

HEC Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review

Minutes of 2nd Meeting

Date : 6 October 2004
Time : 2:30 pm
Venue : Conference Room
15/F, North Point Government Offices
333 Java Road, North Point

Present

Mr Vincent Ng (Chairman)	Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke	
Mr Bernard Chan	Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr Craig Doubleday	Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Dr Alvin Kwok	Conservancy Association
Mr KY Leung	The Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Mr Louis Loong	Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mrs Mei Ng	Friends of the Earth
Mr Roger Tang	Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Dr Andrew L. Thomson	Business Environment Council
Mr Thomas Tso	Deputy Secretary (Planning & Lands)1, Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau
Mr Augustine Ng	Assistant Director of Planning/Territorial, Planning Department

Mr Talis Wong	Chief Engineer/Kowloon, Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mrs Agnes Leung	Chief Executive Officer (2)1, Home Affairs Department
Mr Lawrence Kwan	Chief Engineer/Traffic Engineering (Hong Kong), Transport Department
Mr TW Ng (Secretary)	Senior Town Planner/Sub-Regional 3, Planning Department

In Attendance

Mr Steve Chan	
Mr Paul Zimmerman	Business Environment Council
Miss Christine Chow	Principal Assistant Secretary (Planning)4, Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau
Mr Andrew Cheung	Assistant Secretary (Planning)2, Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau
Mr Raymond WM Wong	Chief Town Planner/Sub-Regional, Planning Department
Mr WP Lee	Senior Engineer/Research Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr Kenneth Wong	Engineer/Research 3 Civil Engineering and Development Department

Absent with Apologies

Mr Jimmy Kwok
Mr Chan Tak-Chor

Action

The Chairman extended a welcome to all Members.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of Last Meeting

- 1.1 The revised minutes of the 1st meeting held on 4 August 2004 were confirmed without further amendments.

Item 2 Matters Arising

- 2.1 **The Chairman** informed that Mr Steve Chan, an HEC Member, had expressed interest to join the Sub-committee as a regular member. The meeting deferred discussion on his request until Mr Chan arrived.

Progress on Review of Harbour Planning Principles

- 2.2 **Dr Thomson** informed that the Task Group on the Review of Harbour Planning Principles would meet for the first time on 7 October 2004. The outcome of the discussion would be reported at the next Sub-committee meeting.

Progress on Enhancement of Central Outlying Ferry Piers

- 2.3 **Dr Kwok** reported that the Task Group on Enhancement of Central Outlying Ferry Piers had met twice on 2 September 2004 and 4 October 2004. The outcome of the meetings would be presented under Agenda Item 4.

Progress on Harbour Plan Review

- 2.4 **The Chairman** said that the review would be discussed under Agenda Item 5.

Progress on Enhancement Projects in West Kowloon and Central Pier No.7

- 2.5 **The Chairman** asked about the status of the enhancement projects on the land reserved for West Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD) and the beautification works on the hoardings of Central Pier No.7.

- 2.6 **Mr Tso** reported that tenders had been invited for the short term tenancy (STT) of a site for cultural and leisure activities at the western part of the future WKCD, and the bids received were being studied. In parallel, Housing, Planning and Land Bureau was working with Architectural Services Department on the proposed 400m long waterfront promenade adjacent to the STT site.
- 2.7 In reply to **Mr Tang's** query, **Mr Tso** clarified that only uses pertaining to arts, cultural, entertainment and leisure activities would be allowed on the STT site and this would be stipulated in the tenancy agreement.
- 2.8 **Mrs Ng** queried the role of the Members in the process. **The Chairman** opined that information on the projects should be provided to help the Sub-committee monitor the projects. In response, **Mr Tso** undertook to provide Members with more information on the projects, including the timetable, at **HPLB** the next meeting.
- 2.9 On the beautification works on the hoardings of Central Pier No.7, **Mr Talis Wong** reported that the project was being handled by CEDD.
- 2.10 **Dr Thomson** cautioned that bearing in mind the immense pressure on landfill sites, due consideration should be given to avoiding generation of construction waste under all planned projects.

Matters Arising from HEC Meetings

- 2.11 **Dr Thomson** said that a few items emerging from the HEC meetings needed further discussion - first, the issue of harbour authority that was brought up at the 1st HEC meeting, which agreed that it should be discussed at this Sub-committee; second, a clear mechanism in setting out the House Rules of the

Sub-committees. **Dr Thomson** considered that these items should have been included in the agenda.

2.12 **Mr Augustine Ng** clarified that the present agenda had been circulated to Members, and further discussed with and agreed by the Chairman. No requests for additional items had been received from Members. He added that the issue of harbour authority should no doubt be discussed by the Sub-committee; but as the harbour plan review had just started, the Sub-committee was not ready for such discussion yet. **Mr Raymond Wong** said that the issue of harbour authority had been examined in detail in the previous Harbour Plan Study. It was a controversial issue and deserved a full-scale debate possibly in the form of a focus group at an opportune stage.

2.13 **Mr Tso** suggested that in order to address Dr Thomson's concern, a checklist of outstanding issues to be considered by this Sub-committee should be compiled to facilitate the Sub-committee in scheduling its work. The meeting agreed. Secretary

(Mr Steve Chan arrived to join the meeting at this point.)

New Member to the Sub-committee

2.14 After **Mr Steve Chan** had explained his interest, the meeting welcomed him as a regular member of the Sub-committee, subject to endorsement by the HEC at its next meeting.

2.15 In reply to **Mr. Tang's** query if there was any deadline for HEC members to join Sub-committees, **Mr Tso** said that the house rules and operations of HEC were still evolving. He pointed out that while more member participation would contribute to the Sub-committees, there could be some technical difficulties. For instance, the larger the regular membership of the

sub-committees was, the bigger the quorum would be required and more co-opted members be allowed. The size of the Sub-committees should not become unwieldy, or else it would defeat the purpose of setting up the Sub-committees. He suggested, and the meeting agreed, that the matter should be brought up to the next meeting of the HEC for decision.

Item 3 Presentation on Questionnaire Survey Findings and Responses from Stakeholders on Ferry Piers under the Study 'Overview on the Enhancement Works at Government Piers and Landing Facilities' conducted by CEDD (Paper No.6/2004)

3.1 With the aid of a powerpoint, **Mr Lee** presented the findings of a public opinion survey on the existing conditions and facilities of ferry piers.

3.2 **Dr Kwok** commented that the survey results were very useful, as they provided a good foundation and reference for the Task Group on Enhancement of Central Outlying Ferry Piers.

(Mrs Mei Ng and Mr Roger Tang left the meeting at this point.)

3.3 In reply to **Dr Kwok's** query, **Mr Lee** said that views among different age groups did not seem to be diverse. On the contrary, different groups had made similar responses concerning aspects for improvement.

3.4 **Mr Brooke** opined that while the survey provided a useful reference, it was not advisable to draw from it a firm conclusion as the views were mainly those of users and operators. There might be a need to extend the net to canvass views from other stakeholders.

3.5 **Mr Leung** said that pier operators always preferred to have vehicular access. Over the years, reclamation had sited the piers further away from the core of the city, adversely affecting the business of ferry services.

This had also resulted in a longer walking distance to the ferry piers. Hence, the comfort of the pedestrian linkage between the ferry piers and the city core needed to be considered.

(Mr KY Leung left the meeting at this point.)

- 3.6 **Dr Thomson** said that the statistics were a powerful tool which pointed to the direction for improvement efforts. He was however concerned that some important aspects might not be addressed. For instance, whilst disabled facilities should be provided, it did not necessarily specify how the real need of the disabled could be addressed. Further, the needs of tourists should be further examined.
- 3.7 In reply to **Mr Doubleday's** query, **Mr Lee** explained that "greening" in the questionnaire referred to planting around the piers.
- 3.8 **Mr Steve Chan** commented that piers could also function as a place for people to gather and consideration should be given to providing more public areas within pier development.
- 3.9 In reply to **the Chairman's** query, **Mr Lee** explained that the next step of the Study would involve formulation of conceptual design schemes for selected piers. The public and pier operators would be consulted on the conceptual design before formulation of implementation plan.
- 3.10 **Mr Augustine Ng** considered that the Task Group on Enhancement of the Central Outlying Islands Ferry Piers should co-ordinate with CEDD to avoid duplication of efforts. **The Chairman** agreed and invited Messrs WP Lee and Kenneth Wong to stay on for discussion on Agenda Item 4.

Item 4 Report from the Task Group on Enhancement of the Central Outlying Island Ferry Piers

- 4.1 **Dr Kwok** reported that the Participatory Programme had been revised after thorough discussion by the Task Group. The revised Programme and the draft notes of the 2nd meeting of the Task Group were tabled for Members' information. The programme was to engage the public in the planning process with the aim of producing a design brief. The proposed programme would comprise, within a timeframe of 6 months, brainstorming meetings, outreach activities, surveys and interviews, focus group meetings, exhibition, charette and public hearing. Consultants needed to be commissioned to undertake the programme and public relations matters with the steer of the Task Group. Outline project specification and technical requirements were being prepared.
- 4.2 **Mr Bernard Chan** commented that the project scope should not be confined to the pier structures alone. **Dr Kwok** clarified that the project scope covered Central Ferry Piers Nos. 1 - 8 and the surrounding areas, including the pedestrian access and waterfront promenade, yet taking into consideration the constraints of Piers Nos. 7 and 8, which were under construction. **Mr Augustine Ng** opined that it was not necessary at this stage to define the project scope, i.e. how much and which adjoining areas of the piers should be included, because this would be one of the subjects of the public participatory programme and hopefully consensus would emerge from the exercise.
- 4.3 The meeting expressed support to the work of the Task Group and entrusted the Task Group with the logistics of the programme.

(Messrs WP Lee and Kenneth Wong left the meeting at this

point.)

**Item 5 Approach on the Overall Harbour Plan Review
(Paper No.7/2004)**

5.1 **Mr Raymond Wong** presented the paper and invited Members to comment on the approach and methodology of the Harbour Planning Framework Review. He suggested that the harbour-front area be divided into about 6 sub-areas instead of 14 nos. as proposed by the Business Environment Council. **Mr Augustine Ng** supplemented that the approach was only preliminary ideas and open for discussion.

(Dr Thomson excused himself from the meeting and his alternate, Mr Zimmerman, took over at this point.)

5.2 **Mr Zimmerman** made the following comments on the approach and methodology as set out in para. 3 of the paper:

- (i) Task (a) - Apart from the harbour planning principles (a1), the aspirations of the community for the harbour (a2) should also be identified.
- (ii) Task (b) - An inventory of land use proposals, projects in progress and status of existing projects around the harbour (b1) should be drawn up, accompanied by an indication of timeframe and responsible parties (b2).
- (iii) Task (c) - agreed that 6 sub-areas might be better than 14, but the principles of delineating sub-areas should be established.
- (iv) Task (c) - Public participation (c1) should be incorporated in the course of concept plan formulation (c2).
- (v) Task (e) - Improvement proposals should eventually be incorporated into the respective outline zoning plans and ownership of various proposals should be identified.

- (vi) Task (f) [new] – The review should also look into the management of the harbour-front area, including the institutional arrangements. Implementation mechanism and agents also needed to be identified.
- 5.3 **Dr Kwok** commented that public participatory activities should be included throughout the review process.
- 5.4 **Mr Bernard Chan** said that an overall harbour planning framework should include an indication of the Government commitment. He considered that as an important task the review should include the formulation of an implementation strategy.
- 5.5 **Mr Brooke** opined that this Sub-committee, being tasked with the formulation of an integrated harbour plan, should keep a watching brief on the work of the other two Sub-committees on Wan Chai Development Phase II Review and South East Kowloon Development Review. He felt that the current order of reporting within the HEC and its sub-committees might need improvement.
- 5.6 **Mr Tso** responded that given the limited resources, HEC and its sub-committees needed to adopt a realistic and pragmatic approach to handle the ambitious tasks. He assured that HEC Secretariat would try its best to coordinate the works of HEC and its sub-committees.
- 5.7 **The Chairman** commented that while the harbour plan review would require considerable coordinating efforts to accomplish, the harbour planning principles, which one of the task groups was working on, should be a crucial tool to guide the work of all sub-committees.
- 5.8 **Mr Augustine Ng** said that in light of the resources of the Sub-committee, we needed to prioritise the tasks

required to be undertaken in the review. He suggested a task group to be set up for the Harbour Plan Review for more focused discussions. **The Task Group on the Chairman** proposed, and the meeting agreed, that the **Review of Task Group on the Review of Harbour Planning Principles** undertook to work out the approach and methodology of the Harbour Plan Review.

- 5.9 **Mr Brooke** proposed that as an initial step Planning Department to consolidate the discussion and suggestions of the meeting in a paper for further discussion at next meeting. The meeting agreed. **PlanD**

Item 6 Report on Key Issues Raised by the Works and Development Committee of the Eastern District Council on Harbour-front Planning (Paper No.8/2004)

- 6.1 **The Secretary** said that this paper was to inform Members of the key issues raised by the Works and Development Committee of the Eastern District Council on harbour-front planning.
- 6.2 **Dr Kwok** opined that the Eastern District Council, and perhaps other District Councils, appeared to have expectations of HEC in enhancing the harbour front. He felt that HEC should maintain dialogues with the District Councils.
- 6.3 In this regard, **Mr Raymond Wong** informed the meeting that the four District Councils of the Hong Kong Island had extended an invitation to the HEC to a seminar on harbour-front planning on 5 November 2004. HEC Secretariat would disseminate details of the seminar to members. The event would provide a good opportunity for exchanges between the DCs and

HEC.

Item 7 Any Other Business

Long-term Role of Island Eastern Corridor

- 7.1 **Mr Zimmerman** proposed that the Government should evaluate the long-term role and existence of the Island Eastern Corridor (IEC), in response to public concern.
- 7.2 **Mr Talis Wong** pointed out that IEC was a strategic road carrying heavy volume of daily traffic. It would be tremendously difficult, if not impossible, to find a substitute to accommodate the traffic load even temporarily. **Mr Kwan** supplemented that the option of submerging the IEC under water would entail reclamation which could be in contravention of the CFA's principle of the "overriding public need".
- 7.3 **Mr Augustine Ng** said that the IEC, stretching 20% of the length of the harbour front was in fact serving the entire HK population rather than just the Eastern District Council. He opined that before the community was given to understand the merits and demerits of different options and coming to a consensus, he considered it not opportune to investigate the proposal of removing the IEC. **Mr Zimmerman** clarified that given that any option for enhancement of this 20% of the shoreline was subject to what could or could not be done with the IEC, basic evaluation of cost and opportunities should be a prerequisite and the first step of any review.

Next Meeting

- 7.4 **Mr Brooke** informed the meeting that he would prepare a paper on harbour authority drawing on **Mr Brooke** international experience for discussion at next meeting.
- 7.5 There being no other business, the meeting closed at 5.20pm. The next meeting is scheduled for 24 November 2004.

**HEC Sub-committee on
Harbour Plan Review
November 2004**