

**Nineteenth Meeting of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee  
held at 2:15 pm on 20 February 2008  
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)
Dr Alvin Kwok	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
Ms Y Y Pong	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Dr Paul Ho	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Ir Dr Greg Wong	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Mason Hung	Representing Hong Kong Tourism Board (HKTB)
Mr Louis Loong	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Paul Zimmerman	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour Limited (SPH)
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)
Ms Sharon Ho	Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport)5, Transport and Housing Bureau
Mr John Chai	Director of Civil Engineering and Development
Mrs Ava Ng	Director of Planning
Mr Herbert Leung	Deputy Director of Lands (General)
Ms Margaret Hsia	Assistant Director(2), Home Affairs Department
Miss Amy Yuen	Secretary

### **In Attendance**

Mrs Susan Mak	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Ms Lydia Lam	Assistant Secretary (Planning)3, DEVB
Mr L T Ma	Project Manager/Hong Kong Island and Islands, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Mr C B Mak	Chief Engineer/Kowloon, CEDD
Mr Raymond Lee	Chief Town Planner/ Studies and Research Planning Department (PlanD)

### **For item 1(A)**

Mr Dick Groves	Retail Development Consultants (RDC)
----------------	--------------------------------------

### **For item 1(B)**

Ms Maggie Brooke	Harbour Business Forum (HBF)
Mr Joe Ma	HBF
Ms Wing Ng	HBF
Ms Brenda Fung	HBF

### **Absent with Apologies**

Mr Nicholas Brooke  
Dr Anissa Chan  
Mr Samuel Mok

## **Action**

### **Welcoming message**

**The Chairman** welcomed all attending the nineteenth meeting of Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC). **The Secretary** reported that at the request of SPH, the Secretary for Development had appointed Mr Paul Zimmerman as a regular member of HEC with effect from 15 February 2008 until the end of the current term on 31 August 2009, replacing Mr Hardy Lok as the representative of SPH. **The Chairman** briefed Members on the change of representatives from SPH to the HEC Sub-committee and Task Groups following the replacement. **The meeting** endorsed the revised membership of the HEC Sub-committee and Task Groups tabled. **The Chairman** thanked Mr Lok's contribution to HEC and welcomed Mr Zimmerman.

## Item 1 HEC briefing

### A. Central waterfront

1.1 **The Chairman** welcomed Mr Dick Groves of RDC. He said that Mr Groves was a member of one of the four winning teams in the “International Planning and Urban Design Competition on the Central Waterfront of Hong Kong” organized by Designing Hong Kong (DHK) and his proposal had been briefly covered in DHK's presentation at the last HEC briefing. Like previous briefings, there was no need for HEC to form any consensus on the presentation. **Mr Groves** presented a PowerPoint on his submission.

1.2 In response to Mr Paul Zimmerman, **Mr Groves** said that the new waterfront presented additional challenges to planning and development as it were not a complete blank sheet. He considered that some Hong Kong people would want to see the Queen's Pier restored as a symbol of connection with the past.

1.3 In reply to Prof Carlos Lo, **Mr Groves** said that he was looking for ways to contribute to the process to come up with a design for the harbourfront. What he described was a pre-development planning sequence in which developers had hypotheses and ideas for development. At some point in time developers needed to come up with a commercial concept, i.e., a design programme, which would be broken into different sub-programmes/specifications and put in a proper sequence, and various groups would work out the respective sub-programmes/specifications. This pre-development planning sequence was very useful and reference might be made to it when planning and designing the Central waterfront. He considered that 30% of the Central waterfront should be a collection of restaurants, the restored Queen's Pier and Star Ferry Clock Tower, a maritime centre and basin. The remaining 70% be dedicated to a better version of the London South Bank, i.e., a good living environment with low-rise and low-density buildings.

1.4 In response to Dr Ng Mee-kam's enquiry about how the at times conflicting commercial development concept and civil society's aspirations could be brought together into Hong Kong's institutional process to achieve a win-win-win situation, **Mr Groves** said that leaders and experts would be required to work

together to develop a great waterfront.

1.5 **Mrs Ava Ng** said that Mr Groves' proposal was quite similar to what the Government had been practising all along. At the strategic planning level, there was a territorial plan incorporating the long-term needs of Hong Kong for the next 20 to 30 years. It set the scene for the planning of Hong Kong's central business district which would be very crucial for sustaining its role as an international trading, financial and business centre.

1.6 Throughout the study process of the territory plan and district-level plans over the past years, there had been continuous public engagement to build a general community consensus on the development of the Central District. There were ample opportunities for the public, including interests from the development sector, to contribute during both planning study and plan-making stages. Starting from late 2006 and during 2007, PlanD had been working on a major Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (UDS), inviting the whole community for views on how the Central harbourfront could be enhanced from the urban design perspective. PlanD had already collected valuable ideas from various sectors of the community including residents living in the area, the property sector and various chambers of commerce. PlanD and its consultant were refining the urban design framework for the new Central harbourfront, which would be put forward for a Stage 2 Public Engagement to be launched later this year. The consultant would also put forward different design options for public discussion. There would be space reserved for public uses, such as maritime museum and exhibition galleries. For commercial sites, while the gross floor area would be specified, flexibility would be allowed for developers to work out an optimal mix of retail, restaurants and offices to cater for changing community needs and market situations.

1.7 In reply to Mr Zimmerman, **Mr Groves** said that a waterfront would be known by its public uses and that it was important to entrust a team of experienced people to engage different parties of the community to identify the components of the public uses. He opined that a waterfront with low-rise and low-density developments would be interesting and contrasting to the city behind.

1.8 **The Chairman** thanked Mr Groves for his presentation and Members for their comments.

## **B. “What is on Hong Kong’s Harbour?” Land Use Study for Hong Kong’s Harbour-front**

1.9 **The Chairman** welcomed Ms Maggie Brooke, Mr Joe Ma, Ms Wing Ng and Ms Brenda Fung of HBF. **Ms Brooke** briefly introduced to Members the report on “What is on Hong Kong’s Harbour?” **Mr Ma** presented a PowerPoint on the summary of the report.

1.10 In reply to Mr Paul Zimmerman, Ms Y Y Pong and Dr Ng Mee-kam, **Mr Ma** said that, according to the report, about 30% of the waterfront area was in private use including the area occupied by the container terminals. If the use of container terminals was excluded from private use, 80% of the Hong Kong waterfront belonged to the Government. The full report contained detailed analyses on the quality of the harbourfront that was accessible and issues including accessibility and vibrancy along the waterfront were addressed. **Ms Brooke** added that HBF would provide the relevant District Councils with the findings of the report.

1.11 In response to Prof Carlos Lo, **Mr Ma** said that what was considered compatible in land use might not be accessible and vice versa. For example, the current use of the western part of the Kowloon peninsular for port facilities was compatible with the Government’s intention although the area was not accessible. However, the existing use of Sai Ying Pun was incompatible with the planning intention but the area was accessible. The concepts of compatibility and accessibility were not necessarily related.

1.12 **The Chairman** thanked the HBF’s efforts in undertaking the land use study and sharing their findings with HEC.

## **Item 2 Confirmation of minutes of the eighteenth meeting**

2.1 **The Chairman** said that the Secretariat circulated the draft minutes of the eighteenth meeting to Members on 6 February 2008 and received no proposed amendments. The minutes were confirmed.

### **Item 3 Progress reports from the three Sub-committee/Task Groups (Paper Nos. 1-3/2008)**

#### **A. Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review (HPR Sub-com) (Paper No. 1/2008)**

3.1 **Mr Vincent Ng** presented the progress report, some parts of which involved the HPR Sub-com's deliberations on a few planning applications submitted to the Town Planning Board.

3.1.1 **Mr Ng** reported that the HPR Sub-com had been briefed on the proposed minor relaxation of the statutory height restriction for a proposed Grade A office building at 863-865 King's Road, Quarry Bay by 10% from 130 mPD to 143mPD. The views of Members were mixed. Some Members supported the proposal in respect of its environmentally friendly building design, measures to enhance pedestrian circulation and provision of a landscaped garden at podium in line with the Harbour Planning Principles (HPPs) and Harbour Planning Guidelines (HPGs).

3.1.2 The HPR Sub-com also discussed the proposed hotel, place of recreation, sports and culture (art venue) and exhibition and convention hall at the ex A-King slipway site and adjoining Government land in Causeway Bay. **Mr Ng** added that the preliminary proposal had been discussed previously by the then HEC Sub-committee on Wan Chai Development Phase II Review under the Harbour-front Enhancement Review – Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Area. The HPR Sub-com had no strong views on the proposal in terms of its development concept of integrating art, cultural and commercial (hotel and retail) uses at the waterfront. However, some Members had reservation on the scale and massing of the proposed development, particularly the hotel portion and considered that there was a lack of integration between the hotel and the art/cultural facilities within the development. The Sub-committee had also encouraged the proponent to take note of the HPPs and HPGs when developing the site.

3.1.3 **Mr Ng** further reported that the HPR Sub-com had been briefed on the proposed erection of “ground standing” signboards at Austin Road West, West Kowloon Reclamation Area. Sub-committee Members had generally considered that the proposed signboards would unlikely affect the overall setting of this part of the waterfront which comprised mainly construction sites, but the concern about any glare impact should be addressed.

3.1.4 Another project proponent briefed the HPR Sub-com on the proposed residential development at 14-30 King Wah Road, North Point. In general, the Sub-committee had no strong views on the proposed development and appreciated the podium setback to facilitate public access to the waterfront and enhance air circulation. Some Members considered that the design, layout and disposition of the residential towers should be improved to further enhance air ventilation.

3.1.5 Representatives from the Tourism Commission (TC) gave a short briefing to seek HPR Sub-com Members’ views on the use/theme, design and management of the proposed development of a piazza in Tsim Sha Tsui. HPR Sub-com Members generally considered that the development of the piazza should not be confined to a unitary theme, but should encourage a diversity of activities in a dynamic way.

3.1.6 **The meeting** noted that HKTB briefed the HPR Sub-com on the proposal of setting up a set of Olympic rings at a harbourfront location in either Central or Wan Chai to showcase Hong Kong as a co-host city for the Beijing 2008 Olympic. The HPR Sub-com had no in-principle objection to the proposal. Specific aspects including possible glare impacts were discussed.

3.1.7 Representatives of the District Lands Office/Hong Kong East briefed the HPR Sub-com on the proposed temporary uses for the Ex-North Point Estate site (comprising the eastern, central and western lots) during the interim period until its disposal for permanent

use. HPR Sub-com Members supported the proposed development of the eastern lot for open space. They however considered that the remaining lots should also be developed into open space for public enjoyment, and that a strip of land at the northern part of the western lot should be set aside for early implementation of the planned 20 m wide waterfront promenade. **Mr Jimmy Kwok** enquired if the HPR Sub-com had discussed the balance between the proposal to set aside 20 m for public open space and the need and advantage of providing public parking space. **Mr Ng** said that given the role of the HPR Sub-com, Members concluded that provision of public utilities and car parks along the harbourfront should not be encouraged.

3.1.8 **The meeting** noted that PlanD and its consultants briefed the HPR Sub-com on the findings and recommendations of the Hung Hom District Study. HPR Sub-com Members noted that the Study had responded to community aspirations for a better environment by lowering the development intensity and building height along the harbourfront. The development concepts for the area had been formulated having regard to the HPPs and HPGs and the views collected during the public engagement activities.

3.2 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested that the HPR Sub-com should look into access to the harbourfront across the existing road infrastructures identified at the briefing just conducted by HBF, the provision of food, drinks, toilets and seats along the harbourfront currently owned by the Government, implementation of the Kai Tak development and the Tamar development. **Prof Carlos Lo** said that the quality of public accessibility to the waterfront was crucial. **Mr Ng** agreed to consider these suggestions with the HPR Sub-com.

**HPR Sub-com**

3.3 In response to Prof Wong Sze-chun, **Mr Ng** said that as an advisory body under HEC, the HPR Sub-com had taken every opportunity to advise proponents to improve accessibility to the waterfront when developing/re-developing specific sites. Government departments had been most willing to take into account the HPPs/HPGs for their projects. Private proponents had been familiar with the HPPs/HPGs and demonstrated their

willingness to accommodate them.

## **B. Task Group on Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (TGUDS) (Paper No. 2/2008)**

3.4 **Ir Dr Greg Wong** presented the progress report. He reported that the TGUDS had been briefed on the findings of the Stage 1 Public Engagement of the UDS and a draft Stage 1 Public Engagement Report was provided for Members' reference. The Task Group had also been briefed by the study consultant on the responses to the public views relating to the design of the new Central harbourfront. The public views had included those previously expressed by stakeholders before the commencement of the Study and those collected in the Stage 1 Public Engagement. The winning and other entries of the "International Planning and Urban Design Competition on the Central Waterfront of Hong Kong" organized by DHK had also been reviewed. The Task Group noted that the major design responses, including enhancing vibrancy and diversity of the new Central harbourfront, providing extensive open space, enhancing pedestrian accessibility, preserving visual corridors, reducing development massing and footprints, ensuring design compatibility with the surroundings, maximizing greenery and sustainable design, alternative concepts for re-assembling Queen's Pier and reconstructing the old Star Ferry Clock Tower, etc., would be incorporated into the refined urban design framework plan, Master Layout Plans, and design concepts for key sites for public discussion in the Stage 2 Public Engagement. The design proposals would be presented for discussion by the Task Group at a separate working session before the launch of the Stage 2 Public Engagement.

3.5 In reply to Dr Alvin Kwok's enquiry about the use for the roof top of Central Pier Nos. 4 to 6 as reported in the newspaper, **Mrs Ava Ng** said that the consultant had been analyzing the views collected in the Stage 1 Public Engagement and was preparing the draft design options. There had been views received during the engagement exercise that creative ideas and variety of uses of the Central Piers would increase the vibrancy of the waterfront.

3.6 **Dr Ng Mee-kam** said that as neither she nor her alternate could attend the Task Group meeting, CE@H submitted

their comments to the Task Group Secretariat before the meeting. **Ir Dr Wong** said that Mr Nicholas Brooke had raised the concerns cited in CE@H's comments, which were tabled at the Task Group meeting, namely, a stage 1.5 public engagement for the UDS to consolidate the views on the planning parameters after the Stage 1 Public Engagement, whether the issue of reducing the land intake by transport infrastructure had been adequately addressed in the UDS, and whether the UDS would thoroughly examine the alternatives for re-assembling Queen's Pier and reconstructing the old Star Ferry Clock Tower. **Ir Dr Wong** believed that the coming working session would discuss these three issues.

3.7 In response to Mr Paul Zimmerman's suggestion of looking at the consultancy brief of the study, in particular whether the consultant was requested to look into the various transport issues, **Ir Dr Wong** said that it was out of the TGUDS' terms of reference to discuss at this stage the Central-Wan Chai Bypass (CWB), the transport network along the northern shore of the Hong Kong Island and the consultancy brief of the UDS, as the contract of the study had already been granted prior to the formation of the Task Group. While he considered that the Task Group and the consultant had completed many steps according to the agreed procedures, he suggested and **the Chairman** agreed that if needed Mr Zimmerman, in his capacity as a regular member of the Task Group, could raise his questions at the future working session/meetings of the Task Group. **Mr Raymond Young** said that as rightly pointed out by Ir Dr Wong, we started the whole process in 2007, completed the Stage 1 Public Engagement, and an inception report had been prepared for the consultancy. The Town Planning Board had also endorsed the study framework. There was no point to look at the consultancy brief again. Instead, we should focus on the outcome. There would be a very extensive public engagement process in the Stage 2 Public Engagement which would go ahead soon. In response to Dr Ng Mee-kam, **Mr Young** said that there was in fact the institutional channel for the views of civil society to be taken on board in the whole process of considering the urban design of the Central waterfront. While it might not be possible to ensure that everybody agreed to everything, differences in opinions did not mean that an institution for taking on board the various views did not exist. He stressed that the HEC was an effective mechanism to collate public views on the design of the

Central waterfront.

3.8 **Ms Y Y Pong** said that instead of overhauling the overall plan, opportunity could be taken to lower the development density of Central and apply other traffic management measures to reduce traffic generation, reduce car parking space at large sites and locate MTR exits at convenient points. **Prof Wong Sze-chun**, who had been a member of the Expert Panel on Sustainable Transport Planning and CWB (Expert Panel), said that the Expert Panel had already provided its recommendations for HEC to decide on its way forward. Separately, he noted that the Task Group discussed at the last meeting that there might be a stage 2.5 public engagement to consolidate public views collected in the Stage 2 Public Engagement. The coming working session of the Task Group would be a good venue to further discuss the relevant issues. **Ir Dr Wong** said that it might not be proper for the existing consultant of the UDS to implement the recommendations of the Expert Panel and there might be a need to consider employing additional expertise to accomplish the additional task if required.

3.9 **Mrs Ng** said that the main objective of the UDS was to formulate a general urban design concept plan for a specific area and more detailed design parameters for individual key sites within the area. Under the UDS, transport issues in terms of connectivity and accessibility of the area would be examined. Macro transport matters like road capacity, measures to tackle future traffic growth and follow-up of the recommendations of the Expert Panel were beyond the scope of the Study. **Mr Young** underlined that we could not give an open-ended assurance to re-open discussion on transport-related issues.

3.10 **Mrs Ng** added that the Study consultant would translate the views collected in the Stage 1 Public Engagement into a concept plan and development options for the Task Group to comment. This process was transparent and interactive. **Mr Jimmy Kwok** recalled that the TGUDS had agreed not to re-open issues that had already been discussed and decided upon. The Task Group had also agreed that there should be a stage 2.5 Public Engagement for consolidating public views and building community consensus before finalizing the study proposals and recommendations.

## **C. Task Group on Management Model for the Harbourfront (TGMMH) (Paper No. 3/2008)**

3.11 In his capacity as Chairman of the TGMMH, **Prof Lee Chack-fan** presented the progress report.

3.11.1 **Prof Lee** reported that the Task Group discussed with TC the management issues of the proposed piazza in Tsim Sha Tsui. The Task Group noted that TC had briefed the HPR Sub-com and that the HPR Sub-com had considered and given advice on the uses and design of the piazza. The Task Group had generally considered that the piazza should be considered in a holistic manner with the surrounding facilities and its management could be integrated with that of the open space in front of Hong Kong Cultural Centre.

3.11.2 **Prof Lee** informed the meeting that the Task Group had discussed Prof Carlos Lo's suggestion of possible steps for developing a management model for the harbourfront. Prof Lo had also briefed the Task Group on five articles on integrated coastal arrangement. The Task Group had noted PlanD's Planning Study on The Harbour and Its Waterfront Areas conducted in 2003. PlanD's study had provided very useful reference and the Task Group had agreed to use it as the starting point for its work.

3.11.3 **Prof Lee** reported that the Task Group had also discussed its revised work plan. Task Group Members agreed that PlanD, Mr Nicholas Brooke, HBF and Home Affairs Bureau (HAB) would be invited to brief the Task Group on their respective work at the next meeting. PlanD and Mr Brooke would brief Members on their research on overseas experiences, HBF its study on organizational structures and harbourfront management, and HAB the proposed statutory body for the West Kowloon Cultural District Development.

3.12 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested that Government departments should be invited to brief the TGMMH on the provision of food, drinks, toilets and seats for the 80% of the

waterfront owned by the Government according to the data provided by HBF. **Prof Lee** said that the whole idea of the Task Group was to recommend to the Government a conceptual model for management of the harbourfront. Mr Zimmerman's suggestion involved implementation of a model. **Mr Raymond Young** said there was not much point in asking Government departments to tell the Task Group how they were managing the facilities mentioned by Mr Zimmerman earlier. He suggested that the Task Group should concentrate on an overall plan or strategy as to how waterfront sites could be better used.

3.13 **The Chairman** noted at that point that the meeting no longer had its quorum. Members could carry on the discussion without making any decision. **Mr Patrick Lau** commented that consideration could be given to listing the objectives of a vibrant waterfront and the obstacles to those objectives, and that restaurants could enhance vibrancy of the waterfront.

#### **Item 4 Matters arising**

##### **A. Briefing to HPR Sub-com on the proposed expansion of Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre (HKCEC) (para. 4.1.4 of the draft minutes of the eighteenth meeting)**

4.1 **Mr Vincent Ng** reported that according to Commerce and Economic Development Bureau, the proposed expansion of HKCEC was not ready to be discussed at the HPR Sub-com at this stage.

##### **B. Mr Nicholas Brooke's sharing with TGMMH (para. 4.3 of the draft minutes of the eighteenth meeting)**

4.2 **The Chairman** said that Mr Brooke would share with the TGMMH his information on overseas harbourfront management models at the next TGMMH meeting to be held in late March/early April 2008.

##### **C. HEC's letter to Director of Audit (D of A) (para. 5.2 of the draft minutes of the eighteenth meeting)**

4.3 **The Chairman** said that the letter incorporated Members' comments would be issued to D of A soon.

(Post-meeting note: The Secretariat issued the letter to D of A and circulated a copy to Members for reference on 21 February 2008.)

**D. Direct and simple access to paragraphs on temporary reclamation in the Report on Cogent and Convincing Materials to demonstrate Compliance with the Overriding Public Need Test (CCM Report) (para. 6.2 of the draft minutes of the eighteenth meeting)**

4.4 **Mr L T Ma** said that a more direct and simple link to the information on temporary reclamation in the CCM report had been provided on the HEC website.

(Post-meeting note: The web link is shown below for Members' reference.

[http://www.harbourfront.org.hk/eng/content\\_page/ccm.html?s=1](http://www.harbourfront.org.hk/eng/content_page/ccm.html?s=1))

**E. Meeting schedule beyond February 2008 (para. 6.5 of the draft minutes of the eighteenth meeting)**

4.5 **The Chairman** said that this item would be discussed under any other business.

**Item 5 Any other business**

**A. Temporary promenade along Kwun Tong public cargo working area (PCWA)**

5.1 **The Secretary** informed Members of the Government's intention to develop a temporary promenade upon the decommissioning of the Kwun Tong PCWA in phases. This temporary promenade might form an initial section of the promenade under the approved Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan. CEDD was working out the details of the proposal and would report to HEC in due course.

**B. Meeting schedule for remaining meetings in 2008**

5.2 **The Chairman** said that a proposed meeting schedule for the remaining meetings in 2008 was tabled for Members' reference. Members were invited to mark their diaries

accordingly.

**C. Date of next meeting**

5.3 **The Chairman** said that the next meeting would be held on 29 April 2008.

5.4 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:35 pm.

**Harbour-front Enhancement Committee Secretariat  
April 2008**