

Seventeenth Meeting of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee
held at 2:30 pm on 17 October 2007
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
Prof Wong Sze-chun	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Dr Ng Mee-kam	Representing Citizen Envisioning@Harbour (CE@H)
Ms Lister Cheung	Representing Conservancy Association
Prof Carlos Lo	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Vincent Ng	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Leslie Chen	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Dr Paul Ho	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors (HKIS)
Mr Kim Chan	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Mr Mason Hung	Representing Hong Kong Tourism Board
Mr Hardy Lok	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour Limited
Mr Nicholas Brooke	
Dr Anissa Chan	
Mr David Ho	
Mr Michael Hui	
Mr Jimmy Kwok	
Mr Patrick Lau	
Mr Derrick Pang	
Mr Raymond Young	Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)
Mr Philip Yung	Deputy Secretary (Transport)1, Transport and Housing Bureau
Mr John Chai	Director of Civil Engineering and Development
Mrs Ava Ng	Director of Planning
Mr Jeff Lam	Assistant Director (Headquarters), Lands Department
Miss Wong Yuet-wah	Secretary

In Attendance

Mrs Carrie Lam
Mrs Susan Mak

Ms Lydia Lam
Mr L T Ma

Mr C B Mak
Mr Raymond Wong

Mr Eric Yue
Ms Phyllis Li

Secretary for Development (SDEV)
Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1,
Development Bureau (DEVB)
Assistant Secretary (Planning)3, DEVB
Project Manager/Hong Kong Island and Islands,
Civil Engineering and Development
Department (CEDD)
Chief Engineer/Kowloon, CEDD
Assistant Director/Territorial, Planning
Department (PlanD)
District Planning Officer/Kowloon, PlanD
Chief Town Planner/Special Duties, PlanD

For item 4

Ms Esther Leung

Mr Danny Lau

Mr Ma Fung-kwok

Mr Ip Kwok-him
Mr Rocco Yim

Deputy Secretary for Home Affairs(3), Home
Affairs Bureau (HAB)
Principal Assistant Secretary for Home Affairs
(West Kowloon Cultural District)2, HAB
Member of Consultative Committee on the Core
Arts and Cultural Facilities of the West
Kowloon Cultural District (CC on CACF)
Member of CC on CACF
Member of Museums Advisory Group of CC on
CACF

For item 5

Dr K K Liu

Mr C C Chan

Mr Peter Yen

Assistant Director (Agriculture), Agriculture,
Fisheries and Conservation Department
(AFCD)
Senior Agricultural Officer (Planning and
Livestock Farm Licensing), AFCD
Agricultural Officer (Planning and Statistics),
AFCD

For item 6

Ms Margaret Kennedy

Chairman, Harbour Day Organising Committee

Absent with Apologies

Ir Dr Greg Wong

Mr Louis Loong

Representing Hong Kong Institution of
Engineers
Representing Real Estate Developers
Association of Hong Kong

Mr Samuel Mok
Ms Margaret Hsia

Assistant Director(2), Home Affairs
Department

Action

Item 1 Introduction by Chairman

1.1 **The Chairman** welcomed all attending the first meeting of the new term of Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC). Upon his invitation, all attendees introduced themselves.

Item 2 Opening Remarks by SDEV

2.1 **Mrs Carrie Lam** thanked HEC for its work in the previous term and expressed her views on the future work of HEC. She said HEC had built up with the public a consensus on the need for a vibrant and accessible harbour-front. It had also cultivated a successful public engagement mechanism through which the Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) had been formulated. In addition, it had contributed to the implementation of two quick-win projects, i.e. the West Kowloon Waterfront Promenade and the Wan Chai Waterfront Promenade. On HEC's future work, DEVB had reviewed the past terms of reference (TOR) and included in the new TOR the work in respect of the new Central harbour-front after completion of the planning for Kai Tak and Wan Chai. While the government had reservation about setting up a statutory harbour authority, she considered that an HEC task group could be established to explore a framework to manage the harbour-front areas in a sustainable way.

2.2 **Mrs Lam** briefed the meeting on DEVB's Policy Agenda, in particular the Kai Tak Development which was one of the 10 major infrastructure projects included in the Chief Executive's Policy Address. DEVB would ensure that the project would stay on schedule and that this vast site would be developed into an attractive place for our citizens to enjoy and take pride in. She invited Members to provide their comments on the part of the Greening Master Plan around the harbour-front when opportunities arose. On review of development intensity, priority would be given to the OZPs that covered harbour-front

areas.

2.3 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** was concerned about the impacts of the major infrastructure projects on the harbour and suggested that HEC should be consulted on the mitigating measures. **Mr Kim Chan** said HEC would have a role in monitoring the major infrastructure projects along the harbour and advising on preservation. **Mrs Lam** said the government would conduct various assessments to ensure protection of the harbour and it would engage all parties concerned at an early stage to gauge their views. On the Wan Chai Development Phase II (WDII) project, **Mr L T Ma** agreed that HEC should be consulted early so that necessary provisions for mitigation of construction stage impacts could be incorporated in the works contracts before tendering.

Item 3 Modus Operandi of HEC (Paper No. 16/2007)

3.1 **The Secretary** briefed the meeting on the recommendations of the paper.

A. TOR

3.2 **Dr Ng Mee-kam** said CE@H agreed that HEC had played and should play the following roles in the current institutional structure -

- Before the commencement of the statutory planning process, HEC's engagement activities had helped stakeholders envision the future, and realize the most critical and relevant planning issues which in turn facilitated consensus building;
- For projects that had gone through the statutory planning process, HEC had endeavoured to keep a close eye on the detailed design and implementation of harbour-front enhancement projects; and
- With the promulgation of the Harbour Planning Principles (HPPs) and Harbour Planning Guidelines (HPGs), HEC should explore ways to enhance the current institutional framework to

ensure that harbour-front developments would have regard to these principles and guidelines.

3.3 **Dr Ng** said in view of the above, CE@H suggested that the TOR should be revised as follows -

“To advise the Government through the SDEV on planning and developments along the existing and new harbour-front of the Victoria Harbour according to the HPPs and HPGs.

Specially, the Committee would -

- Advise on means to engage the public in the planning of the harbour-front areas;
- Advise on the design and development issues including land use, transport and infrastructure, landscaping and other matters related to the existing and new harbour-front and adjoining areas; and
- Explore a sustainable framework to advise on the institutional arrangements to manage the development and operation of harbour-front areas.”

3.4 For (d) of the TOR of HEC, **Dr Andrew Thomson** suggested replacing “sustainable framework to manage the harbour-front areas” by “framework for the sustainable management of the harbour-front in line with the HPPs and HPGs”. **Mr Leslie Chen** suggested revising “landscaping” to read as “landscape”. **The Chairman** asked the Secretariat to update the TOR, as appropriate, taking account Members’ comments.

HEC Secretariat

B. Frequency of meetings

3.5 **Mr Vincent Ng** said HEC should hold six meetings annually and that the meeting schedule should be fixed in advance. **Mr Jimmy Kwok** considered that there was a need to announce the meeting schedule in advance. **Mr Kim Chan** agreed that six meetings should be held a year.

C. Briefings

3.6 **Dr Ng Mee-kam** said CE@H proposed turning HEC briefing into a “Harbour Forum for People”. **Dr Andrew Thomson** considered that since HEC briefing was an important forum for the community, it should be arranged on its own instead of being grouped under HEC meetings. **Mr Nicholas Brooke** said DesigningHongKong’s request for presentation should be heard by HEC. After further discussion, **the Chairman** said some briefings in the past had been cancelled due to lack of proposals. He suggested and **the meeting** agreed that as a trial the briefings could be merged with HEC meetings.

3.7 Regarding HEC’s briefings to the District Councils (DCs), **Mr Patrick Lau** said it was expected that the DCs would suggest quick-win projects in their districts. **Mrs Carrie Lam** said the DEVB would help follow up issues raised by the DCs with HEC Chairman or Members attending DC meetings with government bureaux/departments concerned where appropriate.

D. Sub-committees and Task Groups

3.8 **Dr Ng Mee-kam** said CE@H thought that the sub-committee structure of HEC was of vital importance. It suggested that the following sub-committees which corresponded to the three specific roles identified in the TOR discussed above should be established -

- Planning and Engagement Sub-committee: possible projects included West Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD), Eastern District Harbour-front Enhancement Review (HER) and Western District HER;
- Development and Design Sub-committee: possible projects included Central Harbour Design, Kai Tak, WDII and all the projects under the previous Harbour Plan Review Sub-committee (HPR Sub-com); and
- Institutional Enhancement Sub-committee: to review and advise on a sustainable institutional framework to manage the development and

operation of the harbour-front areas and possibly to include study on “harbour-front enhancement as an over-riding public need”.

3.9 **Dr Andrew Thomson** said in view of the large number of possible tasks that required action from the HPR Sub-com, an action plan with time frame for the different tasks should be prepared to assist the Sub-committee in prioritizing its limited resources. More resources should also be allocated to HEC and the sub-committee/task groups.

3.10 **Mr Kim Chan** hoped that a sub-committee could be formed to review HEC’s previous comments on design of harbour-front projects such as the West Kowloon Waterfront Promenade. **Mr Jimmy Kwok** said HEC itself, instead of a sub-committee, could monitor harbour-front projects with reference to the HPPs and HPGs and offer views on the planning and land use of the WKCD development to the future WKCD Authority. Meanwhile, a new task group as proposed could consider management model for the harbour-front.

3.11 **Prof Carlos Lo** said sub-committees could be established to cater for non-project based issues to ensure continuity, whilst task groups could be designated for project-based matters and attached to sub-committees. **Mr Vincent Ng** said both sub-committees and task groups could report to HEC direct. **Dr Ng Mee-kam** considered that the HPR Sub-com could continue with its monitoring role and that the Task Group on Management Model for the Harbourfront could report to the HEC.

3.12 After some discussion, **the meeting** considered the Sub-committee/Task Groups proposed by the Secretariat acceptable, and agreed that the sub-committee and task groups would report directly to HEC. **The Chairman** encouraged Members to register with the Secretariat the sub-committee/task groups they would like to join after the meeting.

3.13 On openness of sub-committee/task group meetings, after some discussion, **the meeting** agreed that other than the Task Group on Management Model for the Harbourfront, the HPR Sub-com and the Task Group on Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (UDS) would hold open meetings.

**Item 4 Recommendation Report of Consultative Committee
on Core Arts and Cultural Facilities of WKCD
(Paper No. 17/2007)**

4.1 **The Chairman** welcomed Ms Esther Leung and Mr Danny Lau of the HAB, Messrs Ma Fung-kwok and Ip Kwok-him of the CC on CACF, and Mr Rocco Yim of the Museums Advisory Group of the CC on CACF. Upon invitation of the Chairman, **Ms Leung** presented the PowerPoint.

4.2 **Mr Patrick Lau** hoped that adequate greening would be provided to the open space including the promenade at the WKCD. **Mr Kim Chan** said the provision of greening at the WKCD should not be overwhelmed by the crowd control measures thereat and that consideration should be given to diversifying provision of cultural facilities to other waterfront sites such as Kai Tak. The public should be provided with the opportunity to enjoy the waterfront at the WKCD. **Mr Jimmy Kwok** supported the project and said the public should be provided with easy access to the facilities. The promenade there should be connected with the surroundings. **Dr Ng Mee-kam** wished that the WKCD would integrate with the culture of the area and could revitalize and redevelop the community. She noted that the net present value approach was adopted to assess the financial implications but pointed out that other economic, social and environmental impacts would also need to be assessed. She opined that the public should be consulted on the master plan to be drawn up by the proposed statutory body.

4.3 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** suggested adopting a holistic/integrated approach for the development of the WKCD and improving the connectivity of the area with the vicinity. He considered that the height limit, i.e., 50 to 100 mPD, was a very wide band and that this limit should be applied according to the HPPs and HPGs. **Dr Paul Ho** said the HKIS supported the project and hoped that the project could be implemented quickly. **Prof Carlos Lo** said the WKCD project should take into consideration the major concerns of the HPPs and HPGs and enquired about the ways to adequately address the views of the various stakeholders.

4.4 **Ms Leung** thanked Members for their comments. She

explained that there would be 23 hectares (ha) of public open space, most of which was at ground level, to be included in the master plan. This would ensure that adequate open space would be provided in the WKCD for public enjoyment. The master planning of the WKCD would put emphasis on integration with the surrounding areas. The proposed statutory body would pay due regard to the HPPs and HPGs in planning for the area. The recommendations on the WKCD were in fact made after a series of studies and public engagement activities conducted by the CC on CACF over a period of 15 months. The current three-month public engagement exercise would be completed in mid December. If the recommendations were met with broad public support, the Government would proceed with the legislative process to set up a statutory body to take forward the project. The net present value approach was adopted to estimate the funding required to finance the project over a long period of time. The Government Economist had separately conducted an economic impact assessment of the WKCD project, which concluded that the project would give rise to significant tangible and intangible benefits for Hong Kong.

4.5 **Mr Ma** said that on top of the 15 venues and one museum, the 23 ha of open space under the WKCD project would be open to the public. The views gathered from the public engagement exercise would provide input to the design of the open space to ensure that the latest aspirations of the community would be taken into account. On connectivity with the neighbouring areas, in addition to transport networks, other aspects had been and would be duly considered. **Mr Yim** said the Museums Advisory Group had stressed that the M+ would be very creative in building design, governance, management, etc. The Group had great expectations on the creativity of the project including the planning of the open space. He believed that the statutory body would ensure the quality provision of open space among other aspects of the development.

4.6 **Mrs Ava Ng** said relevant planning parameters including plot ratio, building height, open space requirement, etc. would be specified, as appropriate, in the statutory town plan to facilitate preparation of the master plan.

Item 5 Proposed commercial advertising on selected seaward wall spaces at Western and Cheung Sha Wan Wholesale Food Markets (Paper No. 18/2007)

5.1 **The Chairman** welcomed Dr K K Liu, Mr C C Chan and Mr Peter Yen of the AFCD. Upon invitation of the Chairman, **Dr Liu** presented the PowerPoint.

5.2 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** said the adverse visual impact of the proposal on the harbour far outweighed the revenue reaped and hence he did not support the proposal. **Mr Kim Chan** did not support the proposal either and said it would have set a bad precedent for other waterfront sites. **Mr Leslie Chen** shared the views of Messrs Brooke and Chan. **Dr Anissa Chan** suggested that if there was really a case for the proposal, the assessment criteria should include aesthetic and educational value.

5.3 **Mr Patrick Lau** had no objection to advertising boards along the waterfront, as long as they were creative. They were a form of economic activities and a form of public art. **Mr Vincent Ng** said the HPR Sub-com had never supported any similar projects. The floodlight used for advertising boards would also cause adverse effect to the waterfront. **Mr Jimmy Kwok** said he would support the proposal only if it could bring about positive effects to the harbour.

5.4 **Members** noted that the advertising proposal by AFCD was suggested by the Audit Commission which considered that AFCD had not fully utilized the site from the revenue angle. **Members** were of the view that it was not the duty of AFCD to make such an advertising proposal. The uses of our precious harbour-front should not be simply measured from a financial angle. **Members** agreed that HEC should write a letter to the Audit Commission to express its views above and tasked **Mr Vincent Ng** to prepare the letter.

Item 6 Harbour Day 2007

6.1 **The Chairman** welcomed Ms Margaret Kennedy, Chairman of the Harbour Day Organising Committee. Upon invitation of the Chairman, **Ms Kennedy** presented the PowerPoint. [Post-meeting note: the PowerPoint was circulated

to Members for reference on 22 October 2007.]

6.2 **The Chairman** concluded that HEC would support the event.

Item 7 Items for information

A. Information note on Kai Tak Planning Review (Information Note No. 19/2007)

7.1 **Dr Ng Mee-kam** enquired about the follow-up action for the quick-win projects at Kai Tak, the timetable for the Kai Tak Development and the impact of transport networks on the land use, urban design and connectivity of the area.

7.2 **Mr Eric Yue** said that on the progress of the Kai Tak Planning Review, the statutory plan-making procedures for the Kai Tak OZP were almost finished, after which various projects could proceed according to the OZP. The OZP had included transport networks for Kai Tak and its surroundings in particular enhanced connectivity with San Po Kong and Kowloon City.

7.3 **Mr C B Mak** said that CEDD and LandsD had examined quick-win projects at Kai Tak. Given the construction of the proposed cruise terminal at the site, there would not be much opportunity for quick-win projects. From time to time LandsD would encourage activities at the site. For example, HAB had arranged the Mega Tai Chi Show at the runway area. On progress of the Kai Tak Development, CEDD was conducting the Kai Tak Engineering Review and had identified some advance works including the proposed first berth of the cruise terminal to be completed in 2012, the proposed public housing estate at the northern part of Kai Tak to be implemented in 2012-13 and the proposed government office building to be delivered around 2013. Required road networks would be constructed to support these works projects.

B. Information note on WDII Review (Information Note No. 20/2007)

7.4 In reply to Dr Ng Mee-kam's question about the temporary reclamation under the WDII project, **Mr L T Ma** said that the former HEC Sub-committee on WDII Review had

already been advised that temporary works including temporary reclamation would be needed for the construction of the section of the Central-Wan Chai Bypass (CWB) below seabed and for temporary relocation of some of the existing moorings to outside the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter (CBTS). These temporary works would be removed upon completion of the construction of the CWB. There should be enhancement to the conditions in CBTS as the contaminated mud in CBTS would be dredged in the course of the temporary works.

C. Progress report on UDS (Paper No. 21/2007)

7.5 In response to Prof Carlos Lo's enquiry about the difference in the priority order for certain criteria and considerations per paragraph 8 of the paper and their impact on the UDS, **Ms Phyllis Li** said the public generally agreed to the urban design objectives and issues of the Study Area though they had different views on their relative importance. At one workshop of the Stage 1 Public Engagement Programme, the participants considered preservation of the Queen's Pier the most important but the participants at another considered urban design principles like access and sustainable design the most important. At the coming Stage 2 Public Engagement Programme, for comparison and further assessment by the public, PlanD would put forward alternative concepts together with the pros and cons which took into account the views collected at Stage 1.

Item 8 Any other business

A. Caritas Mok Cheung Sui Kun Community Centre's letter

8.1 At the request of Caritas Mok Cheung Sui Kun Community Centre, **the Secretary** tabled for Members' reference the Centre's letter of 16 October 2007 on proposed land use and promenade along the waterfront of the Central and Western District. **The Chairman** said the HPR Sub-com could consider the matter later.

HPR Sub-com

B. Proposed Customs and Excise Department (C&ED) headquarters building at Tin Chiu Road, North Point

8.2 In response to Mr Nicholas Brooke's enquiry, **Mrs Ava Ng** said the North Point OZP was amended in June 2007 to

incorporate building height restrictions in order to provide better planning control. Since 1998 the site had been reserved for development of the proposed C&ED headquarters building. In 2005, C&ED proposed to construct a building with a maximum building height of 142.5 mPD. In view of the proximity of the site to the waterfront, PlanD proposed to C&ED to reduce the building height to 120 mPD. Having considered the HPPs to keep building height of waterfront site low and the need to meet their operational needs, C&ED agreed to reduce it to 131.5 mPD. The site was subsequently allocated to C&ED in March 2006 and funding approval for the construction of the proposed C&ED headquarters was obtained from the LegCo in June 2006. The design and build contract was awarded to a contractor prior to the coming into effect of the building height restrictions on the North Point OZP. The piling works for the proposed C&ED headquarters, a committed project, had recently commenced.

8.3 **Mr Raymond Young** said the DEVB would remind government bureaux/departments again to consult HEC on harbour-front development proposals as and when appropriate.

DEVB

C. Date of next meeting

8.4 **The Chairman** said the next meeting date would be announced later.

8.5 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:05 pm.

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