

28th Meeting of Harbour-front Enhancement Committee
held at 2:30 pm on 17 August 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 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 Kim Chan	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Mr Yu Kam-hung	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Ir Dr Greg Wong	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Ms Priscilla Poon	Representing Hong Kong Tourism Board
Mr Paul Zimmerman	Representing Society for Protection of Harbour Ltd
Mr Nicholas Brooke	
Dr Anissa Chan	
Mr David Ho	
Mr Michael Hui	
Mr Jimmy Kwok	
Mr Patrick Lau	
Mr Samuel Mok	
Mr Derrick Pang	
Mr Thomas Chow	Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)
Mrs Apollonia Liu	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 Herbert Leung	Deputy Director of Lands (General)
Mr Andrew Tsang	Assistant Director (2), Home Affairs Department
Ms Alice Cheung	Secretary

In Attendance

Mrs Carrie Lam	Secretary for Development
----------------	---------------------------

Ms Gracie Foo	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Ms Lydia Lam	Assistant Secretary (Harbour)1, DEVB
Mr Tony Chan	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, Planning Department (PlanD)

For Item 6

Mr Tang Pak-hung	Project Liaison Manager, MTRCL
Mr Clement Ngai	Design Manager – SCL (NSL), MTRCL
Ms Maggie So	Senior Manager – Projects and Property Communications, MTRCL
Ms Mo Sau	Chief Engineer, Major Works Project Management Development Office, Highways Department (HyD)
Mr Leung Tat-fai	Chief Engineer, Railway Development Office (RDO), HyD
Mr Leung Hin-tat	Senior Engineer, RDO, HyD

Absent with Apologies

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

Action

Welcoming remarks

The Chairman welcomed all to the 28th meeting of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC), in particular Mrs Carrie Lam, Secretary for Development; Mr Thomas Chow, who had taken over from Mr Raymond Young as Permanent Secretary (Planning and Lands) of DEVB with effect from 17 August; and Mrs Apollonia Liu, who had taken over from Ms Sharon Ho as

Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport)⁵ of THB with effect from 3 August. **The Chairman** thanked Mr Young and Ms Ho for their contribution to HEC in the past years.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 27th Meeting

1.1 **The Chairman** said that the Secretariat circulated the draft minutes of the 27th meeting to Members and Waterfront Air Ltd (WAL) on 4 August. With the proposed amendments received from WAL to paragraphs 1.5 and 1.7, Mr Paul Zimmerman to paragraph 2.1, and CEDD to paragraph 6.5, the revised draft minutes were circulated to Members on 13 August. As no further amendment was proposed, **the Meeting** confirmed the revised minutes.

Item 2 Matters Arising

2.1 There was no matter arising for follow-up at the meeting.

Item 3 Progress Report from Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review (HPR Sub-com) (Paper Nos. 14 and 15/2009)

A. Progress Report from HPR Sub-com (Paper No. 14/2009)

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

3.1.1 The 29th HPR Sub-com meeting was held on 22 July and the following items were discussed–

- (a) Caritas Mok Cheung Sui Kan Community Centre briefed the Sub-com on “The Regeneration of the Harbourfront in Western District” project. Mr Ng considered that the project could be used for future reference for harbourfront planning in the area;
- (b) The winner of the professional group of the North Point Harbour Conceptual Design Competition briefed the Sub-com on its proposal.

The HPR Sub-com considered the winning scheme useful to the Government in finalising the planning of the area;

- (c) The developer of 1-5 Kai Hing Road, Kai Tak South, briefed the Sub-com on their proposed residential development. The Sub-com had no strong objection to the proposed residential use, but opined that the proposed waterfront promenade should be integrated with the property development;
- (d) PlanD briefed the Sub-com on the draft planning brief for the “Comprehensive Development Area(1)” (“CDA(1)”) site at West Kowloon for the property development above the West Kowloon Terminus of the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link. The Sub-com appreciated that the brief had proposed to reduce the plot ratio, stipulate the building height for the site and disallow any podium structure; but considered that the interface of the future development with the surrounding area should be properly addressed;
- (e) CEDD consulted the Sub-com on two exterior design options for the reprovisioned Wan Chai Ferry Pier and the permanent government helipad under Wan Chai Development Phase II. While the Sub-com did not have much interest in the exterior design options, it was concerned whether the future use of the pier and the heliport could rejuvenate the waterfront, and whether the design of the sites and the surrounding public space could be integrated to ensure a quality waterfront; and
- (f) HyD consulted the Sub-com on the proposed

arrangement for temporary reprovisioning of the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department's Whitfield Depot to facilitate the Central-Wan Chai Bypass and Island Eastern Corridor Link (Trunk Road) project. Members of the Sub-com acknowledged the need for temporary reprovisioning but considered that the proposed parking of refuse trucks on the waterfront was not conducive to public enjoyment of the Harbour. Therefore, the area of the temporary reprovisioning site should be reduced as far as possible and compensatory enhancement measures should be provided.

3.1.2 Members of the HPR Sub-com attended a site visit to Oyster Shell Beach, in Lei Yue Mun, on 12 August to understand more about the residents' initiative to put up a Tin Hau Statue as a landmark and tourist attraction. Members had no in-principle objection to the initiative but requested more details for further consideration.

B. Proposed Quick-wins and Harbour-front Enhancement Opportunities (Paper No. 15/2009)

3.2 **Mr Vincent Ng** presented the paper with a PowerPoint.

3.2.1 **Mr Ng** said that at the 24th meeting of HEC on 15 December 2008, HPR Sub-com was invited to identify possible quick-wins and enhancement opportunities along the harbourfront for further consideration by HEC. After a series of working meetings in March to June 2009, the Sub-com had come up with a proposal, which was endorsed on 22 July 2009.

3.2.2 Members of the Sub-com had reviewed the sites under the "Inventory on Known (Planned and Proposed) Projects at Harbour-front" and sites under short-term tenancy along the harbourfront. To identify possible

enhancement opportunities in a more systematic manner, the harbourfront was divided into various action areas, under which a number of short-term quick-wins and long-term enhancement projects were proposed.

3.2.3 On the way forward, the HPR Sub-com considered that the implementation of the proposed quick-wins and enhancement opportunities would require funding support and strong coordination amongst Government bureaux and departments. Moreover, priorities should be set for the projects, taking into account factors such as resource allocation.

3.3 Both the **Chairman** and **Mrs Carrie Lam** thanked the Sub-com for its hard work and Mr Ng for his leadership and dedication to the Sub-com in the past years. **Mrs Lam** said that the paper provided a comprehensive database of projects along the harbourfront and the Administration fully supported the work of the HPR Sub-com in identifying various quick-wins and enhancement opportunities. Given the large number of initiatives proposed, the Administration would study the proposals carefully, set priorities and identify resources and suitable development models for implementation of the proposals in short to long term. The feasibility of suitable public-private-partnership development model would also be explored, as the land in some of the sites was under private ownership.

3.4 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that harbourfront enhancement should be considered in terms of improvement plans to the areas as a whole rather than on individual projects basis under different departments' remits. He opined that private sector involvement in activating the harbourfront could be accommodated through licensing and short term tenancy agreements. **Mrs Carrie Lam** responded that the Administration had been considering enhancement and revitalization projects using an area-based approach. She acknowledged that it was not always easy to identify a single agent to oversee all the improvement plans for the entire

harbourfront, but the Government was trying different ways to overcome the difficulties. DEVB would continue to play an active role within the Administration.

3.5 **Mr Jimmy Kwok** said that water connectivity could be enhanced by improving the piers and related parking and road facilities. **Mr Ng** shared his view and agreed that those could add vibrancy and attractiveness to the harbourfront.

3.6 **The Meeting** noted and endorsed the HPR Sub-com's recommendations.

Item 4 Progress Report from Task Group on Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (TGUDS) (Paper Nos. 16 and 17/2009)

A. Progress Report from TGUDS (Paper No. 16/2009)

B. Summary Report on Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (Paper No. 17/2009)

4.1 **Ir Dr Greg Wong** reported both Papers No. 16/2009 and 17/2009 together, with the aid of a PowerPoint. Ir Dr Wong said that the summary report gave an account of the work of TGUDS, the key issues discussed, and recommendations of TGUDS on the Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (the Study), as follows –

- (a) the scale and intensity of the proposed developments at Sites 1 and 2 were excessive. High-rise developments at the new Central harbourfront should be avoided; and the proposed gross floor area (GFA) for these sites could be redistributed to Site 5;
- (b) the proposal to remove the Public Transport Interchange (PTI) from Site 2 and to replace it with bus laybys was welcomed;
- (c) the reconstruction of the old Star Ferry Clock Tower 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 Queen's Pier (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 proposed integrated pedestrian walkway system in the eastern part of the Study area was generally welcomed. The walkways should be designed to enrich the pedestrian experience and enhance vibrancy;
- (f) if needed, the Outline Zoning Plans (OZPs) could be amended to cater for the new design concepts arising from the Study; and
- (g) the breaking up of the developments and public space (mainly concerned Sites 3 and 4) to create a more human-scale waterfront environment; reducing and mitigating the presence of the People's Liberation Army (PLA) berth; and providing a continuous cycle track along the waterfront.

4.2 **Ir Dr Wong** thanked TGUDS members for their dedication and contribution and relevant Government bureaux and departments for their input, in particular PlanD, for providing secretariat support. **The Chairman** also thanked Ir Dr Wong and other TGUDS members for their dedication and hard work.

4.3 **Mrs Carrie Lam** thanked TGUDS for the hard work and Ir Dr Wong for his leadership and dedication in the Task Group in the past years. She was delighted that much common ground had been reached in the design and development of the new Central harbourfront. The design concepts for the new Central harbourfront launched under Stage 2 Public Engagement (Stage 2 PE) of the Study represented the Administration's determination and positive response to the public's aspiration for harbour

protection and reduction in development intensity. She noted that it was generally accepted that the harbourfront area, comprising a 2-kilometre continuous promenade and a 11-hectare (ha) public open space, should be spacious and green, and contain elements that would add vibrancy, vitality, and attract public patronage and enhance accessibility. Any commercial development on the waterfront sites should be seen as complementary and not predominating.

4.4 Taking account of TGUDS's advice as set out in its report, **Mrs Lam** gave the following comments—

- (a) Although she could not give a definite response at the meeting, she pledged that the Administration would carefully consider TGUDS's recommendation that the development intensities of Sites 1 and 2 should be further reduced in order to create a world-class, landmark harbourfront more closely integrated with the public pier area. She was particularly appreciative of TGUDS's suggestion that some of the commercial GFA to be taken out from Sites 1 and 2 could be re-provided at the Government, Institutional and Community (G/IC) space at Site 5. This was a balanced and reasonable view taking account of Hong Kong's varied needs and hence would warrant very serious consideration by the Administration;
- (b) The Administration would remove the original PTI from Site 2 and replace it with bus lay-bys so that the at-grade space could be planned and designed with much greater flexibility;
- (c) The Administration would carefully consider TGUDS's suggestion that the future disposal of the Comprehensive Development Area (CDA) in Site 3 should take the form of smaller lots in order to produce greater design diversity;

- (d) The Administration would reconstruct the Star Ferry Clock Tower at its original location, together with a gallery including an exhibition area to display various salvaged items from the old Clock Tower and an information centre as part of the CDA in Site 3; and
- (e) The Administration would provide a cycle track along the waterfront and take on board TGUDS's other suggestions, such as opening up the PLA berth for public use (when not in use by the PLA) as part of the waterfront promenade, creating more intimate courtyard open space at the harbourfront, and providing an integrated pedestrian walkway system to improve connectivity between the waterfront and the hinterland.

4.5 **Mrs Lam** said she noted that the location of reassembling QP was the only issue which TGUDS members could not reach a consensus. The views in the wider community on the issue were also divided. She noted that the majority of non-official members of TGUDS preferred to reassemble QP at its original location with a large lagoon in front of it. The Study Team had carefully considered the implications of the suggestion on Road P2, the technical and engineering aspects, urban design concerns as well as the financial and environmental implications, all of which had been detailed in the Task Group Report. On the other hand, other TGUDS members (including all official members) preferred to reassemble QP by the harbour to revive its pier function. Mrs Lam remarked that the Administration had received clear indication that the public was in favour of the latter option, as supported by 16 out of 18 District Councils which had passed motions in support of reassembling QP by the harbour, including Central & Western District Council where the new Central harbourfront was located. The responses collated independently by the Public Policy Research Institute of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University during the Stage 2 PE also pointed to majority support for reassembling QP by the harbour.

4.6 Based on the above-mentioned public support, **Mrs Lam**

said that the Administration had decided to reassemble QP by the harbourfront, between Piers 9 and 10, to revive its pier function. She further explained that over two years had been spent on the Study and the Central Reclamation Phase III was reaching its final stage and Road P2 would be opened for public use early next year. Hence, there was urgency to conclude the Study so that plans for the new Central harbourfront could be implemented.

4.7 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** said that TGUDS's recommendations had a lot of common ground with the Administration's views on the Study, but suggested that the Administration should conduct a new round of public consultation on the "lagoon" proposal. **Mr Paul Zimmerman** opined that the telephone survey was the most reliable gauge of public views but he disagreed that the public preferred a harbourfront location for reassembly of QP because the public had not been consulted on the question from a heritage angle. He noted that the content of the motions passed by the 14 District Councils in support of reassembling QP by the harbour was the same. To activate the waterfront, he opined that the waterfront should have al fresco dining spaces and suitable property developments along it. **Dr Ng Mee-kam** said that she was glad that much consensus had been reached between the Task Group and the Government on the Study but was disappointed at the Administration's decision to reassemble QP by the harbour, given QP's significant historic value. She shared Mr Brooke's view that a new round of public consultation might be conducted on the "lagoon" proposal. **Mr Samuel Mok** expressed his support for reassembling QP by the harbour to revive its pier function, which was in line with the latest public view. **Mr Kim Chan** asked whether the Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO) had given an assessment on QP, and whether any assessment had been made on the social and economical losses which might result from delay in opening Road P2 for public use if QP was to be reassembled at its original location.

4.8 **Mrs Lam** responded that the Study Team had provided

comprehensive technical data to facilitate consideration by TGUDS and the public. As for the “lagoon” proposal, it had been discussed at TGUDS’s previous meetings and the public was aware of that proposal. The Stage 2 PE works, which was originally expected to complete in July 2008, had taken much longer time to wrap up than anticipated, and the suggestion to conduct a new round of public consultation was not acceptable. Mrs Lam said that the Secretary for Home Affairs had already decided that QP was not to be declared as a monument and that decision had survived legal challenge. She hoped that Members would appreciate the majority public support behind the Administration’s decision to reassemble QP by the harbour.

4.9 **The Meeting** endorsed the TGUDS Report and noted the Administration’s response.

Item 5 Progress Report from Task Group on Management Model for the Harbourfront (TGMMH) (Paper No. 18/2009)

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

5.1.1 The 9th TGMMH meeting was held on 28 July and the following items were discussed –

- (a) The Harbour Business Forum (HBF) gave a presentation to TGMMH outlining their recommendations for an overarching body to oversee the planning, delivery and management of harbourfront areas. In particular, HBF proposed the establishment of a Harbour Committee (HarbourComm) as a start, which would be a high level public-private committee to be chaired by a senior Government official. The HarbourComm would be responsible for providing strategic planning advice on matters including land use, with no transfer of land ownership involved and the duty of management resting with existing Government

departments; and

- (b) Following the retreat session by TGMMH on 13 June, Mr Nicholas Brooke had been invited to draft the recommendation report on management model for the harbourfront with input from both official and non-official members. The report would advocate the early establishment of a high level Harbourfront Commission which would replace the HEC and play not only an advocacy and advisory role, but also exercise overall coordination and monitoring of harbourfront planning, urban design and development. The draft report was being refined with further input from TGMMH members.

5.1.2 The Legislative Council Panel on Development's Subcommittee on Harbourfront Planning (LegCo Subcom) was planning to conduct an overseas duty visit in late September to study waterfront planning and management. It had proposed to meet with TGMMH members to exchange views before their visit. The Secretariat was making the relevant arrangements.

(Post-meeting note: The informal meeting with LegCo Subcom was held on 24 August but the LegCo Subcom's planned overseas visit was postponed to a future date.)

5.2 **Prof Lee Chack-fan** thanked Mr Brooke for his input in preparing the draft recommendation report. He said that there had been enthusiastic exchanges amongst TGMMH members in the drafting of the report and the exchanges had raised some points of substance which would benefit from a more thorough discussion. It was reckoned that more time would be needed to work out such details in the final report.

5.3 **Mrs Carrie Lam** thanked TGMMH for the hard work and Prof Lee for his leadership and dedication in the past years. As TGMMH had studied a wide range of local and overseas models, including paying three overseas visits, she appreciated that more

time would be needed for TGMMH to finalise the recommendation report, particularly in the aspect of public-private partnership. Moreover, as TGMMH's proposal of a high level Harbourfront Commission would likely lead to changes in HEC itself, it was advisable to extend the current term of incumbent HEC members. In that connection, Mrs Lam announced her decision to extend the current term of HEC for a six-month period from 1 September 2009 to 28 February 2010.

(Post-meeting note: DEVB issued a press release on 28 August announcing the extension of the current term of HEC for six months from 1 September 2009 to 28 February 2010.)

5.4 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** welcomed the term extension. He opined that there was no single model universally applicable to all harbourfronts, but that all successful harbourfronts had an overarching body to oversee the planning, delivery and management of harbourfront areas. It was also important that the proposed Commission could be easily accommodated within the Government structure.

5.5 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** remarked that unlike other cities in the world, much of Hong Kong's harbourfront land belonged to the Government. It was a matter of coordination among Government departments to ensure delivery of a quality harbourfront. In the aspect of business involvement, there should be proper control of public spaces which were built and managed by private developers, and that could be achieved by short-term licensing arrangements. Sufficient funding should also be reserved under the proposed Commission.

Item 6 Shatin-to-Central Link (SCL) Cross Harbour Section (Paper No. 19/2009)

6.1 **The Chairman** welcomed the representatives of MTRCL and HyD. **Mr Tang Pak-hung** of MTRCL presented the paper with his PowerPoint. A brochure on SCL was also tabled for Members' information.

6.2 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** agreed with the immersed tube tunnel (IMT) solution. He acknowledged MTRCL's efforts to minimize the temporary reclamation at Hung Hom, but was concerned about the 2.2 ha additional temporary reclamation at Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter (CBTS). He requested MTRCL to consider either using IMT to connect directly with the section of Central–Wan Chai Bypass (CWB) near the Police Officers' Club. He also remarked that protecting the harbour concerned not only the physical size, but also the beneficial uses of the harbour. Among others, the available moorings in the harbour were instrumental to those uses and they should be safeguarded by moving CBTS breakwater outward to compensate for the loss of any mooring spaces. **Mr Nicholas Brooke** commented that the options presented by MTRCL as requiring no reclamation were extreme cases and there should be in-between variations. He wondered whether the recommended options which did require reclamation could withstand the test for overriding public need. **Mr Yu Kam-hung** and **Dr Andrew Thomson** supported the option which could be completed in the shortest period of time to minimize the impact on the harbour. **Mr Derrick Pang** said he was happy to see that the construction of SCL would coordinate with that of CWB and he also preferred the option which could be completed within the shortest time frame. **Mr Vincent Ng** queried why temporary reclamation was repeatedly required for road and railway projects. He requested MTRCL to consider constructing leisure facilities to compensate any temporary losses of harbourfront areas for various railway projects. **Mr Jimmy Kwok** supported using the harbourfront sites temporarily for the construction of SCL if the railway project was conducive to the sustainable development of Hong Kong. He also agreed that the project should proceed in the most expeditious manner in coordination with CWB project; and that mitigating measures should be made to minimize the impact of the project on the harbourfront. **Mr Patrick Lau** asked whether the SCL project would affect harbourfront enhancement initiatives in connection with the CWB project.

6.3 **Mrs Carrie Lam** said that SCL's impact on the

harbourfront was short term but the project was conducive to the long term and sustainable development of Hong Kong. She further said that the relocation of MTRCL Freight Yard and International Mail Centre to facilitate harbourfront enhancement in the area would depend on SCL's alignment.

6.4 **Mr Tang** responded that MTRCL had made its best endeavours to strike a balance between using existing land and the harbourfront to facilitate railway construction. While the project would have short term impact on the harbourfront during construction phase, the completed railway could enhance connectivity to the harbourfront and would not affect the harbourfront enhancement initiatives in connection with the Wan Chai Development Phase II Planning and Engineering Review. The IMT option at the section of CWB near the Police Officers' Club was explored during preliminary design, but it was considered that it would bring even greater impact to CBTS users. The proposal to move CBTS breakwater outwards would require temporary reclamation and it was not certain whether there was an overriding public need for doing so. Moreover, additional temporary reclamation at CBTS could not be eliminated under that option. Many other alignment options without reclamation had also been examined during the professional forum on the SCL alignment options held in June 2009 but only three main categories of "no reclamation" options were presented in this meeting. In response to Mr Zimmerman's question, **Mr Tang** said that protection works for the North Island Line project would be implemented at the Exhibition Station.

6.5 **Mr Zimmerman** said that his proposal to first move the breakwater outward could mitigate the impact of temporary reclamation. **Mr Lau** asked whether SCL project would affect the water quality at CBTS. **Mr Kim Chan** asked whether MTRCL would accept HEC's proposal of harbourfront enhancement projects which could be carried out in conjunction with SCL construction.

6.6 In response, **Mr Tang** said that MTRCL welcomed

proposals of suitable enhancement projects which could be carried out in conjunction with SCL construction. The SCL project would not affect the CWB project and separate environmental impact assessment would be conducted for the additional temporary reclamation to ensure water quality at CBTS.

6.7 **Dr Thomson** asked about the details of pedestrian connectivity between the proposed Exhibition Station and the hinterland. **Mr Tang** said that the detailed design of SCL had yet to commence, but the connectivity with the harbourfront would be enhanced after completion of SCL.

6.8 **Mr Zimmerman** said that if MTRCL was only the agent of the project, the Government should respond to his proposal on moving the breakwater outward. **Mr Leung Tat-fai** of HyD said that the SCL project would not require a new permanent breakwater and that the proposal to move the breakwater outward could only be a temporary arrangement at most. **Ms Mo Sau** assured the HEC that the CWB project would be coordinated with the SCL project as far as possible, to ensure that temporary reclamation at CBTS would be kept to a minimum, especially for the section near the Police Officers' Club. However, coordinated working would be subject to availability of working space, adequate fairway for the boats, timely authorization and approval for the SCL project, etc. She also noted that Mr Zimmerman had made similar suggestion to move the breakwater outward previously during CWB public consultation. She said that the relocation of the breakwater, which involved temporary reclamation, was finally deleted from the CWB scheme because reasonable alternatives to temporary reclamation had been identified, obviating the need for the relocation.

6.9 **The Chairman** thanked MTRCL for their presentation on SCL. He suggested MTRCL to consider proposing harbourfront enhancement initiatives as part of the SCL project. **Mr Tang** thanked HEC's suggestion and said MTRCL would consult HEC again with constructive proposals.

Item 7 Kai Tak Development and Waterfront Designs (Paper No. 20/2009)

7.1 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** presented the paper. He urged Members to consider the need for actively reviewing the OZP and detailed layout plans for Kai Tak Development on an ongoing basis, and to review specifically the land uses and transport infrastructure along the waterfront of Kai Tak. He also urged Members to consider the need for urban design and architectural design resources and overview of all public works along the waterfront.

7.2 **Mr John Chai** said that during his previous discussion with Mr Zimmerman on harbourfront planning issues, including those concerning Kai Tak Development, he had explained that the approved Kai Tak OZP was an approved plan which was the outcome of a thorough public engagement exercise. At a recent LegCo meeting, Mr Chai had also noted comments on improving the Kai Tak Development plan, including refinement of waterfront promenade and road works. The Administration agreed to further consider those concerns at the detailed design stage. **Mr C B Mak** supplemented that CEDD had commissioned two detailed design consultancies in July/August and enhancement of the design would be explored within the broad framework of Kai Tak OZP. HEC and other stakeholders would be engaged in the process.

7.3 **Dr Ng Mee-kam** commented that there was a gap between planning and implementation of urban design although the planning for Kai Tak had gone through an intensive public engagement process. **Mr Nicholas Brooke and Dr Andrew Thomson** said that that was the reason for supporting the establishment of a Harbourfront Commission which could oversee the planning, delivery and management of harbourfront. **Mr Patrick Lau and Mr Vincent Ng** considered that there could be more coordination between Government departments on implementation of development plans.

7.4 **Mrs Ava Ng** remarked that it should be respected that the planning for Kai Tak had gone through a 3-stage community wide public engagement exercise. The Kai Tak OZP had been gazetted, gone through the statutory procedures and finally approved by the Executive Council.

Item 8 Any Other Business

Presentation on Building Design to Foster a Quality and Sustainable Built Environment

8.1 On behalf of Business Environment Council, **Dr Andrew Thomson** presented, with his PowerPoint, the Council for Sustainable Development's Invitation to Response (IR) document on Building Design to Foster a Quality and Sustainable Built Environment. It was part of the Public Engagement Exercise which was kicked off in June and would end in October. The IR documents set out a number of options under three major issues concerning built environment, namely (a) Sustainable Building Design Guidelines; (b) Control on GFA Concessions; and (c) Energy Efficient Building Design and Installations. These issues might have implications on harbourfront enhancement and any views from Members were welcomed. Members noted the contents of his presentation.

Date of next meeting

8.2 **The Chairman** said that the Secretariat would inform Members of the date of the next meeting.

Secretariat

8.3 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:30 pm.

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