

**22nd Meeting of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee
held at 2:15 pm on 18 August 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
Dr Alvin Kwok	Representing Conservancy Association
Mr Vincent Ng	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Leslie Chen	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Mr Kim Chan	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Ir Dr Greg Wong	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Mason hung	Representing Hong Kong Tourism Board
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 Samuel Mok	
Mr Derrick Pang	
Mr Raymond Young	Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)
Mr Philip Yung	Deputy Secretary (Transport)1, Transport and Housing Bureau (THB)
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

Ms Lydia Lam	Assistant Secretary (Planning)3, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr C K Hon	Project Manager/Hong Kong Island and Islands,

Mr C B Mak
Mr Raymond Lee

Civil Engineering and Development
Department (CEDD)
Chief Engineer/Kowloon East, CEDD
Chief Town Planner/Studies and Research,
Planning Department (PlanD)

For Item 1A

Mr Paul Zimmerman
Mr Freddie Hai

Designing Hong Kong (DHK)
Representing 21 Architects and Architectural
Graduate

Dr Ivan Ho

Representing 21 Architects and Architectural
Graduate

For Item 1B

Dr Peter Cookson-Smith
Dr Sujata Govada
Mr Wong Kam-sing

Hong Kong Urban Design Alliance (HKUDA)
HKUDA
HKUDA

For Item 5

Ms Sharon Ho
Mr C S Wai
Mr Y S Chow

Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport)5, THB
Director of Highways
Project Manager/Major Works, Highways
Department (HyD)
Chief Traffic Engineer/Hong Kong, Transport
Department (TD)

Mr H L Cheng

Absent with Apologies

Prof Carlos Lo
Mr Yu Kam-hung
Mr Nicholas Brooke
Dr Anissa Chan
Ms Margaret Hsia

Representing Friends of the Earth
Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors

Assistant Director(2), Home Affairs
Department

Action

Welcoming message

The Chairman welcomed all attending the 22nd meeting of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC).

Item 1 HEC briefing

1.1 **The Chairman** said that the purpose of the briefing was

to provide Members with an opportunity to hear the submissions.

A. Development planned for the waterfront of South West Kowloon

1.2 **The Chairman** welcomed Mr Paul Zimmerman of DHK and Messrs Freddie Hai and Ivan Ho representing 21 Architects and Architectural Graduate. He noted that Mr Zimmerman was a regular member of the HEC representing SPH. **Mr Zimmerman** said that he had requested the Secretariat to circulate a letter objecting to the height restrictions proposed to the draft South West Kowloon Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K20/20 from 21 architects and architectural graduate to the Secretary of the Town Planning Board (TPB). The letter was tabled.

1.3 **Messrs Hai, Ho and Zimmerman** presented their item with a visualizer.

1.4 **Mr Vincent Ng** declared that he was one of the 21 who had signed the letter to the Secretary of TPB.

1.5 In response to Mr Kim Chan's request for the Administration's view to facilitate Members' discussion, **Mrs Ava Ng** said that DHK had submitted to TPB an objection to the height restrictions on the draft South West Kowloon OZP No. S/K20/20. She stressed that the inclusion of the height restrictions for the development in West Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD) had been thoroughly studied with findings of the study presented during the consultation. The West Kowloon Cultural District Authority (WKCDA) would formulate a Development Plan (DP) for WKCD, setting out the various land uses, their disposition and development parameters. In drawing up the DP, WKCDA was required to conduct public consultation. The DP would then be submitted to TPB for processing according to the statutory requirements.

1.6 **Dr Andrew Thomson** said that early and on-going engagement on harbourfront projects with holistic information was important for HEC to provide suggestions for harbourfront enhancement. **Mr Chan** said that it would be too early to conclude on the WKCD proposal. Given its terms of reference, the HEC could contribute to the implementation of the project for

the benefit of the community. **The Chairman** recalled that Home Affairs Bureau (HAB) had briefed HEC and the Task Group on Management Model for the Harbourfront (TGMMH) on WKCD several times and expected that there would be briefings in future, where appropriate.

1.7 **Dr Ng Mee-kam** said that many parties were interested in the WKCD proposal and HEC would be concerned about the application of the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines (HPPs/Gs). **Mrs Ng** reiterated that in accordance with the WKCD Ordinance, there would be ample opportunities for the public to express their views on WKCD. Similar to other stakeholders, HEC would be consulted on the DP prepared by WKCD and in particular, on how the HPPs/Gs had been taken into account in the DP for WKCD. **The Chairman** anticipated that HEC would continue to work with the Government, WKCD and TPB on the WKCD proposal.

1.8 **Mr Hai** said that height restrictions should not be imposed for WKCD prior to the formulation of an overall plan for the area. Given the commercial facilities and M+ with an area of 70,000m² under phase one of the WKCD development, the proposed height restrictions would limit the applicability of the HPPs/Gs to WKCD. **Mr Ho** added that the proposed height restrictions would damage the future development of WKCD. **Mr Zimmerman** said that the relevant OZP was being reviewed by TPB under the old Town Planning Ordinance with close-door discussion. The public would not know about the objection of the 21 architects and architectural graduates. He noted that a salt water station and 23 hectares of ground level open space were included on the promenade in the West Kowloon OZP. He urged HEC to get involved in the planning and development of WKCD.

1.9 **Dr Ng** said that height restrictions, which would help reserve view corridors and contribute to good urban design, could be applied flexibly. **Mrs Ng** said that plot ratios and height restrictions were required to provide a framework for the WKCD to prepare the DP. The plot ratio of 1.81 had been set after comprehensive public consultation by HAB. It would accommodate the total gross floor area of the various required facilities in WKCD and HAB had explained the details and rationale of the plot ratio restriction to HEC. The Legislative Council (LegCo) also had extensive and open discussion on it.

The proposed height restrictions had been set having regard to the requirements of the HPPs/Gs, and the skyline and ridgeline viewing from Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park on Hong Kong Island. For a site like WKCD with an extensive area of 40 hectares, there would be great flexibility in design. DHK's objection would be duly considered by TPB. **Mr Zimmerman** noted the inconsistent approach to height profiles and disagreed with the lack of a minimum percentage of land use for cultural facilities for WKCD in the Notes of the OZP.

1.10 **The Chairman** suggested and **Mr Ng** agreed that the Harbour Plan Review Sub-committee (HPR Sub-com) would keep in view the WKCD project on the application of HPPs/Gs. He thanked the representatives of DHK for their presentation and discussion with Members.

HPR Sub-com

B. Alternative urban design for Central harbourfront

1.11 **The Chairman** welcomed Dr Peter Cookson-Smith, Dr Sujata Govada and Mr Wong Kam-sing of HKUDA. He noted that Dr Govada was an alternate member of HEC representing CE@H. **Dr Cookson-Smith and Dr Govada** presented their PowerPoint.

1.12 **Ir Dr Greg Wong** said that while there were technical problems with HKUDA's proposal, the proposal should be studied further in detail. The goal of the proposal did not appear to differ from that of the Government. On HKUDA's 12 proposed changes to the Government's plan, he suggested that PlanD's consultants should look at them under the Stage 2 Public Engagement of the Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (UDS). **Mr Vincent Ng** declared that he was a member of HKUDA.

1.13 In respect of the area where reclamation would be reduced, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** expressed his support for HKUDA's proposal and enquired about the technical issues in breaking up the waterfront in front of the inner harbour. **Dr Andrew Thomson** noted that HKUDA's proposal had responded to the HPPs/Gs, in particular in terms of the massing and scale of facilities, marine activities, at-grade access, open space and removal of tall buildings. He had reservations on the floating hotel, swimming pool and eco park. **Dr Ng Mee-kam** suggested

that a beach or swimming pool could be proposed at Site 8 rather than Site 4. On the proposed Tamar Green, a place for civic in addition to festive activities could be considered. The proposed Wan Chai Park would make the area more attractive, appealing and interesting. Though the proposal would be more costly, it would bring about more long-term and sustainable benefits to the area. The proposal had addressed most of the aspirations of the public.

1.14 **Mrs Ava Ng** said that PlanD's consultants were in the process of examining the public views received under the Stage 2 Public Engagement of the UDS and preparing detailed analyses and design responses. She saw some common grounds between the goals of the Government's and HKUDA's proposals. On the specific suggestions of HKUDA, the consultants would further study them together with other suggestions collected.

1.15 **The Chairman** thanked the representatives of HKUDA for their presentation and exchange of views with Members.

Item 2 Confirmation of minutes of the 21st meeting

2.1 **The Chairman** said that the Secretariat circulated the draft minutes of the 21st meeting to Members on 11 August 2008 and received no proposed amendments. The minutes were confirmed.

Item 3 Progress reports from the three Sub-committee/Task Groups (Paper Nos. 15-17/2008)

A. HPR Sub-com (Paper No. 15/2008)

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

3.1.1 **Mr Ng** reported that the HPR Sub-com had been briefed on the re-provisioning of the refuse collection point (RCP) at Paterson Street in Causeway Bay to facilitate the proposed widening of Victoria Park Road westbound. The Sub-committee appreciated the design of the proposed RCP, but expressed reservation on its location close to the waterfront. The public would be deprived of the opportunity to use the site and its adjoining vacant land. This would affect the

accessibility to the waterfront.

3.1.2 The HPR Sub-com had also discussed the layout design of the Harbour Area Treatment Scheme (HATS) Stage 2A: Sewage Conveyance System at the eastern end of Fung Mat Road, Sai Ying Pun. According to the latest design, most of the facilities would be put underground, whilst the above-ground structures would occupy a land of 10m². Upon completion of the construction works in 2014, landscape features would be provided in the rest of the site which would be open to the public.

3.1.3 **Mr Ng** further reported that the HPR Sub-com had been briefed on the on the re-provisioning of the Kennedy Town Swimming Pool which would be affected by the MTR West Island Line (WIL) alignment at the Kennedy Town Praya and the temporary works areas of WIL. The Sub-committee suggested that the project team should consider improving the connectivity of the waterfront with the adjoining areas. On the three existing piers around the ex-abattoir works site, the Sub-committee suggested to fix the eastern pier for the use of community as soon as possible, and retain the central pier and the western pier for public use where practicable.

3.1.4 The HPR Sub-com also discussed the amendments to the draft Quarry Bay OZP No. S/H21/24 gazetted on 25 July 2008 which included, amongst other things, the introduction of building height control to prevent out-of-context developments and to regulate the development profile of the built-environment. The Sub-committee noted that relevant HPPs had been considered in proposing the building height restrictions. However, it reiterated the view that building height control alone could not resolve issues affecting the urban fabric. There were also discussions on how the amendments could improve quality of life, preservation of views to the ridgelines, implications of tightening the building height control upon redevelopment and maintaining breezeways and air corridors.

3.1.5 Water Supplies Department briefed the HPR Sub-com on the laying of Western Cross Harbour Main and associated land mains from West Kowloon to Sai Ying Pun. The Sub-committee had reservation on the proposed works area as it would lead to the partial closure of the West Kowloon Waterfront Promenade. Members had queries about the siting, land requirement and duration of the proposed works area. The Sub-committee also expressed the view that information on the temporary works areas along the harbourfront and how they were coordinated in terms of land requirement and programming was not complete.

3.1.6 DEVB briefed the HPR Sub-com on harbourfront enhancement opportunities including two quick-win projects, i.e. a temporary promenade at the Kwun Tong Public Cargo Working Area (PCWA) and extension of the promenade along Aldrich Bay. The Sub-committee noted that an inter-departmental working group would be set up to explore other opportunities for harbourfront enhancement. DEVB would report progress of the working group to the Sub-committee.

3.2 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** noted the HPR Sub-com progress report and suggested that the distribution of work among the Sub-committee and Task Groups should be reviewed. **Dr Andrew Thomson** commented that while the principle of height restriction was good, height restriction alone would not deliver good urban design. He said that a resolution of HEC on this would save the efforts of the HPR Sub-com in deliberating the issue.

3.3 **Mr Ng** agreed with Dr Thomson and said that layout of streets, air ventilation design and development intensity were important factors in improving good urban design. He hoped that more harbourfront quick-wins could be delivered. **Mr Raymond Young** said that TPB was progressively incorporating height restrictions in OZPs and HEC was consulted on those OZPs concerning the harbourfront. There was general consensus in the community supporting the imposition of height restrictions along the waterfront.

3.4 **Ir Dr Greg Wong** said that building height control

contributed to but was not the sole factor in achieving good urban design and planning. On the distribution of work among the Sub-committee and Task Groups, he was of the view that it was the same members of HEC meeting in the Sub-committee and Task Groups and it should not make much difference where the discussion was held. **Mr Jimmy Kwok** believed that HEC supported the imposition of height restrictions on buildings at the harbourfront and there was no need to debate the issue in HEC. **Mr Ng** reiterated that building height restrictions should be supplemented by control on development intensity and air ventilation design, with models to visualize the ideal urban landscape. He confirmed the HPR Sub-com's consensus on this.

B. Task Group on Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (TGUDS) (Paper No. 16/2008)

3.5 **Ir Dr Greg Wong** presented the progress report. He reported that while no Task Group meeting had been held in July-August 2008, public views had been collected for the Stage 2 Public Engagement of the UDS through various channels including Focus Group Workshop, Community Engagement Forum, comment cards, face-to-face interviews, telephone polls, and written submissions. Briefings had been provided to various public and advisory bodies and interested professional institutes and organizations. The study consultants were examining the public views received and preparing detailed analysis and design responses.

3.6 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** asked for a list of the meetings that had taken place in relation to the UDS. He noted that there were reports that the consultation with DCs on the UDS had been orchestrated by Government, with very similar minutes on the DCs' discussions. It would be appropriate for the Government to respond to this allegation. **Ir Dr Wong** understood that the minutes of DC meetings were endorsed by the respective DC Chairmen and he respected the operation of DCs.

TGUDS

3.7 **Mr Raymond Young** said that there had been neither orchestration nor manufacturing of the results of the consultation with DCs. **Mr Zimmerman** said that the terms of reference of the TGUDS were to comment on the UDS and formulate views on the design and development of the new Central harbourfront, and to advise the Government on the public engagement strategy and

activities to be organized for the UDS. It was relevant to raise the matter in HEC.

C. TGMMH (Paper No. 17/2008)

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

3.8.1 **Prof Lee** reported that the Task Group had discussed its proposed overseas visit. Three visit routes had been proposed - London and Liverpool, Vancouver and San Francisco, and Sydney and Singapore. Consideration would be given to including attendance at overseas conferences.

3.8.2 **Prof Lee** informed the meeting that HAB and Jockey Club Creative Arts Centre (賽馬會創意藝術中心) (JCCAC) briefed the Task Group on the management of JCCAC. Members noted that having the right partners would contribute positively to a successful management model.

3.8.3 **Prof Lee** reported that Leisure and Cultural Services Department and Chi Lin Nunnery (CLN) (志蓮淨苑) briefed the Task Group on the management of Nan Lian Garden (NLG) (南蓮園池) by CLN. Members noted that design and management could not be separated as a good design would facilitate the subsequent management. Some Members joined a guided tour of NLG after the meeting.

3.9 **Dr Andrew Thomson** said that the TGMMH had also discussed the management of engineering works along the harbourfront.

Item 4 Matters arising

A. Minutes of the 20th meeting (para. 2.1 of the draft minutes of the 21st meeting)

4.1 **The Chairman** said that the Secretariat circulated the revised draft minutes of the 20th meeting incorporating

Mr Paul Zimmerman's proposed amendments to Members on 11 August 2008 and received no further comments. The minutes were confirmed.

B. Inventory of Known (Planned and Proposed) Projects at Harbourfront (para. 3.2 of the draft minutes of the 21st meeting)

4.2 Upon the Chairman's invitation, **Mr Raymond Lee** reported that the Inventory had been circulated to HPR Sub-com Members before the July Sub-committee meeting. On the proposal to upload the Inventory onto the HEC website for access by HEC Members only, **PlanD** was considering the technical issues.

PlanD

Item 5 Construction of Central-Wan Chai Bypass (CWB) Tunnel Section in Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter (CBTS) and ex-Wan Chai PCWA (Paper No. 18/2008)

5.1 **The Chairman** welcomed Ms Sharon Ho of THB, Messrs C S Wai and Y S Chow of HyD, and Mr H L Cheng of TD. **Mr Wai** introduced the item and **Mr Chow** proceeded with his PowerPoint.

5.2 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested that HyD should brief HEC on its road projects and comprehensive plan to improve connectivity of the harbourfront for the public. Turning to HyD's paper, he wished HyD would highlight the concerns raised during the public consultation in July 2008 on the construction of CWB and how those had been addressed. He did not see any mention of Shatin to Central Link (SCL) and hoped that HyD would ensure good coordination of the CWB and SCL projects, and that reclamation would be reduced to a minimum. On the consultation with stakeholders of CBTS including the vessel owners in September 2008, he suggested that HyD should explain with a map the area in CBTS required for marine operation to support the works. He asked about the opportunity to construct a new breakwater to replace the existing one in CBTS and the technique to ensure that the breakwater would be constructed with minimum reclamation.

5.3 In response to Mr Zimmerman, **Mr Wai** said that HyD

HyD

would collaborate with other departments including PlanD and TD on the studies concerning ways to improve the connectivity along the harbourfront. The consultation conducted in July 2008 was technical in nature and HyD had not received any new suggestions to revise the technical proposal. If there were such suggestions in the next round of consultation with stakeholders of CBTS, consideration would be given to revise the technical proposal, as appropriate. On SCL, following LegCo's funding approval in May 2008, HyD had already commenced the study on the preliminary design and alignment of the project. There was not enough technical information at this stage to conclude whether the construction of SCL would require temporary reclamation and, if required, the relationship between the temporary reclamation for SCL and that for CWB. HyD would seek to reduce the amount of temporary reclamation should both projects involve temporary reclamation at the same time. As regards the operation of CBTS during construction, once the technical proposal of the structure of the tunnel tube was finalized, HyD would confirm how the operation of CBTS would be affected. In respect of the proposed temporary breakwater, the aim was to arrive at a reprovisioning arrangement complying with relevant ordinance and acceptable by stakeholders and the community. One of the goals was not to construct a temporary breakwater, or if the temporary breakwater was required, to minimize its extent.

5.4 **Mr Zimmerman** asked HyD to release information on the operation of CBTS in relation to the cut-and-cover proposal first. **Mr Chow** said that HyD had discussed with Marine Department (MD) the impact of the temporary reclamation on the operation of CBTS. When the temporary reclaimed land, which would provide a work platform and accommodate construction equipment and materials for the works, was formed, a 20m wide navigation channel would be maintained in CBTS for shared use of vessels transporting construction equipment and materials for the works and other vessels in CBTS. There would be no change to the current width of the navigation channel in CBTS although the alignment of the channel would be changing during the works period. This and other requirements of MD would be included in HyD's works contract conditions. During the construction stage, HyD, MD and vessels owners in CBTS would stay in touch to ensure the best operation of CBTS for all concerned. **Mr Zimmerman** again suggested that HyD should explain the situations with a map. **Mr Chow** supplemented that there was

an entrance to the typhoon shelter at each of the eastern and western ends. To ensure both entrances could be used at most times during the construction period, the construction would be separated into phases. The eastern entrance would be slightly affected in phase one but would be wholly opened during phase two. The western entrance would not be affected during the construction period.

5.5 **Mr Leslie Chen** enquired if it would be possible to adopt a hybrid of construction methods. He also asked if the silt to be dredged from the sea-bed would be treated to reduce toxicity before being put back to the sea. **Mr Chow** said that according to the law, if there were problems with the silt, it would be treated before being put back to the sea. On the construction method, given the environment of the sea-bed and the works requirements of the CWB tunnel, the cut-and-over method was the best.

5.6 **Dr Andrew Thomson** enquired in addition to the relocation of the existing heliport, what other constraints had caused and would cause delay to the construction of CWB, and how the construction period could be phased to minimize the impact on the waterfront. **Mr Chow** said that HyD was reviewing the time required for the works with a view to shortening it as practicable as possible. There was a legal restriction on the daily amount of dredging. This had an impact on the time required for reclaiming a temporary piece of land and in turn further the dredging and construction of the tunnel. According to existing information and without allowance for inclement weather, it would take about six years to complete the works. HyD would closely and critically review the programme to speed up the works to relieve traffic congestion along the northern shore of Hong Kong Island. **Dr Thomson** asked when funding approval for the construction of CWB would be sought and the impact on the Central Reclamation Phase III (CRIII) project. **Mr C K Hon** said that while the CRIII works were due for substantial completion by end 2009, the construction of CWB at CRIII would proceed only after the authorization of the road scheme. However, in view of the strong public aspiration of removing early the constraints imposed by CWB on the development of the new Central harbourfront, departments concerned were reviewing the feasibility of implementing certain works to protect the reclamation pending the authorization and construction of CWB.

5.7 **Ir Dr Greg Wong** said that since the CWB tunnel was climbing upwards at the eastern side of CBTS, temporary reclamation would be unavoidable. For the proposed Slip Road Number 8, which was approaching land and climbing upwards to the vicinity of Victoria Park, temporary reclamation would also be unavoidable. As regards the SCL tunnel, the vertical alignment of which was above the CWB tunnel, he anticipated that temporary reclamation would also be required to the south of CWB shortly after the removal of the temporary reclamation for CWB. He suggested that HyD should consider the timing of the execution of the two projects to avoid reclamation after reclamation. He expressed concern about the need for temporary reclamation west of the Yacht Club. He noted HyD's claim that 20m of soil cover for tunneling the CWB was not sufficient because the bore tunnel must be of a diameter of 15m. He questioned whether the depth of soil cover could be reduced if CWB was to be constructed by two tunnels each of a diameter of 8 or 9m to be opened up in between after soil grouting or other stabilization means. This could eliminate the temporary reclamation and avoid possible legal challenge. He also noted the high rock level in the vicinity of Kellet Island where a tunnel boring machine could operate. Due and diligent consideration of such an option would help avoid possible further legal challenge on minimum reclamation. **Mr Wai** said that with the funding approved by LegCo in May 2008, HyD had started the preliminary design of SCL. There should be sufficient technical details to further study the relationship between SCL and CWB by mid 2009. The alignment of SCL was in the mean time under review and its final alignment might be revised. If necessary, HyD would consider possible preliminary works that would facilitate the construction of the two items. In relation to the temporary reclamation west of the Yacht Club, **Mr Chow** said that the length of the CWB tunnel under the Yacht Club was 190m. Half of the sea-bed was covered by rocks and half by silt. This inconsistency in geologic components imposed difficulties on the construction. It would be dangerous to bore two smaller tunnels and connect them in the silt sea-bed some 20m below the sea level. Besides, there was not enough space to accommodate a tunnel boring machine on the sea-bed. The cut-and-cover method with temporary reclamation was therefore the best.

5.8 **Mr Patrick Lau** asked if the phase one temporary

reclamation and the permanent reclamation in front of Oil Street for the tunnel portal and ventilation shaft would be coordinated to shorten the construction time and minimize disruption to the residents of the nearby areas. He recalled that during the public engagement of the Harbour-front Enhancement Review - Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Areas (HER), it was recommended that the water quality in CBTS would be improved. He enquired about the possibility of incorporating this improvement work into the temporary reclamation works for the CWB tunnel. **Mr Chow** said that the permanent reclamation in front of Oil Street would be carried out first to provide a space for traffic diversion to facilitate the construction of CWB connection with Island Eastern Corridor Link (IECL). The aim was to maintain three traffic lanes in each direction during construction. The permanent reclamation would take about two years. It was near the temporary reclamation in CBTS, separated by the eastern breakwater. While the silt in CBTS was dredged regularly by the Government to ensure the water quality, HyD planned to include dredging work in its construction contract for CWB.

5.9 **Mr Jimmy Kwok** considered it necessary for departments concerned to coordinate the various projects in the Central-Wan Chai harbourfront to shorten the time required for construction works. For the public consultation, he hoped that it would include issues like the improvement of water quality in CBTS and harbourfront enhancements to facilitate early implementation of CWB. A comprehensive list of projects related to the CWB would also help the public understand more of the CWB project and support it. **Mr Wai** thanked Mr Kwok for his advice and undertook to conduct follow up action accordingly.

5.10 **Mr Derrick Pang** declared his interest as an engineer working on Government works contracts. He asked about the possibility of shortening the time of construction and reclamation by grouping phases of reclamation works together and seeking exemption under the relevant environmental protection ordinance. **Mr Chow** said that the construction of the CWB portion between Hing Fat Street and City Garden at North Point would take up most of the time, because the dual three lane traffic capacity of IECL must be maintained during the construction. On the temporary reclamation in CBTS, there was a need to strike a balance between the speed of the project and the operation of the typhoon shelter. There would not be any exemption under the

relevant environmental protection ordinance that could shorten the construction time.

5.11 **Mr Zimmerman** said that SPH supported the CWB project and participated in all public consultation sessions for the project. He suggested that **HyD** should provide HEC with the maps he requested as soon as possible. He asked which Government bureau or department was responsible for ensuring that the whole CWB project and its interface works for the entire harbourfront move ahead within the best timeframe. **Ms Sharon Ho** said that THB looked after the road project, while harbourfront enhancement and the Wan Chai Development Phase II (WDII) project fell under the purview of DEVB. Works departments including CEDD and HyD were involved. The authorization of the road scheme came under the Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance (R(WUC)O). With the Judicial Review (JR) initiated by SPH on the gazettal of the road scheme, THB had yet to satisfy the statutory requirement of resolving all the objections before submitting the plan to the Executive Council for authorization. Once the whole road scheme was authorized, THB could seek funding approval from LegCo and thereafter start the tender process and then the construction works. **Mr Zimmerman** asked why THB had not sought authorization for the Central section of CWB. **Ms Ho** said that authorization should be sought for the entirety of the road which served a certain purpose. A part of the road might not be able to serve the same purpose. Seeking authorization for the construction of a part of the road first while there were still legal questions to be resolved on the remaining part could be subject to legal challenge. If the remaining part of the road could not be authorized eventually, the construction of the first part of the road could result in a waste of public money. **Mr Philip Yung** said that THB and HyD were responsible for the implementation of CWB. They could be approached for any enquiries about the CWB project. Enquiries about the other aspects of the WDII project including harbourfront enhancement could be made to CEDD.

HyD

5.12 **Mr Samuel Mok** said that public consultation on CWB had already taken three years. He hoped that the consultation with vessel owners in CBTS could be completed soon. He enquired if placing the east and west lanes of CWB one on top of another might reduce the extent of reclamation. **Mr Wai** said

that the vessel owners would be consulted once the impact on CBTS known. While the construction proposal might be reviewed if necessary, a revised proposal might involve more temporary reclamation.

5.13 **Mr Chow** explained in detail the six-year requirement for the construction of CWB. **Mr Mok** believed in HyD's estimation and enquired whether the Government envisaged any further JR. **Mr Raymond Young** said that there was a related JR on the relevant OZP. TPB was considering how to handle the JR which also had an impact on the construction of CWB. He could not advise when the proceedings of this JR would be completed at this stage.

5.14 **Mr Lau** recalled that under HER, there had been a proposal for the funding of CWB and enhancement of the Central-Wan Chai harbourfront to be sought together. **Ms Ho** said that the plan had been to seek LegCo's approval of funding for all related projects in one go. That was why the various projects had been gazetted under different ordinances on the same date in July 2007. On the question whether the new harbourfront area could be made available before the problems with the CWB were resolved, **Mr Young** said that if CWB was not to be constructed, there would be no overriding public need for reclamation, and no new land could be formed by reclamation for harbourfront enhancement. **Mr Zimmerman** clarified that construction of CWB was delayed because the public had not been consulted on the temporary reclamation, not because of SPH's JR.

5.15 **The Chairman** thanked the representatives of THB, HyD and TD for their presentation and discussion with HEC. He noted HEC's wish for early implementation of CWB.

Item 6 Any other business

A. Issues for HEC raised by Mr Paul Zimmerman

6.1 **The Chairman** said that Mr Zimmerman issued an email with a list of issues to HEC on 11 August 2008. Mr Nicholas Brooke, who did not attend the meeting, circulated his views to HEC on 13 August 2008. **The Chairman** noted that Item 1 of the issues raised by Mr Zimmerman, i.e., the review

of public consultation with DCs on the UDS, had been responded by Mr Young earlier at this meeting.

6.2 **Mr Zimmerman** said that given the long list of issues that he had raised and the late hours, he suggested that the issues be discussed by HEC at future meetings or allocated to the Sub-committee/Task Groups for discussion - Items 1-3 could be discussed by the TGUDS, Items 4-7 by the HPR Sub-com or HEC, and Item 8 by the TGMMH. On Item 2 regarding the information sought on developments in Central, **Ir Dr Greg Wong** suggested that the Government should provide the information to TGUDS Members before the next Task Group meeting. **The Chairman** said that **DEVB** would liaise with CEDD, HyD, PlanD and TD for preparation of responses to the issues before the next Task Group meeting. It was agreed that this approach would be followed for the other items. On Items 2-3, **Ir Dr Wong** said that he had requested the TGUDS Secretary to ask CEDD to provide the information. He noted the difficulties in obtaining the information and hoped that the Department could provide the information as far as possible.

DEVB

6.3 **Mr Vincent Ng** said that it would be better for HEC to look into Item 4 on Kai Tak. For Item 5 on West Kowloon, Item 6 on Kennedy Town and Item 7(a) on the schedule of planned and existing short term tenancies (STTs) on the harbourfront, the HPR Sub-com could look into or monitor them. It would be appropriate for the TGMMH to discuss Item 7(b) on the policy for temporary land use. **Mr Herbert Leung** said that Lands Department (LandsD) had been uploading from time to time onto the LandsD website forecast of STT sites for which the Department was expecting to invite tenders as well as the actual tender invitations themselves. LandsD could provide a link to the HEC Secretariat on each occasion when updating of the above information took place. With regard to the information on existing STTs, the department could consolidate any required information and forward it to the Secretariat for dissemination to Members. **Mr Zimmerman** said that LandsD's information was the basic information to work with. Citing a recent case on a car park on the Hung Hom waterfront, he said that there was a need for HEC or the TGMMH to discuss the policy for temporary land use.

6.4 On Item 8(a) relating to the policy and coordination for

harbourfront among Government departments, **Mr Raymond Young** said that DEVB had been coordinating Government bureaux and departments on harbourfront enhancement initiatives. It had set up an inter-departmental working group on harbourfront enhancement chaired by Mrs Susan Mak of DEVB. DEVB would brief HEC on specific harbourfront enhancement initiatives when ready. **The Chairman** suggested that this issue should be discussed at the next TGMMH meeting

Secretariat

6.5 **The Chairman** noted at that point that the meeting no longer had its quorum.

B. Harbourfront proposals gazetted under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (EIAO), R(WUC)O and Foreshore and Sea-bed (Reclamations) (FS(R)O) Ordinance

6.6 **The Chairman** said that the HPR Sub-com had suggested that in addition to the current practice of notifying HEC Members of planning applications processed by TPB, HEC Members should also be informed of other harbourfront proposals gazetted under the EIAO (環境影響評估條例), R(WUC)O (道路(工程、使用及補償)條例) and FS(R)O (前濱及海床(填海工程)條例), and the deadlines for providing comments on such proposals under the relevant ordinances. The Secretariat had liaised with THB, Environmental Protection Department and LandsD which agreed to the suggestion. **The Secretariat** would follow up accordingly.

Secretariat

C. Date of next meeting

6.7 **The Chairman** said that the next meeting would be held on 20 October 2008 at Conference Room, 15/F, North Point Government Offices.

(Post-meeting note: The next meeting has been rescheduled for 31 October 2008 (Friday) at 2:30 pm in Conference Hall, 3/F, 3 Edinburgh Place, Central, Hong Kong.)

6.8 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:45 pm.

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