

**23<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of Harbour-front Enhancement Committee  
held at 2:30 pm on 31 October 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 (BEC)
Prof Wong Sze-chun	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Dr Sujata Govada	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 Yu Kam-hung	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Ir Dr Chan Fuk-cheung	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Mason Hung	Representing Hong Kong Tourism Board
Mr Paul Zimmerman	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour Limited (SPH)
Mr Nicholas Brooke	
Dr Anissa Chan	
Mr Jimmy Kwok	
Mr Patrick Lau	
Mr Samuel Mok	
Mrs Susan Mak	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Philip Yung	Deputy Secretary (Transport)1, Transport and Housing Bureau (THB)
Mr John Chai	Director of Civil Engineering and Development
Mr Raymond Wong	Deputy Director of Planning/Territorial (Acting)
Mr Jeff Lam	Assistant Director (Headquarters), Lands Department (LandsD)
Ms Lydia Lam	Secretary (Acting)

**In Attendance**

Mrs Carrie Lam	Secretary for Development (SDEV)
Miss Cheung Hoi-shan	Assistant Secretary (Planning)5, DEVB
Mr C K Hon	Project Manager/Hong Kong Island and Islands, Civil Engineering and Development

Mr Bosco Chan  
Mr Roy Li

Department (CEDD)  
Chief Engineer/Hong Kong(2), CEDD  
Senior Town Planner/Special Duties 2, Planning  
Department (PlanD)

For Item 6

Mr C S Wai  
Mr K W Chung

Director of Highways  
Deputy Project Manager/Major Works(2),  
Highways Department (HyD)

Mr Bosco Chan  
Mr C Y Tsang

Chief Engineer/Hong Kong(2), CEDD  
Senior Marine Officer/Planning & Development  
(1), Marine Department (MD)

Mr Eric Ma

Managing Director, Maunsell Consultants Asia  
Ltd (MCAL)

Mr Peter Cheek

Director, MCAL

For Item 7

Mr C K Hon

Project Manager/Hong Kong Island & Islands,  
CEDD

Mr Eric Fung  
Mr Tommy Ng

Chief Engineer/Hong Kong(1), CEDD  
Divisional Director/Project Director, Atkins  
China Ltd (ACL)

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr Leslie Chen

Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape  
Architects

Mr Kim Chan  
Mr Louis Loong

Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners  
Representing Real Estate Developers  
Association of Hong Kong

Mr David Ho  
Mr Michael Hui  
Mr Derrick Pang  
Ms Margaret Hsia

Assistant Director(2), Home Affairs  
Department

**Action**

**Welcoming message**

**The Chairman** welcomed all attending the 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC), including Mrs Carrie Lam and Miss Cheung Hoi-shan of DEVB. Miss Cheung had taken up the role of the Secretary to the HEC Task Group on Management Model for the Harbourfront

(TGMMH) from Ms Lydia Lam, and would join the TGMMH overseas visit to Liverpool and London in early November 2008. He said that Miss Amy Yuen was attending a course at the Peking University and Ms Lam, Acting Principal Assistant Secretary (Planning and Lands)<sup>2</sup>, would serve as the Secretary for this meeting. Mr Raymond Young, Mrs Ava Ng and Ir Dr Greg Wong had sent apologies for not being able to attend the meeting as they had to attend the Town Planning Board meeting. Their representatives attended this HEC meeting. Mr Leslie Chen, Mr Kim Chan, Mr Louis Loong, Mr David Ho, Mr Michael Hui, Mr Derrick Pang and Ms Margaret Hsia had also sent apologies. **The Chairman** said that Mrs Lam would be giving opening remarks on DEVB's Policy Agenda on Harbourfront Enhancement, i.e., Item 2, and would be staying on for Item 6 Central-Wan Chai Bypass (CWB) Temporary Reclamation and Reprovisioning of Affected Vessels and Item 7 Central Reclamation Phase III (CRIII) – Engineering Works Proposed Protection Works for the Reclamation. He suggested and the meeting agreed that the latter two items should be discussed after Item 2.

### **Item 1 One minute's silence in memory of the late Dr Chan Wai-kwan**

1.1 **The Chairman** said that Dr Chan, a member of HEC from May 2004 to June 2007 and also the Chairman of the former HEC Sub-committee on South East Kowloon Development (SEKD Sub-com), passed away in Spain on 8 October 2008. Under Dr Chan's chairmanship, the SEKD Sub-com had accomplished the Kai Tak Planning Review which championed extensive public engagement activities under the objective of "Planning with the Community" to help building up public consensus on the development proposals and formulating a Preliminary Outline Development Plan (PODP). The PODP had served as a basis for the amendments to the Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan (OZP).

1.2 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that Dr Chan believed in public engagement and sustainable development, and had championed the establishment of a round table regarding harbour related matters. He had been instrumental in setting up CE@H and had been an advisor of Designing Hong Kong. These two organizations had recommended to the Government to set up a

committee to look at harbour development. HEC was hence established in 2004.

1.3 In memory of the late Dr Chan, **the Chairman** led a one minute's silence.

## **Item 2 Opening Remarks by SDEV on DEVB's Policy Agenda on Harbourfront Enhancement**

2.1 **Mrs Carrie Lam** thanked the Chairman for giving her another opportunity to brief HEC on the annual Policy Address. She would be pleased to stay on for the two items on CWB and CRIII before attending a Legislative Council (LegCo) meeting to conclude the debate on the Policy Address.

2.2 **Mrs Lam** briefed the meeting on four specific paragraphs in this year's policy address concerning DEVB, namely, the real estate market, regional integration between Hong Kong and Shenzhen in respect of Lok Ma Chau Loop, the removal from the Application List for land sale of the Former Hollywood Road Police Married Quarters Site, and harbourfront enhancement. On harbourfront enhancement, DEVB would co-ordinate inter-departmental efforts on harbourfront planning. In terms of staffing resources, DEVB would set up a dedicated team to be headed by a Principal Assistant Secretary, which would require approval of LegCo, to handle harbourfront-related planning and land issues. She assured Members that harbourfront work would be high on her policy agenda. For the last five or six months, she had been travelling to several cities such as Sydney, London and New York which had experience in developing waterfront areas for public enjoyment. She looked forward to using some of those ideas and inspirations in those cities to work with HEC in future on harbourfront enhancement in Hong Kong.

2.3 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** was pleased to note the high-level support for harbourfront enhancement. **Dr Andrew Thomson** noted the initiatives in sustainable development and quality living environment. He hoped that the limited resources would be used efficiently and effectively. **Mr Vincent Ng** was glad to see and supported those initiatives in the Policy Agenda in relation to harbourfront enhancement. **Mr Paul Zimmerman** welcomed DEVB's Policy Agenda on harbourfront enhancement. He

considered that how to spread the use of the harbourfront between conflicting demands would be a challenge. There seemed a simplification of harbourfront enhancement as beautification of waterfront promenades. He was concerned about the call for more footbridges and tunnels in the Policy Agenda, and was of the view that street level linkages were more important for the harbourfront. On Kai Tak Development, he had had a meaningful discussion with CEDD on an infrastructural project at the north apron area. He said that there was a need for the community including HEC to be consulted early and continuously in the detailed planning for implementation of development proposals.

2.4 **Dr Sujata Govada** said that it was encouraging to note the Government's initiatives towards harbourfront enhancement which were good for Hong Kong. She asked about the Administration's one, five or twenty-year plans on the integrated vision of the harbourfront. **Mr Brooke** opined that as long as there was a majority, rather than a consensus, in favour of a proposal, the Administration should take it forward. **Mr Patrick Lau** believed that the initiative to develop continuous promenades along the harbourfront had responded to the aspirations of the community. He considered that de-centralized implementation of the promenades could have the advantage of maintaining local characteristics over centralized planning. **Prof Carlos Lo** asked whether there was a common vision shared by bureaux/departments for harbourfront enhancement.

2.5 **Mrs Lam** said that while there was no disagreement among bureaux on the significance of the harbourfront and construction of continuous harbourfront promenades for public enjoyment, we had to appreciate and accept that we were not operating from a clean slate and there were a lot of historical baggage and legacies. Victoria Harbour was still performing some functions of a working harbour. In fact, she was told that Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority had managed to persuade the Sydney Government to spend a huge amount of money to remove a cement plant away from the Sydney harbour. In Hong Kong, there were public cargo working areas (PCWA) and typhoon shelters. The Administration needed time to plan before it could deliver its vision for the harbourfront and the plan was much dictated by how fast it could overcome the problems. At future meetings, perhaps the Administration could present on

short, medium and long-term plans. Most short-term plans were in fact quick-win projects and **Mrs Lam** took note of Mr Ng's request for quicker implementation of them.

2.6 Regarding de-centralization and local characteristics, taking as an example the Tsing Yi Promenade which was developed by four developers, **Mrs Lam** said that various sections of the Promenade had their own characteristics. The Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority indeed had been formed by combining three authorities and it allowed various things to develop first before putting them together at a later stage. She noted that the West Kowloon Cultural District Authority Board (WKCDAB) had been set up to oversee the planning of the 40-hectare (ha) site including the promenade. On public engagement, she agreed that the Administration could not always operate on a complete consensus. In respect of Kai Tak Development, it was now in the implementation stage; the engineering study would have to be taken on by CEDD and thereafter by the works agent; and there would be a public consultation on the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). On green buildings, she supported the initiatives to achieve a sustainable and green built environment of Environment Bureau. The Council for Sustainable Development had again kindly agreed to help over engagement of the public on the development of this area.

2.7 **Mr Zimmerman** reiterated the need to look at the commercial and marine uses on top of others along the harbourfront, and to engage the public early and continuously on all plans and proposals.

2.8 **The Chairman** thanked Mrs Lam for her discussion on DEVB's Policy Agenda with HEC.

## **Item 6 CWB Temporary Reclamation and Re provisioning of Affected Vessels (Paper No. 22/2008)**

3.1 **Mr C S Wai** gave a brief introduction and **Mr Eric Ma** presented the item with the aid of PowerPoint slides.

3.2 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** said that he attended the CWB and Island Eastern Corridor Link Public Forum on 25 October 2008. He saw a consensus on the tunnel option at the forum. He

supported the tunnel option. Given the economic situation at the moment, he said that it might be worthwhile to review the justifications for spending \$20 billion on the tunnel option as compared to implementing other less satisfactory options such as tunnel toll adjustments and electronic road pricing which would involve lower capital cost.

3.3 **Dr Alvin Kwok** said that the reprovisioning of affected vessels in the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter (CBTS) was a livelihood and housing rather than an engineering issue. He opined that Government departments responsible for livelihood and housing matters should provide their assistance to the affected. **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that SPH fully supported the tunnel option. He noted that whilst the reclamation required for the tunnel option was greater than that required for the flyover option, the extent of the harbour impaired by the flyover option was greater than that with the tunnel option. Under the flyover option, the impairment to the harbour went beyond the water covered by the flyover. People could no longer enjoy the views of the harbour or use the water for marine uses in the areas affected. He reiterated that the valuable land formed should be used for the tunnel construction but not for large-scale development. On Road P2 and the related surface roads, he suggested reducing the land use to leave more ground level space for the public. He said that replacing the existing breakwater in CBTS with a new one further north would provide more sheltered water as compared with the proposal of keeping the existing breakwater. That would add value to the harbour in the sense that it could allow more marine uses such as yachting and sailing.

3.4 **Dr Andrew Thomson** said that BEC supported the tunnel option and the development of CWB and that the related cost of \$20 billion should not be a concern even in the current economic climate. He considered that the project could alleviate traffic congestions, improve public health, etc. While relying on engineers to reduce the construction cost to the minimum, he hoped that a more holistic discussion with balanced arguments to include quality environment, electronic road pricing, harmonized tunnel prices, alternative routes, sustainable transport modes like railways, etc., could continue. **Mrs Lam** left the meeting at this juncture.

3.5 **Mr Jimmy Kwok** supported the tunnel option given its

comparative advantages. He said that the Administration should apply the experience in the public consultation on the CWB project to others to ensure the greatest public interest. **Mr Patrick Lau** said that discussions at public fora under the Harbour-front Enhancement Review – Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Areas (HER) had revealed two suggestions for CBTS which was a famous site in the 60s-70s. One was to maintain the water community of CBTS, and the other was to revitalize CBTS. He saw a need to include these suggestions in the plan.

3.6 **Dr Sujata Govada** said that CE@H supported the tunnel option. From the point of view of sustainable transport, she suggested constructing Road P2 as a boulevard, building less surface roads, and further studying electronic road pricing and equalizing tunnel tolls. She seconded Dr Kwok's views relating to the livelihood and housing of the affected vessels and Mr Lau's on revitalizing CBTS from a heritage angle. **Mr Samuel Mok** supported the tunnel option and wished that it could be implemented as soon as possible. He enquired about the kick-off date of the CWB project and the co-ordination between the temporary reclamations for CWB and Shatin to Central Link (SCL). He recalled that it was mentioned at the last meeting that CWB would be completed within six years. However, according to the PowerPoint presented at the current meeting, it would take seven years to complete the project.

3.7 **Mr Mason Hung** supported the tunnel option and agreed that consideration should be given to revitalizing CBTS. **Prof Wong Sze-chun** reiterated the recommendation of the HER Expert Panel on Sustainable Transport Planning and CWB that there was a pressing need for CWB. He opined that the project should be implemented as soon as possible. He recalled that there had been general support for the tunnel option in the early stage of the HER public engagement. **Mr Yu Kam-hung** supported the tunnel with the provision of a promenade. He suggested that consideration should be given to increase patronage of the promenade at the planning stage.

3.8 **Mr Wai** thanked Members' support for the tunnel option and noted that Members had no in-principle objection to the proposed reprovisioning of the affected vessels. On livelihood and housing, the Government departments concerned had had

contacts with those affected during the past months. There were existing policies on reprovisioning of those affected to land if they so wished. The reprovisioning plan had been prepared with a view to having the least impact on the livelihood of those affected. At the second stage of the consultation, the wishes of individual vessel owners would be ascertained and met as far as possible, and Members' concern for the environment would be further considered. The commencement date of the project would be subject to the completion of the second stage consultation in end 2008. Regarding SCL, as reported at the last meeting, following LegCo's funding approval in May 2008, HyD had 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. He anticipated that such information would be available by the second quarter of 2009 when HyD would review the arrangement for temporary reclamation. **Mr Ma** said that the whole project would be implemented by phases. While tunnel structural works inside CBTS would take six years, the whole CWB project, which included tunnel structural works, electrical and mechanical works, and signal system works, would require seven years.

3.9 **Mr Ma** continued to explain that CBTS was currently protected by three breakwaters. Mr Zimmerman's proposed removal of one of the existing breakwaters northwards would render the entrance of CBTS prone to influence of wind from different directions, reducing the protected area for vessels. The existing breakwater in question was located above the Cross-Harbour Tunnel and the latter imposed another technical constraint on the proposal. As far as the CWB project was concerned, there was no need for moving the breakwater northwards. **Dr Govada** said that it might be worthwhile to further look at how CBTS could be enlarged.

3.10 In response to **Mr Brooke**, **Mr Wai** said that subject to finalization of the consultation on the reprovisioning of affected vessels by end 2008 and timely completion of the relevant statutory procedures including gazettal of the deletion of the temporary breakwater afterwards, works could start in 2009. **Mr Brooke** said that from the public engagement perspective, HyD should explain clearly to the public the commencement date and

duration of the CWB project. **Dr Kwok** said that revitalization of CBTS should be the planning theme, with which the design of and economic activities at the harbourfront could tie in.

3.11 **Dr Thomson** said that as compared with the Airport Core Projects, the timeframe of the CWB project seemed long. To manage public perception, the rationale behind this timeframe should be explained to the community. **Mr Wai** reiterated the Government's plan to implement the project as soon as possible. If everything went smoothly, the works would start in 2009. He recalled that HyD explained the reasons why the construction of the CWB tunnel section in CBTS would take six years at the last HEC meeting.

3.12 **The Chairman** thanked the representatives of HyD, CEDD, MD and MCAL for their presentation and discussion with HEC. He noted HEC's wish for early implementation of CWB.

#### **Item 7 CRIII – Engineering Works Proposed Protection Works for the Reclamation (Paper No. 23/2008)**

4.1 **The Chairman** welcomed Messrs C K Hon and Eric Fung of CEDD and Mr Tommy Ng of ACL. **Mr Hon** presented his PowerPoint.

4.2 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** understood from the paper that CRIII was to provide land for the construction of essential transport infrastructure including the North Hong Kong Island Line (NIL). He asked about the status of NIL. **Mr Paul Zimmerman** enquired when NIL would be built and what the loading capacity of the CRIII protection works was. **Dr Sujata Govada** asked whether the maximum clearance between the ground level and top slab of the protection works was 4.5 metres. **Mr Hon** said that while the alignment of NIL had been decided, the timing for implementing NIL had yet to be confirmed and would be reviewed in 2016 at the earliest. There was therefore no basis for undertaking any protection works related to NIL at this stage. Same as that for CWB, the design for the CRIII protection works was such that it could support loading up to 50 kilopascals which would be sufficient for the promenade development. The clearance between the ground level and temporary top slab of the protection works was 3 to 4.5 metres.

4.3 **Mr Vincent Ng** asked whether the protection works would impose constraints on the recommendations of the UDS currently underway and the planning and uses of the land above. **Dr Andrew Thomson** enquired whether there was any review by MTR Corporation (MTRC) on when to build NIL. Given the prime location and importance of the land in question, digging the land separately and solely for NIL was not desirable. **Mr Zimmerman** asked whether the financing of the protection works related to NIL was the only obstacle. **Dr Govada** asked further about the clearance between the ground level and tunnel after completion of all works.

4.4 **Mr Hon** said that instead of imposing constraints, the proposed protection works were intended to remove constraints. The diaphragm walls and top slab along the future CWB alignment could provide the necessary environment to ensure that the CWB tunnel box could be constructed underground safely later without opening up the reclaimed land, and the land above could therefore be released earlier for development. Upon completion of the protection works, the clearance between the ground level and top slab, which was a temporary measure to support the ground above with minimum number of vertical structural members, would be about 3 to 4.5 metres. The depth of ground above the top slab of the permanent tunnel structure would however vary depending on location and would mainly be 8 to 9 metres. Regarding undertaking similar protection works related to NIL now, it was common practice that the need of a project should first be established before any public funding should be spent. As confirmed with HyD, the timing for implementing NIL would only be reviewed in 2016. There was therefore no justification to spend money on similar protection works for NIL at this stage. The pressing need for implementing the CWB had however been firmly established and the associated protection works were therefore fully justified.

4.5 **Mr Philip Yung** said that NIL had been included in the Railway Development Strategy 2000 drawn up eight years before. In those days, the project had been intended to tackle forecast congestions of the Island Line. Having regard to changes in forecast population growth and expected development along the northern shore of Hong Kong Island, THB believed that the forecast congestions of Island Line might not occur as early as

had been expected. At the present moment, NIL would not be built at least until towards the latter half of the next decade. The design of NIL stations had not been decided given distant need for the project. Experience also showed that railway design could be subject to changes following public consultation. Protection works related to NIL done prematurely could become abortive. There was no justification to spend money on such works now.

4.6 **Dr Thomson** said that even if NIL would be required in 2020 or 2030, we should ask the net present value of making the protection works today against the cost of doing them later, the cost to the community and the disruption more broadly in social, environmental and economic terms. As there had not been any socio-economic feasibility study on early implementation of the protection works versus later implementation, there could hardly be an answer to when the protection works should be moved forward. However, he fully supported the early implementation of the protection works related to NIL on the basis that NIL was going to be needed.

4.7 **Prof Wong Sze-chun** believed that CWB and NIL would not be constructed at the same time. As the need for CWB had been confirmed, he suggested that its protection works should be implemented at this moment so as to reduce opening up of the reclaimed land to the minimum and allow for the implementation of the promenade earlier. **Mr John Chai** said that after CWB had been constructed, further consideration could be given to the timing for implementing NIL by reviewing the latest transport patterns. There might also be technological advancement in future that the construction of NIL did not require as much digging of the land. The protection works currently required and those related to NIL were separate issues and their considerations need not be made together.

4.8 **Mr Ng** said that given Mr Hon's confirmation that the CWB protection works would not impose constraint on the UDS, he supported the project. He recalled that when demolishing Queen's Pier, he had been informed of the need of the Airport Railway extended overrun tunnel (AREOT) and NIL. **Mr Chai** clarified that there was a need to further review when NIL should be implemented. This did not mean that there was no need for NIL.

4.9 **Mr Brooke** said that technological change in the near future might not carry weight and that the net present value terms were required. **Mr Zimmerman** suggested and **Mr Brooke** seconded that relevant bureaux/departments might explain to HEC in future on AREOT and NIL, including the relevant cost information. **Mr Hon** clarified that a part of AREOT was being constructed under CEDD's contract for safety reason and the remaining part would be required if there was a demand to increase train capacity. **Dr Govada** said that given the merge of the two railway corporations, it was opportune to look at SCL, NIL and the Central harbourfront from a broader and longer perspective. **Dr Thomson** said that railways could be a backbone for sustainable transport which could provide good accessibility to the harbourfront. We needed a forward-thinking approach when considering sustainable transport. **Mr Jimmy Kwok** noted the need for the protection works related to CWB at the current moment and to further review when to build NIL in future. He hoped that the CRIII protection works could be implemented as soon as possible to alleviate traffic congestion and provide the land for the public earlier.

4.10 **The Chairman** thanked the representatives of CEDD and ACL for their presentation and sharing with HEC.

### **Item 3 Confirmation of minutes of the 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting**

5.1 **The Chairman** said that the Secretariat circulated the revised draft minutes of the 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting incorporating Mr Paul Zimmerman's proposed amendments to Members on 28 October 2008 and received no proposed amendments. The minutes were confirmed.

### **Item 4 Progress reports from the three Sub-committee/Task Groups (Paper Nos. 19-21/2008)**

#### **A. HPR Sub-com (Paper No. 19/2008)**

6.1 **Mr Vincent Ng** briefly presented the progress report.

6.1.1 **Mr Ng** reported that the HPR Sub-com had been briefed on the laying of the Western Cross Harbour Main and associated land mains from West Kowloon to Sai Ying Pun by Water Supplies Department.

6.1.2 “A Coalition Against the Proposed Development on King Wah Road” (the Coalition) had presented the views of the local community on a proposed residential development on King Wah Road to the HPR Sub-com. The proposed development was the subject of a section 16 planning application.

6.1.3 **Mr Ng** further reported that a project team led by Tourism Commission had briefed the HPR Sub-com on the Lei Yue Mun Waterfront Enhancement Project. Sub-committee Members had provided their views on the project.

6.1.4 A project team, comprising representatives of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department, Architectural Services Department and CEDD, had briefed the HPR Sub-com on the proposed design of the temporary promenade along Kwun Tong PCWA. Members made some suggestions on the design and proposed facilities of the temporary promenade. The Sub-committee urged the Government to expedite implementation of this project, as well as other quick-win projects for public enjoyment.

6.1.5 In response to the Audit Report and the request of LegCo Public Accounts Committee for exploring options to utilize four vacant piers at the Western Wholesale Food Market, Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department had briefed the HRP Sub-com on the subject. Members did not support the demolition of the existing piers, even though they were lowly utilized.

6.1.6 The HPR Sub-com had been presented with additional information on a signage at the rooftop of CITIC Tower. Although Members noted the improvements to the design of the proposed signage, the Sub-committee decided not to support the proposed signage, since it would increase the overall building height.

6.1.7 The HPR Sub-com had also discussed the

issues referred by HEC to it for follow-up.

6.2 In response to Mr Nicholas Brooke, **Mr Ng** clarified that the related objections to the amendments of the South West Kowloon OZP had been presented to the main Committee and the HPR Sub-com had then been requested to follow up. While the related objections would be handled by the Town Planning Board (TPB), it did not necessarily mean that the HPR Sub-com would not provide comments on any issues relating to West Kowloon. The HPR Sub-com would respect that the related objections would be taken care of by TPB.

#### **B. Task Group on Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (TGUDS) (Paper No. 20/2008)**

6.3 As Ir Dr Greg Wong was unable to attend the meeting, **Mr Roy Li**, Secretary to the TGUDS, presented the progress report. He reported that while no TGUDS meeting had been held during the reporting period, the study consultants were in the process of examining the public opinions collected in the Stage 2 Public Engagement of the Study and revising the design proposals where appropriate. The study team would brief the Task Group on the findings of the Stage 2 Public Engagement and the revised design proposals as soon as the consultants had completed their work.

6.4 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that he had received from PlanD a list of meetings that the study team had attended with public and advisory bodies, District Councils and other organizations on the UDS during the Stage 2 Public Engagement. He pointed out that stakeholders like the real estate developers and the entertainment, retail, food and beverage, and tourism industries had not been consulted. **Mrs Susan Mak** said that the TGUDS had been consulted on the public engagement programme and informed of the briefings to be made to relevant parties in the Stage 2 Public Engagement. A number of public and roving exhibitions had been held in different locations and telephone polls had also been conducted to collect public views. It was understandable that there were limitations in all consultation exercises. **Mrs Mak** advised that Mr Zimmerman's views could be conveyed to TGUDS.

#### **C. TGMMH (Paper No. 21/2008)**

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

6.5.1 **Prof Lee** reported that no meeting of TGMMH had been held during the report period. However, arrangements for TGMMH's overseas visit to Liverpool and London had been made.

6.5.2 **Prof Lee** said that as agreed by HEC in February 2006, Members representing HEC attending overseas conferences would have to pay all the costs incurred for the conferences by themselves. This agreed arrangement was re-circulated to Members on 28 October 2008.

6.5.3 Given the terms of reference of TGMMH and its task to study different harbourfront management models, **Prof Lee** said that the visit to Liverpool and London on 2-8 November 2008 was required for the Task Group to discharge its tasks. DEVB had agreed to provide sponsorship to cover non-official members' air tickets, insurance, hotel accommodation, conference fees and group expenses (including ground transport and briefing tours) within the funds reserved for TGMMH's overseas visits. He suggested and **the meeting** agreed to the above sponsorship for this particular arrangement. He proposed and **Mr Vincent Ng** agreed that the latter would be the delegation leader.

## **Item 5 Matters arising**

### **A. List of meetings held in relation to UDS (para. 3.6 of the revised draft minutes of the 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting)**

7.1 **The Chairman** said that PlanD had forwarded to Mr Paul Zimmerman a list of meetings with public and advisory bodies, District Councils and other organizations on the UDS during the Stage 2 Public Engagement on 27 October 2008. This list had been discussed in para. 6.4 of these minutes.

### **B. Proposal to upload Inventory of Known (Planned and Proposed) Projects at Harbourfront onto HEC website**

**(para. 4.2 of the revised draft minutes of the 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting)**

7.2 Upon the Chairman's invitation, **Mr Raymond Wong** reported that the matter was discussed at the HPR Sub-com meeting on 24 September 2008. As the Inventory was confined to Members only, instead of uploading it onto the Internet, it would be expanded to include more detailed information. As agreed at a discussion session with the Chairman and two Members of the HPR Sub-com on 2 October 2008, the Inventory would be expanded to cover all harbourfront sites incorporating such information as land status, existing/planned uses, enhancement opportunities, etc.

**C. Studies concerning ways to improve connectivity along harbourfront (para. 5.3 of the revised draft minutes of the 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting)**

7.3 **The Chairman** said that HyD's response was forwarded to Members on 31 October 2008.

**D. Maps requested by Mr Zimmerman (para. 5.11 of the revised draft minutes of the 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting)**

7.4 **The Chairman** said that HyD's response was circulated to Members on 27 October 2008.

**E. Harbourfront proposals gazetted under Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance and Foreshore and Sea-bed (Reclamations) Ordinance, and EIA reports for projects involving works on harbourfront under EIA Ordinance (para. 6.6 of the revised draft minutes of the 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting)**

7.5 **The Chairman** said that with the assistance of the bureau and departments concerned, the relevant gazette notices and EIA reports had been linked to the HEC website. Members had been informed of the links.

## **Item 8 Any other business**

### **A. WKCD**

8.1 To establish a working relationship with WKCDAB, **Mr Nicholas Brooke** suggested a lunch with WKCDAB to discuss the HPPs, etc. **The Chairman** said that he happened to be a member of WKCDAB. The intention of WKCDAB was to ask HEC to be its collaborator in further enhancement of West Kowloon Waterfront Promenade and the overall design of the 40 ha of land in terms of its impact on the harbourfront. He expected that HEC and WKCDAB would start discussion soon.

## **B. Kai Tak Development**

8.2 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** reiterated the usefulness of his meeting with CEDD on the infrastructural project at the north apron area. He suggested similar discussions between HEC and Government bureaux/departments on the planning of each parcel of land in Kai Tak, as well as how the plan could be taken forward. **Mr John Chai** said that CEDD was planning to consult HEC towards end 2008/early 2009 when it would have available more detailed engineering results. Same as other public works projects, there would be another process of public consultation before CEDD sought funding approval from LegCo. **Mr Zimmerman** expressed that what HEC required was continuous involvement with it, instead of regular reporting to it. **The Chairman** suggested that CEDD gave some thought to Mr Zimmerman's suggestion. **Mr Chai** said that CEDD would maintain a constant dialogue with Members.

8.3 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** said that once the Government had a clear plan on the Cruise Terminal, it should brief HEC. **Dr Andrew Thomson** said that engagement of relevant stakeholders including end users was important for enhancement of the final design. New concepts in sustainability development like life cycle costing and analysis, which were big transitions from where we were today, could be applied to planning of Kai Tak Development and other developments. Electrical and Mechanical Services Department and Housing Department had done some preliminary work in these aspects.

## **C. Date of next meeting**

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

8.5 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:45 pm.

**Harbour-front Enhancement Committee Secretariat  
January 2009**