

27th Meeting of Harbour-front Enhancement Committee
held at 2:30 pm on 22 June 2009
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 Lo Hong-kam	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 Kim Chan	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
Mr Nicholas Brooke	
Mr Michael Hui	
Mr Patrick Lau	
Mr Derrick Pang	
Mr Raymond Young	Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)
Ms Sharon Ho	Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport)5, Transport and Housing Bureau (THB)
Mr John Chai	Director of Civil Engineering and Development
Mrs Ava Ng	Director of Planning
Mr Jeff Lam	Assistant Director (Headquarters), Lands Department (LandsD)
Ms Alice Cheung	Secretary

In Attendance

Ms Gracie Foo	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Ms Lydia Lam	Assistant Secretary (Harbour)1, DEVB
Miss Cheung Hoi-shan	Assistant Secretary (Harbour)2, 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 2, CEDD
Ms Jacinta Woo	Chief Town Planner/Studies and Research,

Mr Esmond Lee	Planning Department (PlanD) Deputy Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport)4, THB (For Item 1 only)
Mr S T Cheung	Assistant Director-General of Civil Aviation (Airport Standards) (Acting) (For Item 1 only)
<u>For Item 1</u>	
Mr Peter de Kantzow	Director, Waterfront Air Ltd (WAL)
Mr Michael Agopsowicz	Director, WAL
<u>For Item 5</u>	
Mr Yung Cho-leung	Chief Engineer/Land Works, CEDD
Mr Lau Tat-yuen	Senior Engineer/6, CEDD
<u>For Item 6</u>	
Mr Yung Cho-leung	Chief Engineer/Land Works, CEDD
Mr Michael Law	Senior Engineer/5, CEDD
Mr John Chan	Senior Landscape Architect/Land Works 2, CEDD
<u>Absent with Apologies</u>	
Prof Carlos Lo	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Leslie Chen	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Mr Louis Loong	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Paul Zimmerman	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour Ltd
Dr Anissa Chan	
Mr David Ho	
Mr Jimmy Kwok	
Mr Samuel Mok	
Mr Andrew Tsang	Assistant Director(2), Home Affairs Department

Action

Welcoming message

The Chairman welcomed all attending the 27th meeting of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC).

Item 1: HEC Briefing – Water Aerodrome

1.1 **Mr Michael Agopsowicz and Mr Peter de Kantzow** presented their PowerPoint.

1.2 **Ir Dr Greg Wong** said that as compared with helicopters, seaplanes were more comfortable, and less noisy. **Mr Nicholas Brooke** said that seaplanes could bring an additional dimension, vibrancy and excitement to the waterfront. **Dr Andrew Thomson** asked about the potential of the proposal and what HEC should focus on when commenting it.

1.3 **Mr Agopsowicz** said that WAL received from THB the Government's coordinated comments on its water aerodrome proposal in May 2008. The Civil Aviation Department had published a document listing out the detailed requirements for the licensing of aerodromes. WAL's major consideration was safety. It would follow the proper procedures in proceeding with its application for a licence for the proposed water aerodrome.

1.4 **Mr Patrick Lau** said that establishing a water aerodrome at Kai Tak might impose constraints on the waterfront developments there. He wished to be briefed on the constraints before expressing his views. **Mr Kim Chan** asked about the impact of the water aerodrome on the landside development and typhoon shelter in Kai Tak. He was concerned about the noise impact of the water aerodrome proposal. He recalled that there had been concerns about noise generated by a proposed aviation training centre in Kai Tak and a proposed helipad in Wan Chai. He stressed that careful consideration should be given to placing a water aerodrome near Kai Tak.

1.5 **Mr Esmond Lee** said that THB had been communicating with the project proponent on the proposal since early 2008. From the aviation policy point of view, while THB had no objection in principle to the idea, it had pointed out that the feasibility of the idea hinged on the satisfactory resolution of a wide range of technical issues including the noise impact over which Members had raised concerns. The Environmental Protection Department had made it clear that the project was a designated project under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance and had to go through the statutory process, particularly in relation to the noise impact on the residential flats nearby and the future developments in Kai Tak. As advised by CEDD, there would be intense construction activities in the

locality in the near future. The project proponent should assess the impact of the water aerodrome on these construction activities. From the aviation and marine safety point of views, THB had yet to receive a concrete plan from the project proponent on how the seaplane services would be operated in the future such as whether the section of sea in question would need to be cordoned off and how that would affect the marine activities. Victoria Harbour was a working harbour with a lot of activities going on at any time. How these activities would be affected was the subject of a marine impact assessment. The project proponent had mentioned in its presentation the proposed use of the Kowloon City Ferry Pier, which was currently used for the operation of ferry services to North Point, for its water aerodrome. This might involve interface issues with the Highways Department since that pier would be affected by the Central Kowloon Route project. To sum up, it would be useful if the project proponent could come up with a concrete plan for further discussion. The Government was nowhere near to the stage of indicating support for or objection to the idea because it was still waiting for the details to be produced.

1.6 In response to Mr Raymond Young, **Mr Agopsowicz** said that WAL had yet to obtain any approval from relevant government authorities on the Mainland or in the Macao Special Administrative Region for operating scheduled seaplane services between Guangzhou, Macau and Hong Kong. As regards other enquiries, **Mr Agopsowicz** said that locating a water aerodrome near a metro park was common in overseas cities like Vancouver and that the selection of the sea off Kai Tak for the water aerodrome had been made two and a half years ago after a feasibility study. This site could utilize the advantages of Kai Tak as a tourism hub.

1.7 **The Chairman** thanked Mr Agopsowicz and Mr de Kantzow for their presentation.

Item 2: Confirmation of Minutes of the 26th Meeting

2.1 **The Chairman** said that the Secretariat circulated the draft minutes of the 26th meeting to Members on 8 June and received Mr Paul Zimmerman's proposed amendments to paragraphs 2.2 and 2.5 of the draft minutes on 18 June 2009, which were tabled. **The meeting** confirmed the minutes

incorporating Mr Zimmerman's proposed amendments.

Item 3 Progress Reports from the Sub-committee/Task Groups

A. Harbour Plan Review Sub-committee (HPR Sub-com) (Paper No. 9/2009)

3.1 Mr Vincent Ng presented the progress report.

3.1.1 PlanD had briefed the Sub-committee on the draft planning brief for the "Comprehensive Development Area (1)" site at 14-30 King Wah Road, North Point. Members expressed concern about the proposed development density for the site. They considered that in formulating development guidance to facilitate redevelopment of the site, the planning brief should safeguard the interest of the public and ensure that the local community would be benefited from the future development. Issues such as air ventilation, visual permeability and traffic impact should be properly addressed and a greening ratio should be stipulated to guide future development.

3.1.2 The Marine Department had briefed Members on the construction of a two-storey building for its Harbour Patrol Section adjacent to its existing building at Hoi Fai Road, Tai Kok Tsui. The Sub-committee was of the view that more information on the design of the development should be provided to support the proposal. In designing the proposed development, opportunities should be taken to enhance the harbourfront, for instance, by improving pedestrian access along the typhoon shelter and landscaping the site.

3.1.3 The District Lands Office/Hong Kong West and South and the Transport Department had briefed the Sub-committee on the proposed re-tender of a site at Fung Mat Road, Sai Ying Pun on short term tenancy for fee-paying public carpark for goods vehicles. While reiterating its concern about the use of harbourfront land for lorry parking purpose, the Sub-committee noted that the proposal was to address the shortfall of lorry parking

spaces in Western District as a whole. In view of the one-year term certain of the proposed tenancy, the Sub-committee considered that the proposed lorry park could be tolerated in the short term and the use of the site should be reviewed after one year.

3.1.4 Following a series of working meetings to review the information on short term uses and known projects along the harbourfront, the Sub-committee discussed and endorsed an approach to identify enhancement opportunities on 20 May 2009. Another working meeting was held to further discuss the proposals on 3 June 2009. The proposals would be submitted to the Sub-committee for endorsement before presenting to HEC.

3.2 On the short term public lorry park at Fung Mat Road, Sai Ying Pun, **Dr Ng Mee-kam** asked whether the district had any other plan to take care of the shortage of lorry parking spaces, otherwise they would stay at the waterfront permanently. **Mr Ng** said that the site was zoned for open space use and, similar to many other vacant waterfront sites, the site was let out for carparking purpose pending permanent development. Similar concern had been raised by the Sub-committee and passed to concerned department for consideration. It was hoped that the planning intention for open space development could be realized as soon as possible.

B. Task Group on Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (TGUDS) (Paper No. 10/2009)

3.3 **Ir Dr Greg Wong** presented the progress report. During the TGUDS meeting on 18 June 2009, the Task Group discussed a draft summary report, and obtained non-official members' consensuses/majority views on the key urban design issues. The views and recommendations of TGUDS, which were mainly from non-official members, included that –

- (a) high-rise developments at the new Central harbourfront should be avoided;
- (b) the proposal to remove the PTI at Site 2 and to replace it by bus laybys was welcomed;

- (c) reconstruction of the old SFCT at its original location was preferred. TGUDS Members considered that the surrounding environment of the Clock Tower and its visibility should be well planned;
- (d) the reassembly of QP at its original location with a large lagoon in front of it was preferred by the majority of TGUDS Members. Other Members preferred reassembly of QP by the harbour;
- (e) the pedestrian footbridge system in the eastern part of the Study area should enrich the pedestrian experience and enhance vibrancy; and
- (f) if needed, the OZPs could be amended to cater for the new design concepts arising from the Study.

3.4 **Members** noted TGUDS' recommendations on the key urban design issues. **Mr Nicholas Brooke** said that TGUDS had made a significant step forward. **The Chairman** thanked the hard work of TGUDS.

C. Task Group on Management Model for the Harbourfront (TGMMH) (Paper No. 11/2009)

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

3.5.1 The Avenue of Stars (AOS) Management Ltd had shared its experience in managing AOS with TGMMH. Members discussed the "donation" element of the AOS model, relationship between the management company and Leisure and Cultural Services Department, types of activities held on AOS and applicability of the AOS model to other waterfront areas.

3.5.2 A TGMMH delegation visited San Francisco and Vancouver on 11-17 April 2009. At the TGMMH meeting on 27 May 2009, Dr Sujata Govada presented a report on the visit.

3.5.3 TGMMH discussed "Waterfront Typology Comparison – A Short Comparison of Singapore

Marina Bay, Sydney Darling Harbour, Vancouver False Creek and Kai Tak Approach Channel” submitted by Mr Paul Zimmerman of Designing Hong Kong.

3.5.4 The Task Group discussed a number of issues relating to the design of the Kai Tak Development raised by Mr Zimmerman, including accessibility, diversity and vibrancy of the waterfront, outdoor seating and dining along the waterfront, proposed cycle track and design of the taxiway bridge. CEDD agreed to review the design of Kai Tak Development during the detailed design stage.

3.5.5 TGMMH also discussed enhancing the communication between CEDD and HEC on Kai Tak Development. It was agreed that CEDD would brief Members periodically as required.

3.5.6 To consolidate the findings for preparation of the TGMMH recommendation report to be submitted to HEC in August 2009, TGMMH held a retreat on 13 June 2009. Mrs Carrie Lam, Secretary for Development, attended part of the morning session and exchanged views with Members. After discussion and consensus building, Members came up with a “Harbourfront Commission” model, which would be tasked with responsibilities in planning, design, implementation, management, branding, marketing and promotion of harbourfront areas. Mr Nicholas Brooke volunteered to prepare the first draft of the report for comments and input by other TGMMH Members.

3.6 **Dr Andrew Thomson** reiterated the need for a sub-committee to look at the ongoing projects in Kai Tak. **Prof Lee** said that as agreed at the last HEC meeting, TGMMH would monitor the progress of projects in Kai Tak and CEDD would brief TGMMH periodically as required. Consideration could be given to the need after TGMMH submitted its recommendation report to HEC.

Item 4 Matters Arising

A. Cycle track (Paragraph 2.3 of the draft minutes of the 26th meeting)

4.1 **The Chairman** said that CEDD's response was circulated to Members on 18 June 2009.

B. Regular half-yearly briefings by West Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD) Authority (Paragraph 2.9 of the draft minutes of the 26th meeting)

4.2 **The Chairman** informed the meeting that the Secretariat had written to the WKCD Authority to invite the latter to give regular half-yearly briefings on WKCD to HEC. Its reply was being awaited.

C. Golden Bauhinia Square (GBS) (Paragraph 5.2 of the draft minutes of the 26th meeting)

4.3 **The Chairman** said that the Secretariat had relayed Members' views on the improvement of the environment of GBS to the management of HKCEC. HKCEC replied that it would consider addressing the weaknesses where possible.

Item 5 Harbourfront Signage Scheme (Paper No. 12/2009)

5.1 **Miss Cheung Hoi-san and Mr Yung Cho-leung** presented the paper with their PowerPoint.

5.2 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** supported the scheme. However, he said that the Logo Design Competition and the Harbourfront Signage Scheme were two tasks requiring different skills and should be separated in two exercises. **Mr Vincent Ng** welcomed the scheme. He agreed with Mr Brooke's views and suggested that two different consultants be engaged for implementation. **Mr Yung** said that the original plan was to employ a main consultant to identify strategic locations for erecting new signage posts and enhancing existing directional signage. The main consultant would be required to employ a sub-consultant to carry out graphic design work and another sub-consultant to do PR work. **Mr Brooke** stressed the importance of creativity particularly for the Logo Design Competition. **Mr Ng** said that instead of the main consultant employing the two sub-consultants, CEDD should consider appointing different consultants for different tasks in order to achieve the best results.

5.3 **Dr Ng Mee-kam** pointed out that the real problem of getting to the harbour was the physical barriers that deterred people from going there. While supporting the scheme, Dr Ng said that it was equally important to provide the public with easy and direct access to the harbour. **Mr Kim Chan** said that nowadays signage was a part of the street furniture. Consideration should be given to the flexible design of signage with a view to creating visual continuity that could lead users to their destinations. Opportunity should also be taken to enhance the existing directional signs and encourage the public to suggest locations for erecting new directional signs. **Mr Patrick Lau** said that the purposes of the logo and signage should be clearly stated in the tender briefs.

5.4 **Mr Yung** said that CEDD was open in further proceeding with the project including employment of consultants. He thanked Members' suggestions and would consider them before recommending to the Organizing Committee.

5.5 **The Chairman** said that Mr Paul Zimmerman had provided his comments on the paper which had been passed to the Harbour Unit and CEDD for consideration together with other Members' comments. He thanked Miss Cheung and Mr Yung for their presentation.

Item 6 Hung Hom Waterfront Promenade (Paper No. 13/2009)

6.1 **Ms Lydia Lam and Mr Michael Law** presented the paper with their PowerPoint. **Ms Lam** supplemented that the proposed waterfront promenade was one of the quick-win projects identified by the HPR Sub-com.

6.2 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** asked whether the overall responsibility for design would be within the Government or outsourced; whether there would be a cycle track; and whether it would be possible to provide short and medium term access to the adjoining "Comprehensive Development Area (CDA)" sites as part of the Hung Hom Waterfront Promenade project. **Mr Law** said that the design, including conceptual and detailed ones, would be undertaken in-house. The construction would be outsourced to a contractor. As the site was narrow with a width of about 20 metres and footpaths and an undulating lawn were

planned, there might not be sufficient space for a cycle track. **Ms Lam** supplemented that it was a new concept to provide a large piece of undulating lawn for people to walk and sit on it. For the existing promenades at the east and west, there were no cycle tracks.

6.3 **Mr Kim Chan** asked whether there would be water bodies and enough soil for trees, and the possibility of reserving areas in the adjoining “CDA” sites for developing the promenade. **Dr Ng Mee-kam** enquired whether the design of the promenade had addressed the public’s views collected in the Hung Hom District Study; whether there would be interesting street furniture; and whether the design of the railings along the seawall would block the sea view. She was concerned about the management of the promenade and suggested that consideration be given to management by the owner of the adjacent “CDA” sites.

6.4 **Prof Lo Hong-kam** asked whether public transport connections, toilets and food kiosks would be provided. **Mr Patrick Lau** opined that trees, which could provide shades and comfort, and colourful and artistic street furniture were attractions to users. Vertical features should be set up at entrances to facilitate wayfinding. **Mr Vincent Ng** was pleased to note the latest development of the promenade, which was one of the quick-win projects identified by HPR Sub-com. He asked whether it would be possible to construct a cycle track with a width narrower than standard and for shared use with pedestrians. He said that other facilities such as food kiosks and toilets should be considered at the detailed design stage.

6.5 **Mr John Chai** thanked Members’ comments which CEDD would further consider where appropriate. He said that there were competent landscape architects in CEDD who had completed similar projects successfully. **Mr Brooke** hoped that CEDD could provide the best team to take charge of this project. **Ir Dr Greg Wong** suggested exploring the possibility of using parts of the adjoining “CDA” sites to make the promenade more interesting. **Mr Lau** hoped that there would be breakthrough for adopting non-standard designs, like lawns and plant troughs without kerbs and blending of drainage covers with the environment.

6.6 **Mrs Ava Ng** said that Members had been consulted on

the planning briefs of the two adjoining “CDA” sites which included a 10-metre wide non-building area (NBA) along the southern boundary of the sites. The NBA would not only add to the width of the waterfront promenade, but also provide space for alfresco dining. The promenade could link up with green corridors extending from the waterfront to the hinterland enabling residents’ easy access. When the Master Layout Plans of the “CDA” sites were submitted, PlanD and other departments concerned would follow up Members’ suggestions as appropriate. **Mr Raymond Young** said that it would not be possible to extend the promenade into the two “CDA” sites which were already on the Application List and estimated to be available later this year. On the management model for the promenade, this could be considered at a later stage when the two “CDA” sites were developed by private developers. Regarding the provision of food kiosks, this hinged very much on financial viability. While the proposed promenade was temporary in nature, the suggestion of providing food kiosks could be considered when the other two open space sites in the east and west would be developed in future.

6.7 **Mr John Chan** said that the overall ratio of 50% soft works and 50% hard works was appropriate given the site conditions and provision of the undulating lawn. There would be many large trees providing shades to the users. Most of them would be planted on large lawn area and their roots could grow freely. The railings along the seawall would be of see-through type in order to allow unobstructed view. Long seating benches would be provided both under rain shelters and in open areas along the promenade. There were already toilets in good condition at the pier. He believed that paving bricks, paving patterns, lighting posts and a variety of plants would add colour to the promenade. The lighting posts and trees, which were vertical features, together with the undulating lawn would provide various visual effects. Members’ suggestions would be taken into account when finalizing the design.

6.8 **Prof Lo** suggested packaging the promenade as a jogging trail cum waterfront walk with different themes providing users with different experiences. **Ms Lam** said that the existing promenades in the east and west were popular spots for jogging and walking, and the main theme of the Hung Hom Waterfront Promenade was also jogging and walking. The Yau Tsim Mong

and the Kowloon City District Councils would be consulted on the design. She thanked Members for their support and suggestions.

Item 7 Any Other Business

A. Mr Paul Zimmerman's proposed invitation to THB for presentation on harbourfront enhancement strategies and initiatives

7.1 As Mr Zimmerman was not present, **the Chairman** suggested that Mr Zimmerman could elaborate his suggestion at a future meeting.

B. North Point Harbour Design Competition

7.2 **Mr Patrick Lau** thanked Members for their support. He also thanked Mr Raymond Young who attended the prize presentation ceremony as a guest of honour on 23 May 2009. The winning entries would be exhibited at Taikoo Shing, the Hong Kong Central Library and Heng Fa Chuen from 7 to 22 September 2009.

C. Date of next meeting

7.3 **The Chairman** said that the next meeting had been scheduled for 17 August 2009.

7.4 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:25 pm.

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