HEC Secretariat on 27 February 2006 that it was not ready for the briefing in March. As there was no other request, the March briefing was cancelled.)

5.13 **Prof Lam Kin-che** saw the value of presentations by proponents, through which Members would know more about the updated and creative concepts of planning and development. He agreed to have a clear mechanism, review the list of harbour-front projects with a view to selecting some of them for presentation and encourage close dialogue with other committees, District Councils, etc. **Mrs Ng** said given its advisory role and reputation, the HEC should be cautious in choosing proposals for HEC briefings. **Dr Chan** said that HEC briefings would not affect the role of TPB and hoped that after

reviewing HEC briefings, HEC might turn such briefings into town hall meetings which would attract all interested public to attend them. In connection with the recent request for presentation on Kai Tak, Sub-committee on SEKD Review had discussed the issue and agreed that, in the context of the Stage 2 Public Participation Programme of Kai Tak Planning Review, it was not appropriate for the Sub-committee to hear from the proponent but not the others. It was also not appropriate for the proponent to present at the Sub-committee meeting without HEC's endorsement.

5.14 **The Chairman** suggested that in order to facilitate the review of HEC briefings at the next meeting, **the Secretary** should prepare a paper for discussion. The paper should include factual information on the requests for presentation to HEC, the arrangement for them, as well as the difficulty in the arrangement. Since there had been requests for presentation that related to the work of the Sub-committees, the paper should also take into account the possibility and merits of referring those cases to the respective Sub-committees, with a view to drawing brief guidelines for handling such requests.

Secretary

C. Date of next meeting

5.15 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:30 pm. Given the date of the current meeting, the next HEC meeting scheduled for 23 March 2006 (Thursday) would be rescheduled for April 2006. The meeting date would be announced later.

HEC Secretariat

**Harbour-front Enhancement Committee Secretariat
April 2006**