

**Eleventh Meeting of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee**  
**held at 2:30 pm on 27 April 2006**  
**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
Ir Dr Greg Wong Chak-yan	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Mason Hung	Representing Hong Kong Tourism Board
Mr Louis H B Loong	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Hardy Lok	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour Limited
Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke	
Dr Chan Wai-kwan	
Mr Kwok Chun-wah, Jimmy	
Mr Lau Hing-tat, Patrick	
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 (ETWB)
Mr Bosco Fung	Director of Planning
Mr John Chai	Director of Civil Engineering and Development
Mr K K Lau	Deputy Commissioner for Transport/Planning and Technical Services
Ms Margaret Hsia	Assistant Director (2), Home Affairs Department
Ms Lydia Lam	Secretary (Acting)

**In Attendance**

Mr Robin Ip	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau (HPLB)
-------------	---

Mr George Tsoi	Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport)5, ETWB (Acting)
Mr L T Ma	Project Manager/Hong Kong Island and Islands, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Mr Raymond Lee	District Planning Officer/Kowloon, Planning Department (PlanD)
Mr Raymond Wong	Chief Town Planner/Sub-Regional Planning, PlanD

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr Leslie H C Chen	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Mr Chan Kwok-fai, Bernard	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr Chan Chit-kwai, Stephen	
Mr Chan Yiu-fai, Steve	
Professor Jim Chi-yung	
Professor Lam Kin-che	
Ms Lee Wai-king, Starry	
Mr Wu Man-keung, John	

**Action**

**Welcoming Message**

**The Chairman** welcomed all Members to the eleventh meeting of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC). As Miss Wong Yuet-wah was on study leave, Ms Lydia Lam was the acting Secretary for this meeting.

**Item 1 Confirmation of minutes of the tenth meeting**

1.1 The draft minutes of the tenth meeting were circulated to Members on 7 April 2006 and no proposed amendments were received. The minutes were confirmed.

**Item 2 Progress reports from the three Sub-committees (Paper Nos. 4 - 6/2006)**

**A. Sub-committee on South East Kowloon Development Review (Paper No. 4/2006)**

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

2.1.1 **Dr Chan** informed the meeting that the Stage 2 Public Participation programme of the Kai Tak Planning Review had been completed and thanked Members' support to and involvement in the programme. He said that the Second Kai Tak Forum, including a site visit to Kai Tak with the public, was held in March 2006 to conclude the Stage 2 Public Participation.

2.1.2 **Dr Chan** reported that the Stage 3 Public Participation programme of the Kai Tak Planning Review would be conducted after the views collected in the previous stages of public participation were consolidated for preparation of a Preliminary Outline Development Plan (PODP). At the last two Sub-committee meetings, Members maintained their concerns on the temporary uses in the Kai Tak site and considered that the extensive waterfront areas should be made available for public usage. The Sub-committee undertook to bring this issue to the attention of HEC.

2.2 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** reiterated BEC's concern that the location of the cruise terminal and the reclamation required for marine facilities such as the anchoring areas or piers should be considered by HEC before the Sub-committee further proceeded with the Kai Tak Planning Review. **Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke** said that it was crucial to link Kai Tak with the surrounding areas and pull together the components in a holistic way. In view of various projects in Kai Tak, a structured implementation programme for them was important.

2.3 **Mr Bosco Fung** said that during the public consultation of the Kai Tak Planning Review, there was general public support for development of a cruise terminal in Kai Tak. Regarding the issue of connectivity, to enhance connectivity between Kai Tak and its adjacent areas was one of the major objectives in planning for Kai Tak. This issue would be carefully examined in preparing the PODP for the Stage 3 Public Participation. The implementation programme would be further considered in finalizing the PODP. **Dr Chan** said that the location of the cruise terminal in Kai Tak had been discussed extensively in the Kai Tak Planning Review and suggested not discussing this matter at the current meeting. He opined that the Government should report to HEC on the progress of the Expression of Interest (EOI) exercise in respect of the cruise terminal in due

course.

2.4 **Mrs Rita Lau** said that it was Government's policy that Hong Kong needed another cruise terminal. The EOI for the cruise terminal and the inclusion of the cruise terminal as a planning component in the Kai Tak Planning Review were not contradictory. **Dr Chan** said that if the Government accepted none of the proponents in response to the EOI, the cruise terminal development at Kai Tak might have to be expedited. If the Government accepted any one of the proponents, there would be more time for planning.

2.5 **Mrs Mei Ng** said that the level of acceptability depended on the background information provided during public participation. She enquired if there would be reviews on the footprint of the cruise terminal and its related infrastructure and facilities required for evacuation and tackling pollution problems. She also asked the stance of HEC on the location of the cruise terminal in Kai Tak. **Mr Vincent Ng** said that HEC had already established a mechanism to gauge public views and recalled that there had been a systematic discussion on the cruise terminal in Kai Tak during the previous stages of public participation. He considered that the established mechanism should be respected. **Dr Chan** was of the view that the platform established by HEC for discussing the cruise terminal and other components in Kai Tak was successful. **The Chairman** said that the issue of cruise terminal had been discussed thoroughly during the public participation of the Kai Tak Planning Review.

2.6 **Mr Zimmerman** suggested that a wider range of different concepts and more information to substantiate the location of the cruise terminal in Kai Tak should be provided in the next stage of public participation. **Mrs Ng** suggested that a strategic environmental impact assessment (EIA) and the Computer Aided Sustainability Evaluation Tool (CASET) system should be adopted. **Mrs Lau** said that the CASET system was a standard procedure for the Government in making policies and that all concerned officers would regularly update themselves on the application of the CASET system. She said that detailed engineering feasibility studies, including EIA Study, would be undertaken in parallel with the statutory planning procedures in amending the draft Outline Zoning Plans (OZPs).

## **B. Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review (HPR) (Paper No. 5/2006)**

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

2.7.1 **Mr Ng** reported that the revised Harbour Planning Principles (HPPs) and the Central Harbourfront and Me (CHarM) would be covered under agenda items 4 and 5 respectively. As a harbour-front enhancement initiative, the Sub-committee was co-organizing a drawing competition with Central and Western District Council (DC) and the successful entries of the competition would be reproduced and mounted on the hoardings along the Central waterfront to beautify the Central harbour-front as a temporary measure. PlanD was hiring a public relations firm to administer the drawing competition and undertake the related logistics.

2.7.2 The Sub-committee also discussed Lands Department's (LandsD) proposed temporary uses for the ex-Sheung Wan Public Filling Barging Point site and Tamar site. As regards the former site, the Sub-committee suggested to LandsD that the tender document should include the requirement for provision of taller potted trees along the waterfront to provide effective greening both to and from the harbour. Regarding the latter site, the Sub-committee generally considered that the proposal should accord with the HPPs, in particular that the design of the site should enhance the visual and physical access to the harbour and the harbour-front areas. Its comments on the proposal had been conveyed to LandsD.

2.8 **Mrs Mei Ng** suggested that HEC should give thoughts to providing various species of plants in the implementation of the greening plan for the harbour-front. **Mr Jimmy Kwok** remarked that consideration should be given to enhancing accessibility for the public to reach the harbour-front in considering temporary uses for sites therein. **Mr Ng** said that further efforts should be spent in discussing with Government departments concerned for enhancing temporary uses for harbour-front in line with the HPPs.

2.9 **Dr Ng Mee Kam** said that a recent planning study conducted by the Centre of Urban Planning and Environmental

Management, the University of Hong Kong indicated the public aspiration for improved accessibility of the proposed Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park. **Mrs Rita Lau** said that it was a leap forward to cease the operation of the Public Filling Barging Point at the Sheung Wan waterfront. As the development of this site into a waterfront promenade to link up with the proposed Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park that would involve public funding, the Government had to follow a set of established financial procedures. **Mr Raymond Wong** understood that Leisure and Cultural Services Department planned to seek funding in mid 2007 for the project. In the interim, LandsD proposed a short term tenancy for letting out the site as a temporary car park. **Dr Greg Wong** hoped that the potted trees to be provided at the temporary car park would remain there permanently so that people could view them from the sea in future. Regarding the ex-Wan Chai Public Cargo Working Area, **Mr L T Ma** said that at the advice of the Sub-committee on Wan Chai Development Phase II (WDII) Review, CEDD had started preparing the design for a temporary footpath in the area and would consult Wan Chai DC on the design.

2.10 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested that columns of “next step” and “date” should be added to the checklists to indicate updated progress of items and that all items should be maintained until the respective enhancement items had been completed. **The Secretary** said that the updated progress of items had already been reported under the “present position” column of the existing checklists. She suggested that the heading of this column should be revised and the dates for the updated progress of the respective items would be added. On deletion of items, she said that once the corresponding action parties had completed their action on the respective items, they would be deleted.

**HEC Secretariat**

### **C. Sub-committee on WDII Review (Paper No. 6/2006)**

2.11 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** presented the progress report.

2.11.1 **Mr Leung** reported that the Envisioning Stage of Harbour-front Enhancement Review - Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Areas (HER) and the discussion on Central – Wan Chai Bypass (CWB) had been completed and that the next stage of HER, i.e. the Realization Stage, was about to commence. To start the Realization Stage, the Sub-committee would brief Town Planning Board (TPB), Legislative Council Panel

on Planning, Lands and Works and four DCs concerned.

2.11.2 **Mr Leung** remarked that the Sub-committee agreed in majority to the Consultants' view that there was no feasible "no-reclamation" alignment option for CWB and that the public in general supported the tunnel option. However, the flyover option would be included in the public engagement under the Realization Stage.

2.12 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that if the tunnel option was to be implemented, consideration should be made to submerging Island Eastern Corridor (IEC) at its interface with the CWB tunnel. The slip roads at Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre (HKCEC) would on one hand enhance the vehicular capacity of CWB and on the other hand have a great impact on the enjoyment of the harbour-front. The discussions so far had not touched on the trade-off between reduced capacity to solve traffic problems and harbour-front enhancement. **Dr Ng Mee Kam** said that some matters were beyond the ambit of the Sub-committee and should be followed up by HEC and other relevant Government departments and committees concerned.

2.13 **Mr L T Ma** said that the details of the interface between CWB and IEC would have to be further considered with the Consultants' submissions. The Consultants had already included in their report their analysis of different interface arrangements, including that with the submergence of part of the IEC as proposed in the public submissions received at the HER Envisioning Stage. Such analysis would be shared with the public at the Realization Stage. Regarding the slip roads, they were essential for effective relief of the traffic congestion along the Connaught Road Central/Harcourt Road/Gloucester Road Corridor. On the design of the slip roads, the Consultants had taken into consideration the HPPs and proposed at-grade pedestrian linkages to the harbour-front as far as possible. On the aspect of reclamation, the Government would ensure full compliance with the requirements of the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (PHO) and Court of Final Appeal's (CFA) judgment. The Consultants had already provided the areas of reclamation under the various construction options and would furnish further information on the "shallow water" idea for consideration of the Sub-committee. **Mr Ma** added that the endorsed report of the HER Envisioning Stage, including a "Foreword" and an "Appendix" summarizing those matters beyond the ambit of the WDII Review but considered appropriate

for further consideration by HEC, would be submitted to HEC.

2.14 **Mr Patrick Lau** said that North Point was most affected by CWB and its associated infrastructure and reclamation, but enhancement works in the area had not been discussed in detail. **Mr Ma** said that during the public engagement under the HER Envisioning Stage, the public clearly requested the maintaining of the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter (CWTS) and the ex-Public Cargo Working Area in Wan Chai, and it was the reason for shifting the CWB-IEC connection point to the east of the CWTS. The Consultants' report had included illustrations on the harbour-front enhancement works at the connection and the Eastern District Council and the public would have opportunities to provide further input in the next stage of the public engagement activities.

2.15 **Mr Thomas Chow** said that the Government had consulted Transport Advisory Committee (TAC) on the Expert Panel Report. TAC echoed the Expert Panel's support for constructing CWB and the associated slip roads as well as implementing other transport management measures in order to achieve a sustainable transport development. On traffic management measures, the Government was discussing with the operators of Western Harbour Crossing and Eastern Harbour Crossing on possible options for better distributing the cross-harbour vehicular traffic and had also embarked on updating the study on electronic road pricing. **Mr K K Lau** said that it would not be a sustainable solution if the slip roads were not built. In brief, the deletion would result in 2016 higher traffic flow along the Gloucester Road corridor than the current situation or in other words the traffic congestion could not be solved.

2.16 **Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke and Ir Dr Greg Wong** considered that the issues of HER should be brought to the attention of HEC at an appropriate stage. **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** remarked that the issue of reclamation and overriding public need should be discussed by HEC and suggested that a seminar on this with representatives from legal profession taking part be arranged. **Mr Robin Ip** said that the Sub-committee had discussed the matter and that the relevant Government departments would consolidate the information to revert to the Sub-committee. **Mrs Rita Lau** said that the onus to satisfy the PHO and CFA judgment was on public officers. Once the alignment of CWB was fixed after the public engagement



exercise, the relevant Government department would need to ensure compliance with PHO and CFA judgment.

2.17 In response to **Mr Hardy Lok's** suggestion of inviting representatives from Department of Justice (DoJ) to discuss their views with HEC, **Mr Ip** reiterated that the Government would revert to the Sub-committee after receiving all the relevant information with DoJ. **Mr Brooke** cautioned that more legal opinions could result in less scope for manoeuvre and suggested not proceeding with the matter formally. **Dr Ng** said that the public should be provided with opportunities to express their views in relation to reclamation and overriding public need. **Mr Kim O Chan** said that while legal views on the issue might be useful, it was necessary to explain to the public that economic development required infrastructural support. **Mr Leung** considered that legal views should be obtained after the alignment of CWB and other related details were clear. **Mr Ip** said that the Government would follow up the matter appropriately before responding to the Sub-committee.

### **Item 3 Matters arising**

#### **A. Confirmation of minutes of the ninth meeting (paragraph 1.1 of the draft minutes of the tenth meeting)**

3.1 **The Chairman** said that at the tenth meeting, **Mr Steve Chan** suggested amending the third sentence of paragraph 2.6 of the revised draft minutes of the ninth meeting to read as "To facilitate the public to better appreciate the impacts of development around the harbour, **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 revised minutes on this paragraph were circulated to Members on 25 April 2006. No further amendments were proposed and the minutes were confirmed.

#### **B. BEC's motion on temporary land use and quick-win enhancement strategies (paragraph 4.4 of the draft minutes of the tenth meeting)**

3.2 **The Chairman** said that HPLB would forward the passed motion to the relevant Government bureaux/departments concerned for follow-up. **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** suggested that the Government should report to HEC on the progress of this

matter in due course.

**C. Sharing of public engagement experience on the HER (paragraph 5.8 of the draft minutes of the tenth meeting)**

3.3 **Mr Bosco Fung** said that he had discussed the matter with **Mr Leung Kong-yui** after the last meeting. **PlanD** would conduct a study to refine the existing urban design framework and prepare planning/design briefs for the key development sites as shown on the Central District (Extension) OZP after discussing with the relevant Government departments and obtaining the required funding. As the study was initiated by TPB, **PlanD** would first revert to TPB on the study approach, followed by consultation with HEC. The community would be engaged in the study process. He reiterated that the proposed study was to refine the existing urban design framework and prepare planning/design briefs to supplement the Central District (Extension) OZP in response to TPB's directive, instead of reviewing the approved OZP.

**PlanD**

**D. Review of HEC briefings (paragraphs. 5.9 and 5.14 of the draft minutes of the tenth meeting)**

3.4 **The Chairman** said that this item would be discussed under item 6.

**Item 4 Revised HPPs (Paper No. 7/2006)**

4.1 **Mr Vincent Ng** presented the paper. **Members** endorsed the revised HPPs.

**Item 5 CHarM – Final Report and Design Brief (Paper No. 8/2006)**

5.1 **Mr Vincent Ng and Dr Alvin Kwok** presented the paper.

5.2 After some discussion, **Ir Dr Greg Wong** suggested and **Members** agreed that the section in relation to landscape on page 15 of the Design Brief should be suitably revised to tally with the motion on temporary land use passed at the tenth meeting. Subject to this revision, the Design Brief would be submitted to **PlanD** as input to future formulation of enhancement projects or planning review for the study area. On the proposed extension of tram services to the waterfront in the Design Brief, **Messrs**

**HPR  
Sub-committee**

**George Tsoi and K K Lau** expressed their reservations about the technical and financial viability of it. **Mr Robin Ip** remarked that the recommendations of the Design Brief were subject to technical and financial consideration of the various Government departments concerned.

5.3 In response to **Dr Kowk's** proposed design competition to take forward the Design Brief, **Mr Raymond Wong** said that as **PlanD** would conduct a study to refine the existing urban design framework and prepare planning/design briefs for the key development sites on the new Central waterfront and present the findings to HEC later, it would be more appropriate to consider the matter in that context. **Mr Ng** suggested and **the meeting** agreed that the **HPR Sub-committee** should further consider the way forward at its forthcoming meeting.

**HPR  
Sub-committee**

#### **Item 6 Review of HEC briefings (Paper No. 9/2006)**

6.1 **The Secretary** presented the paper. **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** suggested that all proponents who requested to present their ideas to HEC should be encouraged to present at HEC briefings. **Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke** said that a more proactive approach should be adopted to engage all interested groups to present on particular subjects at the briefings on a regular basis. **The Secretary** said that the proposed briefing arrangement had built in a mechanism which was in line with Dr Chan's suggestion, i.e. for those proposals relevant to the ambits of the respective Sub-committees, where the Chairman or the Sub-committee Chairmen could not come to an agreement as to the appropriate forum for the briefing, the proposals would be circulated by the HEC Secretariat to all HEC members for a majority view following the arrangement at Chart 1 of the paper. In response to **Mr Paul Zimmerman's** suggestion of a shorter lead-time for accepting applications for the briefings, **the Secretary** quoted the two requests for presentations related to Central at the April 2006 briefing and clarified that while no walk-in submissions/presentations would be entertained, there was no deadline for accepting requests as long as a reasonable notice was given by the proponents for the Secretariat to make necessary arrangement.

6.2 **Mrs Mei Ng** said that the arrangement so far had successfully incubated a culture of public hearings. She encouraged a fixed venue and time for the briefings. In addition, she reiterated that Members should reach out to the

community to listen to the views of districts. She also proposed to enhance the promotion for the briefings. **The Chairman** suggested and **Members** agreed that the recommendations as listed at paragraphs 8 and 9 of the paper should be endorsed. To promote the briefings, **Mr Robin Ip** proposed and **the meeting** supported that the **HEC Secretariat** recommend feasible ways for further consideration of Members.

**HEC Secretariat**

## **Item 7 Any other business**

### **A. Operation of Sub-committees in new term of HEC**

7.1 In light of the re-appointment of all Members to a new term from 1 May 2006 to 30 June 2007, **the Chairman** suggested and **Members** agreed that in order to maintain the continuity of the operation of the three Sub-committees, the composition, including the Chairmanship, of the Sub-committees should remain unchanged. He informed the meeting that Mr Paul Zimmerman would not continue to be BEC's alternate member in HEC. He expressed his appreciation for Mr Zimmerman's efforts spent on HEC and wished him all the best. **Mr Zimmerman** indicated his views on the operation of HEC, details of which could be referred to the audio record at the HEC website as follows -

[http://www.harbourfront.org.hk/eng/content\\_page/doc/11th\\_agenda7.mp3](http://www.harbourfront.org.hk/eng/content_page/doc/11th_agenda7.mp3)

### **B. Charrettes on Central harbour-front and Tamar**

7.2 **Dr Ng Mee Kam** tabled an invitation letter from Central and Western DC and CE@H to all HEC members for two charrettes on Central harbour-front and Tamar to be held on 7 and 21 May 2006 (Sundays) from 2:30 pm to 5 pm. **The Chairman** encouraged Members to attend the charrettes.

### **C. Work plan and end of term report for HEC**

7.3 **Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke** suggested including in the agenda of the next meeting an end of term report for HEC and a work plan for the next 14 months. **Dr Ng** proposed that the two items be grouped into one document on the retrospect and prospect of HEC.

**HEC Secretariat**

#### **D. Date of next meeting**

7.4 As some Members, who were also members of DCs, would be engaged with other meetings on the fourth Thursday of each month, the dates of future meetings would be reviewed. The next HEC meeting scheduled for 25 May 2006 (Thursday) would be rescheduled and the meeting date would be announced later.

**HEC Secretariat**

(Post-meeting note: The next HEC meeting has been rescheduled for 26 July 2006 (Wednesday).)

7.5 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:35 pm.

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