

**Fifth Briefing of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee**  
**held at 2:30 pm on 14 March 2007**  
**at Conference Room, 12/F, Murray Building,**  
**Garden Road, Central, Hong Kong**

**Minutes of Briefing**

**Present**

Prof Lee Chack-fan  
Mr Leung Kong-yui

Dr Alvin Kwok

Mrs Mei Ng

Mr Vincent Ng

Mr Kim Chan

Ir Dr Greg Wong

Mr Mason Hung

Mr Dennis Li

Dr Chan Wai-kwan

Mr Patrick Lau

Miss Ophelia Wong

Miss Wong Yuet-wah

Chairman

Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and  
Transport in Hong Kong

Representing Conservancy Association

Representing Friends of the Earth

Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects

Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners

Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers

Representing Hong Kong Tourism Board

Representing Society for Protection of the  
Harbour Limited

Director of Planning (Acting)

Secretary

**In Attendance**

Mr L T Ma

Project Manager/Hong Kong Island and Islands,  
Civil Engineering and Development Department  
(CEDD)

Mr Anthony Loo

Assistant Commissioner/Urban, Transport  
Department

**For item 1**

Mr Paul Zimmerman

Representing Designing Hong Kong Harbour  
District (DHKHD)

**For item 2**

Mr Albert Lai

Representing Citizen Envisioning@Harbour  
(CE@H)

**Welcoming Message**

**The Chairman** welcomed Members and proponents to the fifth briefing of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC). He reminded Members that, like the previous briefings, there was no need for the HEC to form a consensus view on the presentations. The purpose of this briefing was to provide Members with an opportunity to hear the submissions. The proceedings and deliberations would be recorded and uploaded to the HEC website. The minutes would be passed to Members and the relevant extracts to the proponents for reference.

**Item 1 Presentation by Designing Hong Kong Harbour District on A Living Harbour – Not All Reclamation is Bad**

1.1 Upon the Chairman's invitation, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** of DHKHD presented the submission.

1.2 On Mr Zimmerman's slide presentation on the works for a beacon near Kellet Island, **Mr L T Ma** said that the works, which were carried out in summer 2006, were not reclamation but urgent repair works to the foundation of the beacon. Regarding the draft Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan (OZP), **Miss Ophelia Wong** said that it set out broad land use framework and that detailed planning had yet to commence. The CEDD was carrying out an engineering feasibility study under which government departments concerned would look into detailed land use proposals. There would be opportunities to incorporate proposals for marine activities. In the course of the Kai Tak Planning Review, the Planning Department (PlanD) had received proposals advocating to designate the Kai Tak Nullah for marine uses. Such proposals were however subject to the long term relocation plan of the existing nearby public cargo working area and the water quality therein. Up till now, the technical assessments undertaken under the Kai Tak Planning Review indicated that the water quality, even after mitigation measures, would still not be suitable for such activities.

1.3 **Ir Dr Greg Wong** said that the uniqueness of Victoria Harbour had bearings on its planning for marine uses and that it was important to provide the public with user-friendly harbour-front facilities. He considered that there was a need for

a development permission plan extended into the harbour. **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** enquired whether the submission argued for better use of the current waterfront or attempted to define reclamation so as to make it possible for those facilities to be built along the harbour-front. **Mrs Mei Ng** said that there should be a balance between centralized and decentralized marine use planning and that a marine OZP might be required. She was concerned about the impact of increased marine uses on the sewage loading and traffic within the harbour.

1.4 **Mr Patrick Lau** said that consideration should be given to relocating some marine activities from the harbour to elsewhere such as Sai Kung. **Mr Ma** said that any reclamation proposals had to satisfy the overriding public need test laid down by the Court of Final Appeal. **Mr Dennis Li** said that since the harbour was very small, there was a need to protect the precious harbour. He remarked that the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance did not apply to the sea beyond the limit as defined under Chapter 1 of the Laws of Hong Kong. Within the harbour area, there was a need to enhance land/water interfaces without recourse to reclamation.

1.5 **Mr Zimmerman** said that there was a need for a broad marine use framework for the harbour to address the demand for marine activities and that the demand could be identified by detailed technical studies. Once the demand was identified, there would be a need to consider how to use the various parts of the harbour to meet the demand. On reclamation to form land to provide land/water interfaces for the public to better use the harbour, he said that it could add value to the harbour, instead of impairing it. With respect to the impact of pleasure vessels on water quality, it was very small and there was already stringent legislative control over it.

1.6 **The Chairman** thanked Mr Zimmerman for his presentation.

## **Item 2 Presentation by Citizen Envisioning@Harbour on Central Design Review**

2.1 **The Chairman** said that CE@H presented at the 8 April 2006 HEC briefing on planning the Central harbourfront. It conducted a forum in November 2006 on the design proposals for Central. The purpose of this presentation was to report on the outcome. This presentation was related to the PlanD's Central

Reclamation Urban Design Study (CRUDS) which the HEC, at the meeting on 26 July 2006, agreed that the HPR Sub-com should provide input to the Study.

2.2 Upon invitation by the Chairman, **Mr Albert Lai** of CE@H presented the submission.

2.3 On CE@H's proposed panel on overriding public need test, **the Chairman** recalled that the HEC had discussed the matter and considered that the public engagement activities conducted by the HEC Sub-committees provided successful platforms for stakeholders to exchange their views on harbourfront enhancements.

2.4 In respect of CE@H's report entitled "Review of the Design Study for Central Waterfront Report of the Workshop held on Monday, November 13<sup>th</sup>, 2006" (the Report), **Miss Ophelia Wong** did not see much divergence between the Report and the CRUDS, except the proposal in paragraph 8.2 of the Report on the Road P2 which was a dual-two road under government's plan. She said that the purpose of the CRUDS was to refine the existing urban design framework and prepare planning/design briefs for key development sites of the Central District (Extension) OZP as requested by the Town Planning Board (TPB). The Study was not for reviewing the land use zonings which were reaffirmed by the TPB after considering several rezoning requests/application in relation to the Central District (Extension) OZP in August 2005 and March 2006 respectively. She remarked that CE@H's Report would serve as an input to the CRUDS among others. In response to Mr Vincent Ng, she said that despite the complication involved, the CRUDS would commence in late March 2007.

2.5 **Mrs Mei Ng** appreciated CE@H's presentation and suggested that Members should start reflecting on the role and effectiveness of HEC in public engagement. She asked CE@H about the ideal way forward after public consultation. **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** enquired CE@H about their views on consultation fatigue of the public.

2.6 **Mr Lai** said that the current occasion provided a good opportunity to know the different value between development and conservation. There was a need to solve the difference by reviewing the existing planning and consensus building processes in order to achieve social harmony. The public would not have

fatigue as long as they realized that their views were accepted in the processes.

2.7        **The Chairman** thanked Mr Lai for his presentation.

**Item 3    Any other business**

3.1        There being no other business, the briefing was adjourned at 4:25 pm.

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