

**Twentieth Meeting of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee
held at 2:15 pm on 29 April 2008
at 15/F, North Point Government Offices, 333 Java Road, 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
Dr Alvin Kwok	Representing Conservancy Association
Mr Vincent Ng	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects (HKIA)
Mr S C Lo	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 Nicholas Brooke	
Mr David Ho	
Mr Michael Hui	
Mr Patrick Lau	
Mr Samuel Mok	
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)
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 C K Hon	Project Manager/Hong Kong Island and Islands, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Mr C B Mak	Chief Engineer/Kowloon, CEDD
Mr Raymond Wong	Assistant Director of Planning/Territorial

For Item 1

Mr Paul Zimmerman	Designing Hong Kong (DHK)
-------------------	---------------------------

For Item 5

Miss Ophelia Wong	Deputy Director of Planning/District
Ms Phyllis Li	Chief Town Planner/Special Duties, Planning Department (PlanD)
Ms Irene Ip	Aedas Ltd
Mr Tony Yeung	Aedas Ltd
Prof Andrew Leung	CityU Professional Services Ltd
Dr K K Yuen	Public Policy Research Institute, Polytechnic University

For Item 6

Ms Esther Leung	Deputy Secretary for Home Affairs (WKCD)
Mrs Frances Yim	Assistant Secretary (WKCD)2, Home Affairs Bureau (HAB)
Mr Louis Kau	Senior Town Planner (WKCD), HAB
Ms Olga Lam	Acting Assistant Director (Kowloon) (Lands Administration Office, Headquarters), Lands Department (LandsD)

For Item 7

Mr Y S Chow	Project Manger/Major Works, Highways Department (HyD)
-------------	--

Absent with Apologies

Prof Carlos Lo	Representing Friends of the Earth
Dr Anissa Chan	
Mr Jimmy Kwok	
Ms Margaret Hsia	Assistant Director(2), Home Affairs Department

Welcoming message

The Chairman welcomed all attending the twentieth meeting of Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC). He informed the meeting that Mr C K Hon had taken over from Mr L T Ma as Project Manager/Hong Kong Island and Islands, CEDD, with effect from 3 March 2008. He thanked Mr Ma's contribution to the HEC and welcomed Mr Hon.

Item 1 HEC briefing - Four Tourists and Hong Kong's Harbourfront: A Survey of the Waterfront of Victoria Harbour

1.1 **The Chairman** said that the four students of Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Massachusetts, the USA, could not attend the briefing because of examinations. They had asked Mr Paul Zimmerman, in his capacity as Founder of DHK, to present the PowerPoint provided. Like previous briefings, there was no need for the HEC to form a consensus view on the presentation. The purpose of the briefing was to provide Members with an opportunity to hear the submission. **Mr Zimmerman** presented the PowerPoint.

1.2 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** was interested in the implementation of the practical proposals of the survey. **Mr Vincent Ng** wished that more quick-win projects could be implemented, given his understanding that funding should not be a problem. **Mr Raymond Young** suggested that the Harbour Plan Review Sub-committee (HPR Sub-com) come up with practicable proposals. Development Bureau (DEVB) had been exploring with relevant departments possible quick-win projects, including those on short-term tenancy on Government land. It would discuss with the HPR Sub-com when ready. The suggestion to improve directional signage could be referred to the HKTB and HyD for consideration.

1.3 **Mrs Ava Ng** said that similar problems reflected in the four students' survey had previously been identified in the Planning Study on the Harbour and its Waterfront Areas completed in 2003. Under the current Harbour Plan Review, the harbourfront was divided into seven districts and review for each of them had been proposed. The Hung Hom District Study had

now been completed and the Hong Kong Island East Harbour-front Study would commence in late 2008. The Review was in the right direction.

1.4 **The Chairman** suggested and **Mr Vincent Ng** and **Mrs Susan Mak** agreed that DEVB would further work with the HPR Sub-com on quick-win projects for implementation. **Ms Y Y Pong** suggested that suitable Government land should be identified for short-term use as in the case of the Wan Chai Waterfront Promenade. The Government could provide information on its land along the waterfront. **Mr Zimmerman** considered that in addition to Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD), Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department, HyD, Marine Department and LandsD should be encouraged to provide input. He informed the meeting that another batch of overseas students would be invited to do a similar project next year. **Dr Alvin Kwok** said that consideration might be given to surveying the flow of visitors at existing waterfront promenades/open spaces and the preference of residents, organizing activities and events to promote popularity and removing the existing physical barriers to the waterfront.

**DEVB and
HPR Sub-com**

1.5 **The Chairman** thanked Mr Zimmerman for his presentation and Members for their comments.

Item 2 Confirmation of minutes of the nineteenth meeting

2.1 **The Chairman** said that the Secretariat circulated the draft minutes of the nineteenth meeting to Members on 21 April 2008 and received no proposed amendments. The minutes were confirmed.

Item 3 Progress reports from the three Sub-committee/Task Groups (Paper Nos. 4-6/2008)

A. HPR Sub-com (Paper No. 4/2008)

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

3.1.1 **Mr Ng** reported that the HPR Sub-com had considered its work plan for the current term including the progress of the overall Harbour Plan Review, providing input to development proposals along the

harbourfront, identifying opportunities for harbourfront enhancement and promoting public engagement. Following the completion of the Hung Hom District Study, Hong Kong Island East would be the next district for review. Preparatory work for the Hong Kong Island East Harbour-front Study, as part of the overall Harbour Plan Review, had already commenced. The Study would be commissioned later this year. Members reiterated the importance of financial support for harbourfront enhancement, which he understood from the Secretary for Development (SDEV) should not be a problem.

3.1.2 The HPR Sub-com had also discussed the proposal to expand the heliport facilities on the rooftop of the inner pier of the Hong Kong–Macau Ferry Terminal (MFT) from one helipad to two helipads with an arrival lobby, VIP lounge, departure lounge, flight operation control centre, and other aviation related facilities and support plant rooms at various levels of the MFT. The Sub-committee had no objection to the proposed development, but was concerned with its possible noise impact.

3.1.3 **Mr Ng** further reported that the HPR Sub-com had been briefed on the building height restrictions incorporated into the draft Hung Hom Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K9/21 gazetted on 29 February 2008. Members generally agreed to the proposal.

3.1.4 The Sub-committee had discussed how to follow up the issues raised by Mr Paul Zimmerman at the last HEC meeting. On measures to improve access to the harbourfront impeded by existing road structures, they had been and would continue to be considered in the on-going/future studies and the overall Harbour Plan Review. Regarding the provision of food, drinks, toilets and seats along the harbourfront within Government land, the views of the local community on the facilities to be provided at particular locations would be respected. As regards the monitoring of Kai Tak and Tamar development, in line with the agreement of the HEC at the beginning of the current term on issues relating to the

former Sub-committees on South East Kowloon Development Review and Wan Chai Development Phase II Review, they should be referred to the HEC for discussion. On the HEC's Harbour Planning Principles (HPPs), the point on whether or not they were formally adopted by the Town Planning Board (TPB) should not be a key issue as they had already been widely applied both by the Government and private sector. The HEC would continue to act as a "guardian" promoting and monitoring the application of the HPPs.

3.2 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** understood that for the proposed heliport in Wan Chai, only fixed noise receivers, i.e., people working or living there were taken into account in the noise impact study, but pedestrians were not included. He considered this inappropriate and could be subject to challenge, in particular, the Golden Bauhinia Square was a popular tourist spot. **Ir Dr Greg Wong** said that Environmental Protection Department should release itself from its role under the relevant ordinance when viewing the case from a planning angle. **Mr Zimmerman** said that pedestrians were also temporarily stationary when staying at and enjoying the waterfront, and should be treated as sensitive noise receivers. **Mr Ng** said that without Government environmental officials at the meeting, the Sub-committee might only be able to consider the environmental perspective like noise and air quality impacts of proposed projects in a general manner, not in detail. **The Chairman** suggested that the Secretariat should seek the views of Environment Bureau on Members' comments.

Secretariat

B. Task Group on Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (TGUDS) (Paper No. 5/2008)

3.3 **Ir Dr Greg Wong** presented the progress report. He reported that the TGUDS held two working meetings in March 2008 and one site visit before the launch of the Stage 2 Public Engagement details of which would be discussed under agenda Item 5. The study team briefed Members on the work plan for the Stage 2 Public Engagement, the public engagement materials, the public opinion collection exercise and the study proposals. Members provided comments and suggestions which where appropriate were taken into account in revising and finalizing the public engagement materials. The public exhibitions of the

Stage 2 Public Engagement were launched on 12 April 2008. The Task Group held its third meeting on 23 April before the Focus Group Workshop on 26 April 2008.

3.4 In respect of the process, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** felt that when the TGUDS discussed the Stage 2 Public Engagement, nothing could be changed - venues had been booked, dates had been set, models had been built and documents had been written. **Ir Dr Wong** said that, from the point of view of the TGUDS, it would have been better if Members had been consulted on the specifics of the public engagement activities. On the design proposals, he had seen changes in the development intensity and layout of the groundscraper and was optimistic about public aspirations and rational discussion being taken into account.

3.5 **Mrs Ava Ng** said that the launch of the Stage 2 Public Engagement had been discussed by the TGUDS. TGUDS had also been consulted on the work plan and endorsed the booking of venues for the public engagement activities prior to the re-appointment of Mr Zimmerman to the HEC and the Task Group. She hoped Members would appreciate the time constraints with the booking of venues and other logistical arrangement. With regard to the design proposals, there had been amendments after deliberations of the Task Group and there could be further changes arising from the Stage 2 Public Engagement.

3.6 **Mr Zimmerman** said that there were factual errors in the Stage 2 Public Engagement Consultation Digest (Digest). On page 5 it was stated that a planning application under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance was required for the electricity supply buildings (ESBs) along Road P2. He understood that such approval had already been given in 2006. On page 29 of the Digest, it was stipulated that Concept B of re-assembling Queen's Pier at its original location would delay the completion of Road P2. He said that, in response to his request, CEDD confirmed last Saturday that there could be delay to the re-assembling of Queen's Pier but not necessarily the completion of Road P2. He remarked that these two errors would not have been made if the Task Group had been consulted. In response to Mr Zimmerman, **Mr C K Hon** clarified that last Saturday Mr Zimmerman enquired about the possibility of first constructing the already designed Road P2, then constructing a

new Road P2 and abandoning the built one such that Queen's Pier could be re-assembled at its original location without any delay of Road P2. Concepts A and B on pages 28 and 29 of the Digest were made on the same footing that Queen's Pier would be re-assembled as soon as possible. If there were to be different assumptions, the comparison would be different. He did not agree that the information about the delay of the completion of Road P2 on page 29 of the Digest was wrong. **The meeting** noted that further enquiries on the UDS Stage 2 Public Engagement would be addressed under Item 5. **Mr Zimmerman** reiterated the importance of discussion with the Task Group before issue of any public documents.

C. Task Group on Management Model for the Harbourfront (TGMMH) (Paper No. 6/2008)

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

3.7.1 **Prof Lee** reported that the Task Group had heard a presentation by HAB on the proposed West Kowloon Cultural District Authority (WKCDA). It noted that there would be further public consultation on the development plan of the WKCD covering as well the provision of open space. The Task Group generally emphasized the importance of public participation and integration of the development and facilities with the surrounding areas.

3.7.2 **Prof Lee** informed the meeting that the Task Group had discussed with PlanD, Harbour Business Forum and Mr Nicholas Brooke on their studies and research on overseas harbour authorities, and Prof Carlos Lo's proposed assessment framework for overseas harbour authorities. SDEV had shared her views with the Task Group on the essential features of an ideal Hong Kong model and the way forward for management of the harbourfront.

3.7.3 **Prof Lee** reported that the Task Group had also discussed the tools for managing the harbour and harbourfront suggested by DHK. The HPR Sub-com could identify more quick-win projects to try out the

various management arrangements. For the next Task Group meeting, LCSD would be invited to brief the Task Group the management modes of the Avenue of Stars, West Kowloon Waterfront Promenade, Wan Chai Waterfront Promenade and Tsing Yi Promenade

3.8 **Mr Brooke** said that the TGMMH had made much headway and appreciated the support expressed by SDEV. Having studied the overseas models in some detail, it was time for the Task Group to have a closer look at the characteristics we expected for the Hong Kong model.

Item 4 Matters arising

Issues to be considered by HPR Sub-com (para. 3.2 of the draft minutes of the nineteenth meeting)

4.1 **The Chairman** said that the issues had been covered by the HPR Sub-com progress report.

Item 5 UDS Stage 2 Public Engagement (Paper No. 7/2008)

5.1 **The Chairman** welcomed Miss Ophelia Wong and Ms Phyllis Li of PlanD, Ms Irene Ip and Mr Tony Yeung of Aedas Ltd, Prof Andrew Leung of CityU Professional Services Ltd and Dr K K Yuen of Polytechnic University. At this point, **Mrs Ava Ng** responded to Mr Zimmerman's earlier question on the factual error on page 5 of the Digest (para. 3.6 refers). She said that the statement with an asterisk on the Design Constraints Drawing only reflected the factual information that ESB use required planning application as a statutory requirement, and did not agree that the statement was a factual error. **Miss Wong** then introduced and **Mr Yeung** presented a PowerPoint on the item.

5.2 **Dr Ng Mee-kam** said that the design concepts of the UDS were good and hoped that PlanD could ensure the implementation of the concepts of roof garden, greening and sustainable design by means of conditions of land sale. **Mr Patrick Lau** agreed that the design principles should be clearly stated in conditions of land sale. He enquired how the design principles such as in the form of greening ratios could be implemented. **Mr Vincent Ng** considered that the design proposals in the Stage 2 Public Engagement such as the reduction

in development intensity, breaking up the building massing of the groundscraper into smaller blocks and respect for historical buildings and HPPs were great improvement over the previous design. While reiterating HKIA's stance of re-assembling Queen's Pier at its original location, he asked what compromise had to be made particularly for Central Piers Nos. 9 and 10 to restore the marine function of Queen's Pier.

5.3 **Ms Y Y Pong** said that she supported re-assembling Queen's Pier at its original location and breaking up the building massing of the groundscraper. In respect of the development parameters of the groundscraper at Site 3 on page 19 of the Digest, she enquired about the major difference between the gross floor area (GFA) originally estimated and currently proposed. **Mr Paul Zimmerman** asked how long the Central Reclamation Phase III (CRIII) site would remain a construction site. Regarding infrastructural facilities along the Central waterfront like the ESBs and air ventilation shafts, there did not seem to have been enough specific discussion by the TGUDS. He looked forward to confirmation that Queen's Pier could be put back at its original location at some stage in the future without a delay to resolving the traffic congestion.

5.4 In reply to Dr Ng and Mr Lau, **Miss Wong** said that, once the major views of the public had been analyzed, design briefs for the key sites would be prepared. Greening ratios and landscape master plan could also be prepared at the next stage. Roof greening and other environmentally-friendly designs could be included in the conditions of land sale. In reply to Mr Ng's enquiry about the effects of the possible re-assembly of Queen's Pier on the waterfront on Central Piers Nos. 9 and 10, **Miss Wong** said that the consultant had advised that for marine safety, if Queen's Pier was to be re-assembled between the two piers, one set of landing steps each at those two piers closest to Queen's Pier would be closed off and one out of the three sets of the re-assembled landing steps at Queen's Pier would be used. The seawall caissons would need to be re-constructed and the external design of the two piers would be modified to match that of Queen's Pier. The total cost was about \$220 million, while \$200 million would be involved if Queen's Pier was to be re-assembled at its original location.

5.5 In response to Ms Pong, **Miss Wong** said that the

original estimated GFA for Site 3 was 190,000 m², including public car park but excluding facilities for mini-bus, taxi and coaches. The GFA currently proposed was 157,400 m², with public car park, mini-bus, taxi and coach facilities included. For Site 6 where reclamation would be reduced greatly, the decrease in GFA was more than 20,000 m².

5.6 Regarding Mr Zimmerman's enquiry, **Miss Wong** said that, as explained at TGUDS meetings, the planning application for the ESBs was submitted to the TPB in 2005 by CEDD and the TPB had approved the planning application for the ESBs in 2006 after submission of a revised design. Under the current UDS, the consultant would propose design enhancements for the ESBs and air ventilation shaft which could be integrated with the new waterfront. In respect of Mr Zimmerman's proposed variation to the construction of Road P2, **Mr C K Hon** said that the proposed variation was technically feasible. However, Concepts A and B of Queen's Pier had sought to address the aspiration for re-assembling Queen's Pier as soon as possible and that a permanent Road P2 would be built as required. He said that the programme for the Central-Wan Chai Bypass (CWB) had been delayed, while that for the North Hong Kong Island Line had yet to be determined. **Mr Hon** remarked that implementation of items in the Public Works Programme could only commence after the relevant procedures were accomplished and the requisite funding applications were approved.

5.7 In reply to Dr Ng, **Miss Wong** said that, depending on the response, there could be more public forums in addition to consultation with District Councils (DCs) and professional bodies. An interactive 3-D computer model had been installed in the computers at the exhibition venues but there were technical difficulties in uploading it onto the Internet.

5.8 In response to Mr Derrick Pang, **Miss Wong** said that models had been produced to illustrate the GFA proposed for the various sites. The Digest had clearly stipulated the GFA for the key sites. There had been views in the Stage 1 Public Engagement that Queen's Pier should not be preserved, other than suggestions to relocate it to the waterfront or re-assemble it at the original location. She hoped that a clearer majority view would emerge after the Stage 2 Public Engagement. She said that the implementation programme of the key sites would become clearer

upon the completion of the UDS. She stressed that all works would be implemented as soon as possible.

5.9 In reply to Ir Dr Wong, **Mr C K Hon** said that while the costs of Road P2 under different scenarios could always be estimated, Mr Zimmerman's proposal to build Road P2 and then to discard the newly built Road P2 would involve additional as well as abortive costs. Road P2 was included in the existing CRIII contract and construction should continue until a decision was reached on the re-assembly location of Queen's Pier otherwise monetary claims would arise. **Mr Brooke** saw the need to manage public expectation as by the end of 2009 a large tract of land would be formed by reclamation which the public could not enjoy because of further infrastructural works.

5.10 **Mr Ng** commented that the minority view of not to re-assemble Queen's Pier should not be taken on board as it had been promised that Queen's Pier would be re-assembled either on the waterfront or at its original location. **Miss Wong** noted that only a few had suggested not to re-assemble Queen's Pier.

5.11 In response to Mr Samuel Mok's question on the views of the participants in the Focus Group Workshop on 26 April 2008 relating to the re-assembly of Queen's Pier, **Miss Wong** said that views were diverse. Among those who indicated a clear preference on the waterfront or original location, more preferred the original location. However, there were also some participants who preferred the waterfront location and at the same time suggested memorial features at the original location. Some had no preference, and some disliked both locations. **Mr Mok** was concerned that the views of the silent majority who had not attended the public engagement activities might not be taken into account. **Miss Wong** said that a telephone interview would be conducted later and all the 18 DCs would be consulted.

5.12 **Mr Zimmerman** said that there had been no reference to or mentioning of the heritage principles in the Digest, nor recognition of Queen's Pier as a graded structure and Antiquities Advisory Board's grading of Queen's Pier. **Miss Wong** said that page 15 of the Digest explained the historic value of Queen's Pier and provided the information that Queen's Pier was a Grade I Historical Building. She believed that given the wide media coverage of Queen's Pier, Hong Kong people were well aware of

the background of Queen's Pier.

5.13 **The Chairman** thanked the representatives of PlanD and the consultants for their presentation and discussion with the HEC. He said that the TGUDS would further follow up on issues relating to the UDS.

TGUDS

Item 7 CWB and Island Eastern Corridor Link (Information Note No. 9/2008)

6.1 As representatives for Item 6 had not yet arrived, **the Chairman suggested** and **the meeting** agreed discussing Item 7 first.

6.2 **The Chairman** said that the item was included in the agenda in response to SPH's letter of 31 March 2008 which was circulated to Members on 9 April 2008. He welcomed Mr Y S Chow of HyD. **Mr Chow** presented the paper.

6.3 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that SPH supported the construction of CWB. SPH recognized that the cut-and-cover method would be the best method of construction which might require temporary reclamation. Although the need for temporary reclamation was mentioned, the public consultation documents did not provide specific details for the public to discuss whether there was an overriding need for the temporary reclamation. For the temporary breakwater the Government had to establish the overriding public need of providing protected water for small vessels. He said that the delay of the CWB was not caused by SPH's request for judicial review but the Government's decision that temporary reclamation did not fall within the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance. On another judicial review instituted by a hotel developer, he said that the Government had to review whether an overriding public need for visual and physical access to the harbour had been established that would warrant additional reclamation, if any.

6.4 **Ms Sharon Ho** thanked Mr Zimmerman for his recap of SPH's stance presented in the judicial review and the HEC for its input to the Harbour-front Enhancement Review – Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Area and suggestions for the alignment of the CWB. In reply to Dr Paul Ho, she said that the Government was studying the impact of the judgment on the

CWB project and reviewing the steps to be taken to implement the project in a lawful and reasonable manner as early as practicable. The Government would conduct further public consultation and provide supplementary documents to justify the overriding public need of the temporary reclamation. It would not appeal against the judgment.

6.5 **Dr Ng Mee-kam** was disappointed with the request for judicial review after the public engagement process advocated by the HEC and reiterated the need to provide legal backing for such. **Mr Zimmerman** said that the Government needed to be transparent and open in justifying the overriding public need of the temporary reclamation in order not to get into trouble again.

6.6 **The Chairman** thanked Mr Chow for his presentation.

Item 6 Temporary Use of the WKCD Project Area (Paper No. 8/2008)

7.1 **The Chairman** welcomed Ms Esther Leung, Mrs Frances Yim and Mr Louis Kau of HAB and Ms Olga Lam of LandsD. **Ms Leung** presented the paper.

7.2 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** suggested that more open space should be provided for as long as possible. **Dr Paul Ho** enquired whether the development plan of Site F currently under preparation would meet the proposed temporary use. **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that as far as possible the promenade should be continuous and consideration should be given to building some transfer stations for works or storage of equipment further inland or underground. **Mr Vincent Ng** believed that the proposed activity at Site F would attract more people to the West Kowloon Waterfront Promenade. He hoped that the performance venue could be integrated with the promenade. **Dr Alvin Kwok** would like to see the venue to be used by non-franchised organizations with the grass maintained. Consideration should be given to inviting creative artists to perform at the site. Accessibility should be improved to increase attractiveness. **Mr Michael Hui** opined that the nature of activities would have an impact on their sustainability. While a park could be the main theme of the area, there could also be small shops selling a variety of goods to attract people. **Mr S C Lo** suggested that some area in the WKCD could be rented to green organizations temporarily

for gardening activities as well as organic farming.

7.3 **Ms Leung** thanked Members for their suggestions. She said that there would be an open tender exercise for Site F to test the response of the market. This would encourage civic involvement, a greater variety of activities and participation of commercial as well as non-profit making organizations. While it would be possible from the perspective of arts and cultural development to integrate the temporary provision of open space, there might be land management and traffic and noise impact assessment considerations which should be taken into account. On the suggestion of a continuous harbourfront promenade, **Ms Olga Lam** informed the meeting that a large portion of the land concerned was being occupied as work site/area for railway projects and with existing utility structures such as pump house.

7.4 **Mr Brooke and Mr Ng** suggested that a non-traditional approach should be adopted by departments concerned when processing applications for temporary use. **Dr Ng** said that residents nearby would be happy if the land could be made available as open space with only minor touch-up. **Mr Zimmerman** said that creative thinking would be required for managing the site for temporary enjoyment of the public. He suggested that departments concerned could consult the HEC on the matter. **Ms Leung** noted that according to the schedule, tenders in respect of Site F would be invited in June 2008 and the site would be handed over to the successful bidder in August or September 2008.

7.5 **The Chairman** thanked representatives of HAB and LandsD for their presentation and discussion with the HEC.

Item 8 Any other business

Date of next meeting

8.1 **The Chairman** said that the next meeting would be held on 10 June 2008 at 2:15 pm.

8.2 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:50 pm.

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