

**Twelfth Meeting of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee  
held at 2:30 pm on 26 July 2006  
at 3/F, 3 Edinburgh Place, Central, Hong Kong**

**Minutes of Meeting**

**Present**

Professor Lee Chack-fan	Chairman
Mr Roger Nissim	Representing Business Environment Council (BEC)
Mr Leung Kong-yui	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Dr Alvin Kwok	Representing Conservancy Association
Mrs Mei Ng	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Vincent Ng	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Leslie Chen	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Ms Pong Yuen-ye	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Ir Dr Greg Wong	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Mason Hung	Representing Hong Kong Tourism Board
Mr Louis Loong	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong (REDA)
Mr Hardy Lok	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour Limited
Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke	
Mr Jimmy Kwok	
Professor Lam Kin-che	
Mr Patrick Lau	
Ms Starry Lee	
Mr John Wu	
Mr Thomas Chow	Deputy Secretary (Transport) <sup>1</sup> , Environment, Transport and Works Bureau
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
Miss Wong Yuet-wah	Secretary

**In Attendance**

Mr Robin Ip	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands) <sup>1</sup> , Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau (HPLB)
Ms Lydia Lam	Assistant Secretary (Planning) <sup>3</sup> , 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 Wong	Assistant Director of Planning/Territorial (Acting)
Ms Phyllis Li	Assistant Director of Planning/Special Duties (Acting)
Mr Kelvin Chan	District Planning Officer/Kowloon (Acting), Planning Department (PlanD)
Mr Roy Li	Senior Town Planner/Special Duties(1)2, PlanD
Miss Angela Tam	Chief Executive Officer(2)1, Home Affairs Department (HAD)

**Absent with Apologies**

Dr Ng Mee-kam	Representing Citizen Envisioning@Harbour
Mr Bernard Chan	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr Stephen Chan	
Mr Steve Chan	
Dr Chan Wai-kwan	
Professor Jim Chi-yung	
Mrs Rita Lau	Permanent Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands)
Miss Linda Law	Assistant Director(2) (Acting), HAD

**Action**

**Welcoming Message**

**The Chairman** welcomed all Members to the twelfth meeting of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC). He informed the meeting that with effect from 20 July 2006, Mr Roger Nissim had become BEC's alternate member at HEC. Given Mr Nissim was REDA's alternate member at HEC before that date, **REDA** would inform the Secretariat of its new nomination.

**REDA**

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

1.1 The draft minutes of the eleventh meeting were circulated to Members on 21 June 2006. On 25 July 2006, **Dr Ng Mee-kam** suggested replacing "her organization" in line 2 of paragraph 2.9 by "the Centre of Urban Planning and

Environmental Management, the University of Hong Kong”.  
**The meeting** agreed to the amendment.

1.2 Regarding Mr Paul Zimmerman’s views on the operation of HEC expressed under AOB of the eleventh meeting, after some discussion, **Members** voted for the arrangement that reference to the audio record of the meeting at the HEC website should be included in the minutes.

(Post-meeting note: Confirmed minutes incorporating the agreement and decision in paragraphs 1.1 and 1.2 above respectively were circulated to Members on 1 August 2006.)

## **Item 2 Progress reports from the three Sub-committees (Paper Nos. 10 - 12/2006)**

### **A. Sub-committee on South East Kowloon Development Review (SEKDR) (Paper No. 10/2006)**

2.1 **Mr Kelvin Chan, Secretary of the SEKDR Sub-committee**, presented the progress report on behalf of Dr Chan Wai-kwan who could not attend the meeting.

2.1.1 **Mr Chan** informed the meeting that the Stage 3 Public Participation programme of the Kai Tak Planning Review (KTPR), which had started on 23 June 2006, would be completed on 23 August 2006. The Sub-committee had discussed the draft Preliminary Outline Development Plan (PODP) and their main comments were as follows –

- Connectivity within the district and with the adjacent districts, in particular the Kwun Tong District, should be enhanced;
- Integration of public facilities such as the multi-purpose stadium complex and the Metro Park with the surrounding developments should be strengthened to enhance public accessibility; and
- The mitigation measures to tackle the environmental problems at the Kai Tak Approach Channel were still outstanding and they might affect the PODP in

due course.

2.1.2 In respect of the Stages 1 and 2 Public Participation, the Sub-committee had noted that most of the Sub-committee's proposals to enhance the public participation process, such as various forums and Collaborators Meetings, had been implemented. The Sub-committee had reckoned that the KTPR had developed a good example of public participation in the whole planning process.

2.1.3 The Sub-committee also noted that the PODP would be finalized to take into account the comments received in the Stage 3 Public Participation.

## **B. Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review (HPR) (Paper No. 11/2006)**

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

2.2.1 **Mr Ng** reported that owing to the latest development of the proposed West Kowloon Cultural District, the West Kowloon Waterfront Promenade, originally scheduled for use until early 2007, could remain to be available for public enjoyment for about three more years. The Government proposed to extend the Promenade and further enhance the facilities to improve patronage. The enhancement works was scheduled for completion by end of 2006. The Sub-committee supported the proposals and offered additional comments for Government's consideration.

2.2.2 The Sub-committee had discussed the architectural and landscaping design of the proposed stormwater pumping station at the Sheung Wan waterfront. The project was scheduled for completion by mid 2009. The Sub-committee supported the proposal with its emphasis on green elements and made a number of suggestions, including the provision of more varieties of plants, acoustic enclosures and refreshment kiosks, as well as the use of recycled materials and energy efficient design in street furniture. The Drainage Services Department (DSD) would take into

account the Sub-committee's views and suggestions when finalizing the detailed design. On the Harbour Area Treatment Scheme Stage 2, the Sub-committee had discussed with the DSD about the relocation of the shaft and related facilities to a more remote area and their design.

2.2.3 The Sub-committee had also agreed to streamline the revised approach and programme for the Hung Hom District Study by skipping the option formulation stage and the associated public engagement process. It had submitted a request to HEC to carry out an evaluation of the public engagement processes undertaken so far for the Wan Chai Development Phase II Review (WDIIR), KTPR and Central Harbourfront and Me (CHarM) public participatory programme with a view to streamlining the process. **The Chairman** said that the request would be covered under AOB.

2.2.4 Regarding a proposal to erect inflatable advertising boards at the rooftop of North Point Ferry Pier submitted by a ferry operator, the Sub-committee had advised the operator to provide the Sub-committee with more site-specific information and to consult relevant stakeholders, including local residents and ferry users.

2.2.5 The Central Hoarding Beautification Drawing Competition was launched on 20 June 2006. The Task Group on this competition would assess all entries received in August 2006. Announcement of winners and prize presentation would take place around September and October 2006 respectively. The Task Group on Harbour Planning Principles had also started discussing the approach and programme of the formulation of harbour planning guidelines.

2.3 In response to Mrs Mei Ng, **Mr Ng** said the **Sub-committee** would consider proposals for erection of advertisement boards along the harbour-front on individual merits, taking into account different nature of the proposals and the locational environment.

2.4 In relation to Ms Starry Lee's enquiry about the progress of the enhancement of the Hung Hom waterfront promenade and the Hung Hom Ferry Pier, **Mr Raymond Wong** said that the Sub-committee would consider conducting the Hung Hom District Study after the public participation activities of other reviews under HEC were completed. He also informed that a private developer had presented to the Sub-committee their proposal of a temporary waterfront promenade along Hung Hom Bay to enhance the harbour-front area. In this regard, **Mr Ng** said that since the enhancement of the Hung Hom waterfront promenade involved a private developer, the land disposal/management issue would be more complicated than that of a project undertaken by the Government and it was worthwhile for the Sub-committee to consider the design of the proposed promenade further, after the land use issue had been addressed. **Mrs Ng** reiterated that the public should not be deprived of the right to use the promenade, no matter who the developer was. **Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke** suggested accelerating the whole Harbour Plan Review which included the Hung Hom District Study.

### **C. Sub-committee on WDIIR (Paper No. 12/2006)**

2.5 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** presented the progress report. He reported that in view of the least area of the harbour being affected under Variation 1 of the Tunnel Option among the options/variations with comparable functional/traffic performance assessed by the Consultants and the general support reflected in the recent public engagement, the Sub-committee had endorsed adopting such Variation as the basis for Concept Plan preparation. The Town Planning Board (TPB), Transport Advisory Committee, relevant District Councils, Legislative Council Panel on Planning, Lands and Works (LegCo PLW Panel) and professional institutions had been briefed on this Variation 1. The Consultants were developing different themes of land use proposals and harbour-front enhancement ideas for consultation with the public in the Realization Stage of the Harbour-front Enhancement Review – Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Areas (HER).

2.6 In response to Dr Alvin Kwok's enquiry, **Mr Thomas Chow** clarified that the report on the proposed time-variable toll charges for the three cross-harbour tunnels published recently in a

newspaper was not up-to-date and that the report of the Expert Panel on Sustainable Transport Planning and Central-Wan Chai Bypass (CWB) was the most updated one. The Expert Panel report had been considered and endorsed by the Sub-committee. **Mr Leung** said that he had been interviewed by the editor of a newspaper, who agreed that the newspaper report had not touched on the need to construct the CWB.

2.7 **Mr Roger Nissim** asked who the adjudicator for the overriding public need of the CWB would be. **Mr Leung** said that during the past two years, having considered the opinions collected during the HER Envisioning Stage, views of the Expert Panel, reports of the Consultants, legal advice sought from the Department of Justice through official members, etc, the Sub-committee agreed that there was a need for a CWB and that the Variation 1 of the Tunnel Option should be adopted together with other measures to alleviate the transport and traffic problems. The Sub-committee would continue the public engagement process in the HER Realization Stage and Detailed Planning Stage. **Mr L T Ma** said that in the past two years, the questions on whether the CWB could meet the overriding public need test had been deliberated thoroughly by the Sub-committee, Task Force on HER, Expert Panel and respective Government departments, as well as at various public engagement activities under the HER Envisioning Stage.

2.8 **Mr Robin Ip** said that the Government had pledged to protect and preserve Victoria Harbour and would ensure full compliance with the requirements of the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance and the Court of Final Appeal's judgement. The purpose of the WDIIR was to implement the CWB that was essential to meet the present and compelling transport need. The need had been confirmed by the Expert Panel. Reclamation would be required and the extent of reclamation would be kept to the minimum. Opportunity would also be taken to provide the public with an accessible and vibrant harbour-front.

2.9 **Mr K K Lau** said that the technical paper reported in the newspaper was published by two experts in 2002, who were also members of the Expert Panel. The Expert Panel had taken into account this technical paper in reaching its conclusions. There was already a consensus on the need of the CWB. **Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke** said that it was vital for the WDIIR

process to be robust, transparent and properly documented, since it would be subject to challenge in future. **Mr Nissim** considered that the effectiveness of toll equalization for the three cross-harbour tunnels should be tried before gazetting the CWB, otherwise the claim that the CWB was the last resort would not be demonstrated. **Mr Jimmy Kwok** said that currently there was already a compelling need to improve the traffic in Central and Wan Chai. He anticipated an increase in traffic flow resulting from the increased movements between the Mainland and Hong Kong. The pressing need for the CWB had been demonstrated by the open and transparent WDIIR platform. **Mrs Mei Ng** considered that views of individual members should also be respected and requested to record in the minutes her disagreement to the recommendation of the Expert Panel report to construct the CWB.

2.10 **Mr Chow** said that the Expert Panel report had clearly concluded that a series of measures, including construction of the CWB and balanced tunnel tolls, should be considered to solve the traffic congestion along the northern shore of the Hong Kong Island. No single measure could solve the traffic problems and there was a compelling need to construct the CWB. On balancing tunnel tolls, the Government had conducted model testing with the support of experts and found that this measure alone could not solve the traffic congestion. The Government would continue discussing with tunnel operators on tunnel tolls. He considered and **the Chairman** agreed that the collective decision of the Sub-committee to accept the Expert Panel report should be respected.

2.11 In response to Mr Patrick Lau's enquiry, **Mr Ip** said that the 25 July 2006 LegCo PLW Panel paper on waterfront connectivity and pedestrian access along the northern shore of Hong Kong was a follow-up to the Panel's request made at the 9 June 2006 special Panel meeting when discussing the outcome of the HER Envisioning Stage. The paper informed the Panel of the waterfront connectivity and pedestrian access along the northern shore of the Hong Kong Island and the related enhancement measures and plans.



**Checklists on items presented to/discussed at HEC/Sub-committee meetings (as at mid July 2006)**

2.12 **The meeting** noted the revised checklists which included the dates for the updated progress of the respective items under the “present position” column as appropriate.

**Item 3 Matters arising**

**A. Revised HEC/Sub-committee checklists (paragraph 2.10 of the draft minutes of the eleventh meeting)**

3.1 **The Chairman** said that this item had been dealt with under paragraph 2.12.

**B. BEC’s motion on temporary land use and quick-win enhancement strategies (paragraph 3.2 of the draft minutes of the eleventh meeting)**

3.2 **The Chairman** said that HPLB had forwarded the passed motion to the relevant Government departments for follow-up.

**C. PlanD’s Urban Design Study (paragraph 3.3 of the draft minutes of the eleventh meeting)**

3.3 **The Chairman** said that this item would be discussed under item 5.

**D. CHarM Design Brief (paragraph 5.2 of the draft minutes of the eleventh meeting)**

3.4 **The Chairman** said that the Sub-committee had revised the Design Brief and submitted it to the Government as input to future planning and development of the Study Area.

**E. Proposed design competition to take forward CHarM Design Brief (paragraph 5.3 of the draft minutes of the eleventh meeting)**

3.5 **The Chairman** said that the study on Refinement of the Urban Design Framework for the Central Reclamation and

Preparation of Planning/Design Briefs for Key Development Sites, which would be discussed under item 5, would take into account the recommendations of the CHarM Design Brief.

**F. HEC end of term report and work plan (paragraph 7.3 of the draft minutes of the eleventh meeting)**

3.6 **The Chairman** said that this item would be discussed under item 4

**Item 4 Harbour-front Enhancement Committee end of term report and work plan covering August 2006 – July 2007 (Paper No. 13/2006)**

4.1 **The Secretary** introduced the paper and presented the HEC end of term report and work plan. **Mr Kelvin Chan, Secretary of the SEKDR Sub-committee**, presented the SEKDR Sub-committee end of term report and work plan on behalf of Dr Chan Wai-kwan. **Messrs Vincent Ng and Leung Kong-yui** presented the HPR and the WDIIR Sub-committee end of term reports and work plans respectively.

4.2 In respect of the HEC work plan, **Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke** suggested that the development of West Kowloon Cultural District should be looked at in the coming months. For the SEKDR Sub-committee work plan, he proposed a short term planning programme to facilitate community access to Kai Tak. On the HPR Sub-committee work plan, he said that implementation of management mechanism of the harbour should be further discussed. **Mr Raymond Wong** said that the issue had been studied previously and was also discussed on a number of occasions by the HEC. The recommendation was that the existing mechanism was generally efficient in guiding harbour development and any drastic change to the existing mechanism was both unnecessary and undesirable. **Mr Robin Ip** added that the proposed harbour authority might not be applicable to local situation and that such a proposal would have institutional, legislative and policy implications. The current mechanism under which the various Government bureaux/departments performed their duties with effective co-ordination among each other was functioning properly. There was no need to set up an independent harbour authority. **The Chairman** suggested that the **HPR Sub-committee** should include their work and views on

**SEKDR  
Sub-committee**

**HPR  
Sub-committee**

the matter in the next end of term report for discussion of HEC.

4.3 Relating to the HEC work plan, **Mrs Mei Ng** said that recently at the request of the Advisory Council on the Environment (ACE), the Government had agreed to conduct a review on air quality objective. Subject to completion of the review, she suggested that proponents for harbour-front developments should be encouraged to make reference to the recommendations of the review. **Professor Lam Kin-che, also Chairman, ACE**, believed that once the review was completed, the Government department concerned, i.e. Environmental Protection Department, could present to HEC on the review. **The Chairman** suggested that the presentation to HEC on the review could be conducted in due course.

**Item 5 Refinement of the Urban Design Framework for the Central Reclamation and Preparation of Planning/Design Briefs for Key Development Sites (Urban Design Study) (Paper No. 14/2006)**

5.1 Upon invitation of the Chairman, **Ms Phyllis Li** presented the paper.

5.2 **Mr Vincent Ng** welcomed PlanD's proposed Urban Design Study and agreed that the **HPR Sub-committee** should provide comments on the study. He requested that there should not be any pre-determined design and enquired about the possibility of preserving the existing Star Ferry Pier clock tower and Queen's Pier.

**HPR  
Sub-committee**

5.3 **Mr L T Ma** said that as stipulated in the approved Outline Zoning Plan (OZP), to provide for the Airport Railway Extended Overrun Tunnel and an underground drainage box culvert in addition to Road P2, the existing Star Ferry Pier and Queen's Pier, which were neither declared monuments nor graded historical buildings, needed to be demolished. It should be noted that while the clock tower was Government property, the clock belonged to the "Star" Ferry Company Limited (SF). Having conducted a technical feasibility study in 2005 for relocating the existing clock to the new clock tower, the SF considered that this was not feasible as new parts and components of the clock necessary for the relocation and subsequent maintenance were not available. A new clock with similar

rhythmic sound would therefore be installed in the new clock tower and the existing chime would be dismantled and displayed at the new clock tower.

5.4 **Mr Robin Ip** echoed the views of Mr Ma. He said the new Star Ferry Pier, together with the new clock tower, was designed under a historical heritage approach proposed by the SF and was submitted to the TPB in January 2002 when considering the proposed amendments to the OZP relating to the reprovisioning arrangement of the Star Ferry Pier. The amendments to the OZP, which included amendments to allow reprovisioning of the Star Ferry Pier, were subsequently exhibited for public inspection in February 2002, and no objection was received.

5.5 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** considered that the reasons for demolishing the existing Star Ferry Pier clock tower and Queen's Pier should be explained to the public. **Dr Alvin Kwok** suggested that the public should be consulted on this issue under the Urban Design Study. **Mr Ip** said that the plan to demolish the existing Star Ferry Pier clock tower and Queen's Pier had gone through a statutory planning process including public consultation.

5.6 **Mr Bosco Fung** said that, as an alternative, consideration could be given to the possibility of incorporating some special features of the existing clock tower in the design of the new Central harbour-front. **Ir Dr Greg Wong** said that if preservation of the existing clock tower in situ at this stage would have cost and planning implications, the Government could consider removing the clock tower structure in several pieces like the case of Murray House and re-assembling them in the future nearby Central Waterfront promenade.

5.7 In response to Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke, **Ms Li** said that one of the tasks of the Urban Design Study was to recommend design controls, i.e. mechanisms to take forward the recommendations of the study for implementation. Some of the sites in the study area were zoned "Comprehensive Development Areas" on the OZPs, the development of which required submission of Master Layout Plans (MLPs) to TPB for approval. Based on the Urban Design Study, PlanD would prepare planning briefs, which were guidelines to be endorsed by the TPB, for

developers to prepare MLPs. In addition, all vacant sites in the area were Government land and therefore the recommended requirements under the study could be implemented through the land lease and allocation mechanisms as appropriate.

5.8 In reply to Mr Roger Nissim, **Ms Li** said that like other OZPs, the Central District (Extension) OZP was subject to review from time to time and that the latest reviews by the TPB took place in August 2005 and March 2006 in connection with several rezoning requests/application. **Mr Ip** said that for the long term development of the economy and interest of the public, there was a need to implement the OZPs as soon as possible. PlanD's Urban Design Study was on the right track of implementation.

5.9 **Ir Dr Wong** suggested that since the public had concern over the air ventilation of the future development in Central particularly the groundscraper, the air ventilation assessment parameters and analytical process should be open and transparent. **Mr Patrick Lau** considered that micro-transport issues such as means to facilitate better circulation of visitors in the area should be included in the Urban Design Study. **The Chairman** encouraged further exchange of views between HEC and PlanD on the study in the coming months.

## **Item 6 Conservancy Association's motion on Central review**

6.1 **Dr Alvin Kwok** presented the motion. **Mr Robin Ip** said that the motion touched on areas under two approved OZPs, namely Central District (Extension) OZP and Central District OZP. The two OZPs were approved in 2002 and 2003 respectively under the Town Planning Ordinance after undergoing a due statutory process involving extensive public consultation. In considering several rezoning requests/application in relation to the Central District (Extension) OZP in August 2005 and March 2006 respectively, the TPB reaffirmed the land use zonings of the current plan and rejected the requests/application. It also requested PlanD to conduct the Urban Design Study, which had been discussed thoroughly under item 5. For public interest, the Government needed to implement the approved OZPs as soon as possible.

6.2 **Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke** considered that the motion was overtaken by PlanD's Urban Design Study, which

had already responded to the motion and hence Dr Kwok's motion might not be necessary. **The Chairman** proposed that HEC be a partner of PlanD to provide input to the study. **Dr Kwok** agreed not to put the motion to vote and suggested collaborating with Central and Western District Council on top of HEC for the study.

**PlanD**

## **Item 7 Any other business**

### **A. Evaluation of public engagement processes**

7.1 **The Chairman** suggested and **the meeting** agreed that the **Secretariat** should prepare a paper on the evaluation of the public engagement processes undertaken so far for the WDIIR, KTPR and CHarM public participatory programme with a view to streamlining the process with input from the three Sub-committees for discussion at the next meeting.

**HEC Secretariat**

### **B. Vote of thanks**

7.2 **The meeting** noted that Mr Bosco Fung would retire in end July 2006 and thanked him for his efforts spent on and contributions made to HEC. It wished him all the best after retirement.

### **C. Date of next meeting**

7.3 The next HEC meeting was tentatively scheduled for September 2006 and the meeting date would be announced later.

**HEC Secretariat**

(Post-meeting note: The next meeting is deferred to 8 November 2006.)

7.4 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:40 pm.

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