

Thirteenth Meeting of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee
held at 9:30 am on 8 November 2006
at 3/F, 3 Edinburgh Place, Central, Hong Kong

Minutes of Meeting

Present

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| Prof Lee Chack-fan | Chairman |
| Dr Andrew Thomson | Representing Business Environment Council |
| Mr Leung Kong-yui | Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong |
| Dr Ng Mee-kam | Representing Citizen Envisioning@Harbour |
| Dr Alvin Kwok | Representing Conservancy Association |
| Mrs Mei Ng | Representing Friends of the Earth |
| Mr Vincent Ng | Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects |
| Mr Kim Chan | Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners |
| Mr Bernard Chan | Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors |
| 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 |
| Mr Hardy Lok | Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour Limited (SPH) |
| Mr Stephen Chan | |
| Dr Chan Wai-kwan | |
| Prof Lam Kin-che | |
| Mr Patrick Lau | |
| Mr John Wu | |
| Mrs Rita Lau | Permanent Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands) |
| 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

| | |
|--------------|--|
| Ms Sharon Ho | Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport)5, Environment, Transport and Works Bureau (ETWB) |
| Ms Lydia Lam | Assistant Secretary (Planning)3, Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau |

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| Mr L T Ma | Project Manager/Hong Kong Island and Islands, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) |
| Mr Talis Wong | Chief Engineer/Kowloon, CEDD |
| Miss Ophelia Wong | Deputy Director of Planning/District |
| Mr Raymond Wong | Assistant Director of Planning/Territorial (Acting) |
| Mr Raymond lee | District Planning Officer/Kowloon, Planning Department (PlanD) |
| Miss Linda Law | Senior Administrative Officer(2), Home Affairs Department (HAD) |

For Item 4

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Miss Au King-chi | Commissioner for Tourism, Economic Development and Labour Bureau (EDLB) |
| Miss Patricia So | Assistant Commissioner for Tourism 2, EDLB |

Absent with Apologies

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Mr Leslie Chen | Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects |
| Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke | |
| Prof Jim Chi-yung | |
| Mr Jimmy Kwok | |
| Ms Starry Lee | |
| Mr Philip Yung | Deputy Secretary (Transport)1, ETWB |
| Mrs Ava Ng | Director of Planning |
| Ms Margaret Hsia | Assistant Director(2), HAD |

Action

Welcoming Message

The Chairman welcomed all Members to the thirteenth meeting of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC). He informed the meeting that Mr Philip Yung had replaced Mr Thomas Chow as Deputy Secretary (Transport)1, ETWB. However, owing to other commitment, Mr Yung was unable to attend the meeting. Mr Steve Chan had resigned from HEC with effect from 3 October 2006. **The Chairman** thanked Messrs Chow and Chan's contribution to and time and efforts spent in serving the committee.

Item 1 Confirmation of minutes of the twelfth meeting

1.1 The revised draft minutes incorporating Ir Dr Greg Wong's proposed amendments were circulated to Members on 6 November 2006 and no proposed amendments were received. The minutes were confirmed.

**Item 2 Progress reports from the three Sub-committees
(Paper Nos. 15 - 17/2006)**

**A. Sub-committee on South East Kowloon Development
Review (SEKDR Sub-com) (Paper No. 15/2006)**

2.1 **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** presented the progress report and the revised Kai Tak Preliminary Outline Development Plan (PODP) which had been prepared taking into account the views collected in the Stages 1 to 3 Public Participation of the Kai Tak Planning Review (KTPR). Based on this revised PODP, a draft Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) would be prepared for submission to the Town Planning Board (TPB). Subject to TPB's agreement, the OZP would be exhibited for public inspection under the provision of the Town Planning Ordinance and the public could comment on the OZP in the forthcoming statutory planning process.

2.1.1 In respect of the revised PODP, **Dr Chan** highlighted the following –

- The previously planned Shatin to Central Link depot site would be relocated to outside Kai Tak;
- Integration of the proposed multi-purpose stadium complex with the surrounding open space would be further enhanced;
- The middle part of the former runway next to the Metro Park had been planned for residential and hotel developments;
- The southern part of the former runway had been planned for tourism developments including a tourism node and cruise terminal facilities. The development of cruise terminal facilities would be discussed under item 4. The proposed tourism

node would comprise hotels and tourism-related facilities, including the possibility of a high-rise building with provision of a public observation deck and the mechanism to control the building height of this high-rise building would be further considered in preparing the OZP. Though public views were diverse, the proposed helipad was located at the tip of the former runway; and

- Linkages between Kai Tak and the surrounding areas were enhanced.

2.1.2 **Dr Chan** said that the revised PODP had not touched upon the use of the water body at the Kak Tak Approach Channel (KTAC), which the Sub-committee wished to enhance together with the harbour-front area for public enjoyment. The Sub-committee suggested both cruise terminal development and harbour-front enhancement for public enjoyment could be implemented at the same time. The Sub-committee had discussed its future role and concluded that it would continue to have a role to play by giving advice on harbour-front enhancement in the future development of Kai Tak.

2.2 In response to Prof Lam Kin-che's enquiry, **Dr Chan** said that CEDD was conducting a review on the water quality of the KTAC, which was crucial for the planning of the water area for public enjoyment. He added that the future of the nearby typhoon shelters would also have an impact on the future use of the water area for public enjoyment.

2.3 On the proposed connections between Kai Tak and the surrounding areas, **Mr Hardy Lok** said that SPH supported the proposal which was beneficial to the community subject to the overriding public need test being satisfied.

2.4 **Mrs Mei Ng** said that consideration should be given to solving the noise pollution arising from the proposed hotel, residential, helipad and cruise terminal developments, preserving the Kai Tak heritage and grasping the opportunities to use technological measures to solve the problem of the KTAC and adopting environmentally friendly transport means for the area.

2.5 **Mrs Rita Lau** thanked the efforts of the SEKDR Sub-com spent in the KTPR. She said that the TPB would consider the new draft Kai Tak OZP and that CEDD would seek funding approval from the Legislative Council soon. Afterwards, studies on the engineering feasibility and the required environmental impact assessment (EIA) would be conducted to assess the noise impact and water quality among other things. She said views on the need for reclamation at the KTAC were diverse. Subject to the investigations on KTAC, the possibility of reclaiming the KTAC as the last resort would not be ruled out, provided that the overriding public need test would be satisfied. Whether the water body could be used for public enjoyment would be subject to the findings of the study conducted by CEDD.

2.6 As regards preservation of Kai Tak heritage, **Mr Raymond Lee** said that there would be guidelines to protect the ridgelines of Lion Rock and Kowloon Peak viewing through specific view corridors by stepped-building height control. The appearance of the former runway would also be maintained. The proposed runway park could be designed to include the aviation history as a theme. The Sung Wong Toi Inscription Rock would be relocated back to its original location inside the proposed Sung Wong Toi Park overlooking Lei Yue Mun gap along a heritage trail extending along the former runway. There would also be landscaped pedestrian decks providing connection between Kai Tak and the surrounding heritage points like Kowloon Walled City Park. The existing piers along the waterfront would be maintained and more public landing steps would be provided to allow flexibility for water activities. Water elements/features had been included in the proposed open spaces to enhance the relationship between land and water at this harbour-front site. There would be a number of footbridges connecting Kai Tak and the surrounding areas and their detailed design would be built subject to further technical considerations.

2.7 **Dr Ng Mee-kam** suggested that school sites should be relocated to areas near to open space and that environmentally friendly transport system and enhanced connection between Kai Tak and the surroundings should be provided. **Mr Patrick Lau** suggested that the landscape at Kai Tak and the visual connection between Kai Tak and the northern coast of Hong Kong Island should be improved for the benefits of the residents therein. He

had concern over the proposed waterfront location of the multi-purpose stadium complex and considered that such facilities could be located in inner area. **Mr Kim Chan** suggested that the hygienic and water quality problems of the typhoon shelters should be resolved, particularly in view of the proposed development of a cruise terminal nearby. In the long run, these areas should be made available for public enjoyment. Consideration should be given to adopting the concept of net development density so as to improve air ventilation and avoid wall-effect of buildings. He requested that the development of Kai Tak should be planning-oriented instead of engineering-led, that the public could be benefited from the provision of facilities for public enjoyment during the various development stages, and that broad leaf trees could be planted at the early stage.

**B. Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review (HPR Sub-com)
(Paper No. 16/2006)**

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

2.8.1 **Mr Ng** reported that having considered the Chinese University of Hong Kong's (CUHK) presentation on Vision Study on Central Piers and Surrounding Areas, the HPR Sub-com agreed that the proposal by the CUHK might serve as an input to the Central Reclamation Urban Design Study to be conducted by PlanD.

2.8.2 On the Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park Phase II which included a swimming pool complex among other things proposed by Architectural Services Department (ArchSD), the Sub-committee noted the technical constraints on the disposition of the swimming pool complex. Noting that the project design was still at the conceptual design stage, the Sub-committee requested ArchSD to take into account its views to allow for visual permeability of the swimming pool complex at the detailed design stage.

2.8.3 PlanD had presented to the Sub-committee on the planning of the open space development between Shun Tak Centre and the Western Wholesale Market as well as the steps taken by concerned departments to

implement the planned open space development and enhancement of accessibility. The Sub-committee had noted that the open space at the Sheung Wan Ex-gala Point would be completed by late 2009 while the Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park and the open space to its west extending to the Wholesale Food Market would be completed by early 2011.

2.8.4 In respect of the Central Hoarding Beautification Drawing Competition, the Sub-committee had received a total of 950 entries. The finalists and winners were announced in mid August and mid September 2006 respectively. A prize presentation ceremony was held on 22 October 2006 in the City Hall Theatre together with an opening ceremony in Queen's Pier to signify the mounting of award-winning entries on the hoardings of the Central waterfront. A booklet on the competition with the award-winning entries had been produced and sent to each HEC Member.

2.8.5 The Task Group on Harbour Planning Principles (HPPs) had discussed the draft Harbour Planning Guidelines. The draft Guidelines would be revised in the light of the comments from the Task Group for submission to the Sub-committee for consideration tentatively by end 2006.

2.9 On the proposed Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park Phase II, **Mr Stephen Chan** suggested that escalators and lifts should be provided for the pedestrian flyovers leading to the park and that the promenade along Sheung Wan and Central waterfront should be connected to form a continuous one.

C. Sub-committee on Wan Chai Development Phase II Review (WDIIR) (Paper No. 17/2006)

2.10 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** presented the progress report. He reported that the Realization Stage of the Harbour-front Enhancement Review – Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Areas started in early October 2006. The four District Councils on Hong Kong Island had been consulted and a roving exhibition, a collaborators' working session and two community workshops had been held. The Legislative Council Panel on Planning,

Lands and Works would be consulted on 28 November and a consensus building town hall meeting would be held on 16 December 2006. He anticipated that the Realization Stage report would be ready in early 2007, which would mark the completion of the stage, and then the Detailed Planning Stage would commence. He observed that the public views received during the Realization Stage on the need for harbour-front enhancement for public enjoyment converged, though views on the details of enhancement were diverse. He considered that the existing water quality along the coast of Victoria Park Road and the need to satisfy the overriding public need imposed restrictions to harbour-front enhancements.

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

2.11 **The meeting** noted the checklists.

Item 3 Matters arising

A. Central Reclamation Urban Design Study (paragraphs 5.2 and 6.2 of the revised draft minutes of the twelfth meeting)

3.1 **The Chairman** said that PlanD would consult the HPR Sub-com and collaborate with the Central and Western District Council during the course of the study as and when appropriate. **The meeting** noted that PlanD issued the Invitation for Technical and Fee Proposals on 12 October 2006. The study was planned to commence within November 2006 for completion within eight months.

B. Evaluation of public engagement processes (paragraph 7.1 of the revised draft minutes of the twelfth meeting)

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

Item 4 Development of new cruise terminal facilities in Hong Kong

4.1 After a brief introduction by **Miss Au King-chi**, **Miss Patricia So** conducted a PowerPoint presentation on the topic.

4.2 To reduce disruption to the harbour-front for the purpose of public enjoyment, **Dr Andrew Thomson** enquired about the possibility of forming the sites for the three berths at the same time. **Mrs Mei Ng** expressed reservations about the forecast demand for cruise terminal facilities and queried the need to locate them at the central location of Victoria Harbour. She also asked about the proposed way forward after the three berths had reached their full capacity and the measures to prevent pollution. **Dr Alvin Kwok** inquired about the ways to ensure the successful tenderer's compliance with sustainability development principles, HPPs (including maximizing opportunities for public enjoyment), and the planning intention such as putting Kai Tak heritage along the former runway under the PODP when developing the cruise terminal facilities.

4.3 **Mr Vincent Ng** accepted the proposed location for the cruise terminal facilities and asked about the background, breakdown and planning concept of the proposed commercial gross floor area (GFA) of 50,000 square metres. **Mr Kim Chan** enquired if the cruise terminal and the former runway park could be developed within the same phase and how connections would be provided in the short run to bring people to the waterfront. He also wished to know the medium-term transport arrangement if there would be an opening at the former runway.

4.4 **Miss Au** said that the findings of the KTPR indicated general public support for locating the proposed cruise terminal facilities at Kai Tak. The location was also welcomed by the travel trade, including cruise operators who advised that cruises berthing at the Victoria Harbour would be tourism attraction itself. According to the findings of a consultancy study commissioned by the Tourism Commission, Hong Kong would need an additional berth between 2009 and 2015, and another one or two after 2015. The Government thus planned to commission the first berth by 2012 and the second berth after 2015. Plan for the third berth would be subject to market demand. Regarding the timing of development, she said that the cruise terminal facilities would be developed first, while the surrounding areas would be developed in phases. There would be advance infrastructure, including roads, to support the cruise terminal facilities and other development in the vicinity.

4.5 On compliance with sustainability development principles and HPPs, measures to prevent pollution, interface among various land uses and fulfillment of the Kai Tak planning intention under the revised PODP, **Miss Au** advised that the Government would engage stakeholders to gauge their views on major issues related to the cruise terminal project during the pre-tender consultation scheduled for early 2007. The views collected would provide a basis for the preparation of tender requirements. Regarding the non-domestic GFA of 50,000 square metres, it was roughly derived from the parameters of a minimum ground floor footprint of 7.6 hectares, which as advised by consultants was necessary for housing the berthing and supporting facilities for the new cruise terminal, and a height restriction of 35 metres as laid down by the draft OZP for Kai Tak. Development of commercial facilities would be compatible with the cruise terminal and enhance the vibrancy of the whole area. She noted that the existing non-domestic GFA at Ocean Terminal, Shun Tak Centre and Hong Kong China Ferry Terminal was also around 40,000 square metres.

4.6 In response to Prof Lam Kin-che, **Miss Au** said that in 2002, an EIA on the previous Kai Tak development, which incorporated the previous cruise terminal proposal, was conducted. Under the current plan, there was a need to dredge the sea bed to develop the along-side berths and the dredging works would require a separate EIA. The works should not commence until the EIA approval was obtained. On the use of the waterfront of the former runway by the public, **Miss Ophelia Wong** said that the public's wish to enjoy the harbour-front had to be balanced against other needs including the need for a cruise terminal. Under the revised PODP, there would be a continuous promenade along the waterfront of Kai Tak, including a landscaped deck on top of the proposed cruise terminal building. Exhibits of the former air traffic control tower could be placed at the proposed Runway Park located at the tip of the former runway. The long-term plan was to extend the waterfront promenade to Lei Yue Mun.

4.7 In reply to Dr Ng Mee-kam's suggestion, **Miss Wong** said that design concept to reminisce the flying history of Kai Tak had been included in the schematic design of the proposed cruise terminal and tourism node to recall the Kai Tak memory. On the timing of implementation of the various land uses, she

said that relevant bureaux/departments were considering the matter and that a timetable would be sorted out later.

4.8 **The Chairman** thanked Miss Au and Miss So for their presentation.

Item 5 Evaluation of public engagement processes (Paper No. 18/2006)

5.1 **The Secretary** introduced the paper. **Mr Leung Kong-yui** presented on the WDIIR evaluation report, **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** on the Kai Tak one and **Mr Raymond Wong** on the one on the Central Harbourfront and Me (CHarM).

5.2 **Mr Leung** said that public engagement involved large amounts of resources and that streamlining the process in straightforward cases while maintaining activities to deliberate complicated issues was therefore suggested. He opined that during the consultation process, the role of HEC Members should be to facilitate the process, rather than expressing their own views. He considered that once a consensus was reached after a public consultation programme organized in the name of HEC, it should be accepted by HEC as a whole.

5.3 **Dr Chan** appreciated that the process of planning with the community had been realized in the KTPR public participation events like the Kai Tak Forums and site visit to Kai Tak, during which various stakeholders could enjoy, learn from and be involved in the process. He wished to clarify that public engagement was not the cause of project slippage. Instead, it could help project proponents grasp community views and therefore facilitate smooth project implementation.

5.4 **Mr Wong** said that the experience in the CHarM was useful for PlanD to conduct the Hung Hom District Study. He also shared the HPR Sub-com's experience in and evaluation of the Central Hoarding Beautification Drawing Competition.

5.5 **Mr L T Ma** said that public engagement activities were suitable occasions to provide the public with the relevant information, facilitating exchange of views and smooth implementation of projects at later stages. **Dr Ng Mee-kam** said that the process of public engagement could be formalized so

that the results could be acceptable to the public who would then be keen to participate in future public engagement activities.

5.6 **Mrs Mei Ng** said that the role of HEC was to remind the public that Victoria Harbour was an important public asset of great value. **Dr Alvin Kwok** suggested organizing a symposium in mid 2007. The purpose was to record systematically HEC's experience in public engagement, as well as to listen to experts' views and overseas experience and the public's expectation towards HEC. **Mr Vincent Ng** said that HEC's public engagement was valuable in consensus building, minimizing the gaps among the various stakeholders and encouraging public involvement. **Mrs Rita Lau** appreciated the contribution of HEC and departments concerned to the success of the public engagement process.

5.7 **The Chairman** suggested that **Dr Kwok, Dr Ng and Prof Lam Kin-che** should further discuss the proposed symposium. On the proposal to invite overseas experts to present at the proposed symposium, the financial implications should be seriously considered. **Mrs Ng** suggested that to express HEC's gratitude, HEC should invite the public who had taken part in the public engagement activities to attend the symposium if organized.

**Dr Kwok, Dr Ng
and Prof Lam**

Item 6 Any other business

Date of next meeting

6.1 The next meeting was tentatively scheduled for January 2007 and the meeting date would be announced later.

(Post-meeting note: The next meeting will be held on 25 January 2007 (Thursday.))

6.2 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:20 pm.

**Harbour-front Enhancement Committee Secretariat
January 2007**