

**29<sup>th</sup> Meeting of Harbour-front Enhancement Committee**  
**held at 2:30 pm on 17 November 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
Mr Lam Kin-lai	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
Mr Paul Zimmerman	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour Ltd
Mr David Ho	
Mr Michael Hui	
Mr Jimmy Kwok	
Mr Samuel Mok	
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 Jeff Lam	Assistant Director (Headquarters), Lands Department (LandsD)
Mr Andrew Tsang	Assistant Director (2), Home Affairs Department (HAD)
Ms Alice Cheung	Secretary

**In Attendance**

Mrs Carrie Lam	Secretary for Development (for agenda item 1 only)
Ms Gracie Foo	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, Development Bureau (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)

**Absent with Apologies**

Prof Carlos Lo	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Leslie Chen	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Mr Mason Hung	Representing Hong Kong Tourism Board
Mr Louis Loong	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Nicholas Brooke	
Dr Anissa Chan	
Mr Patrick Lau	
Mr Derrick Pang	

**Action**

**Welcoming message**

**The Chairman** welcomed all to the 29<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC), in particular Mrs Carrie Lam, Secretary for Development, who would attend for item 1 and give Members a short briefing on the 2009-10 Policy Address.

**Item 1 Briefing on the 2009-10 Policy Address**

1.1 **Mrs Carrie Lam** said it was the third consecutive year that she briefed HEC on the Chief Executive’s Policy Address. In the 2009-10 Policy Address, DEVB had three main initiatives which she considered to have relevance to HEC, namely Beautifying the Harbourfront, “Conserving Central” and Revitalization of Private Industrial Buildings.

1.2 On revitalization of private industrial buildings, **Mrs Lam**

explained that there were many industrial buildings along the harbourfront situated in several action areas recommended by the Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review (HPR Sub-com), e.g. Yau Tong and Kwun Tong. Revitalization of those industrial buildings would add vibrancy and improve accessibility to the harbourfront, hence complementing harbourfront enhancement projects. More emphasis had been placed on the policy measures on wholesale conversion, rather than redevelopment, of existing industrial buildings which might help avoid more new high-rise buildings along the harbourfront.

1.3 Regarding beautifying the harbourfront, **Mrs Lam** said that DEVB had set up the Harbour Unit to co-ordinate and identify harbourfront enhancement initiatives. On the basis of the beautification proposals for the 22 action areas submitted by HPR Sub-com in August, DEVB would co-ordinate the efforts of concerned bureaux and departments to gradually take forward harbourfront beautification measures.

1.4 As for “Conserving Central”, **Mrs Lam** remarked that the overall feedback on the plan was positive. Sites 1 and 2 in the new Central harbourfront was one of the eight projects included under “Conserving Central” as Victoria Harbour was undoubtedly Hong Kong’s greatest natural asset. Having carefully considered the recommendations put forth by the Task Group on Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (TGUDS) and the public views received, Mrs Lam said that the Chief Executive had announced in the 2009-10 Policy Address that the Administration had taken on board most of the recommendations, including the significant reduction of the development density of Sites 1 & 2 and transfer of the Gross Floor Area (GFA) to Site 5 in the new Central harbourfront. However, after the announcement of the decision, there were some views raised against the GFA transfer to Site 5. She gave the following responses to those views–

- (a) Site 5 was zoned “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) in the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) with permissible GFA of 58,000 m<sup>2</sup> and building height of 80 metres above Principal Datum (mPD). It was never intended for open space use. The proposal to change its land use from “G/IC” to commercial would

not lead to any GFA increase, but would help bring in more activities and people flow to the relatively quiet Wan Chai North to add vibrancy to the area;

- (b) Upon the completion of the Central Government Complex at Tamar and the future commercial development in Site 5, the Central Business District (CBD) would be more logically and physically extended to Wan Chai North;
- (c) The Administration could not underestimate the demand for various land uses, including Grade A office, in Central which was the commercial hub of Hong Kong;
- (d) By transferring 58,000m<sup>2</sup> GFA from Sites 1 & 2 to replace the original “G/IC” GFA in Site 5, a larger open space area in Sites 1 & 2 could be created for public enjoyment;
- (e) Changing Site 5 to commercial use would provide a very good opportunity to improve the pedestrian connectivity from Wan Chai North to Admiralty and Central; and
- (f) A traffic impact assessment for the Central reclamation area had been conducted in 2005, using a baseline assumption of 859,000m<sup>2</sup> GFA in the area. The assessment concluded that the Central–Wan Chai Bypass (CWB) and the road network in the vicinity of the area would be sufficient to cope with the additional traffic flow brought by the new developments in the future. Compared with the 2005 assessment under which a total GFA of 859,000 m<sup>2</sup> was assumed, the latest design of the new Central harbourfront including all planned developments including Tamar Complex would only give rise to 427,000m<sup>2</sup> GFA, which was 50% less. As such, the road network was expected to be sufficient to cope with the additional traffic flow.

1.5 **Mrs Lam** also reported three events in the past two weeks which might have some enlightenment on the work of HEC–

- (a) On 7 November, upon the request of the Legislative Council Panel on Development's Subcommittee on Harbourfront Planning (LegCo Subcom), a site visit to harbourfront areas, including Kwun Tong Promenade Stage 1, Hoi Yu Street waterfront, Quarry Bay Park and Western Wholesale Food Market, was arranged. The visit was widely covered by the media, showing that the public had much aspiration on harbourfront enhancement;
- (b) On 8 November, an organization held its annual Harbour Day. While welcoming such activity for the public to share their passion for the harbour, she was concerned about the publicity leaflets of the activity which contained outdated information about reclamation and was misleading to the public. **Mrs Lam** said that a fact sheet with accurate and up-to-date information about reclamation would be circulated to Members (*Post-meeting note: A fact sheet and a map showing the facts about the reclamation projects were circulated to Members on 17 November.*); and
- (c) The LegCo Subcom, at its meeting on 9 November, welcomed in general the Administration's efforts in harbourfront enhancement. It also requested the Administration to provide further information concerning the development of Site 5 and the management model of Sites 1 & 2. The Administration was studying the possible management models of Sites 1 & 2 and would consult the Task Group on Management Model for the Harbourfront of HEC in due course.

1.6 **Mrs Lam** said that as the title of the 2009-10 Policy Address was "Breaking New Ground Together", she hoped that the Administration, HEC and other relevant stakeholders could

continue to work together on harbourfront enhancement in the time to come.

1.7 **Mr Vincent Ng** thanked Mrs Lam for her recognition of HEC's work. He considered that the GFA transfer to Site 5 was a balanced proposal which could avoid excessive development density in Sites 1 & 2 whilst meeting the demand for Grade A offices. As HEC had spent a lot of time and engaged the public in reaching the consensus, he supported the proposal and opined that it was time to move on to the implementation stage. **Ir Dr Greg Wong** said that the decision making process in working out the proposal for the new Central harbourfront was transparent. The public could judge whether the result of the proposal was good for Hong Kong as a whole. **Mr Kim Chan** said that it remained the Hong Kong Institute of Planners' stance to support the GFA transfer from Sites 1 & 2 to Site 5. On the QP issue, the Institute's main stream view favoured in-situ reassembly but the Institute would respect the majority public view. He pointed out that the original planning intention of Site 5 was for development, not open space. Site 5, together with the neighbouring sites in the vicinity could form a commercial core which could revitalize Wan Chai North area. **Dr Ng Mee-kam** said that she was delighted to see many of the proposals in "Conserving Central". She supported the proposal to reduce the development density at Sites 1 & 2 and to transfer the GFA to Site 5. She was disappointed that QP would not be reassembled at its original location. She hoped that as suggested by the Hong Kong Institute of Planners, some memorial elements could be put up at the original location of QP to commemorate its historic significance. **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the Society for Protection of the Harbour Limited (SPH) organized a Walk for the Harbour on 8 November and some information on the gazetted reclamation areas was distributed. He said SPH was not aware that the proposed reclamation areas had been degazetted and if there was inaccuracy, he would rectify it. He agreed that there would be improvement to the new Central harbourfront by redistributing the GFA from Sites 1 & 2 to Site 5. He said that the "Master Layout Plan" (MLP) presented to the LegCo in the LegCo brief on Urban Design Study for the new Central harbourfront had not been discussed at HEC and therefore he could not agree that the "MLP" reflected all the recommendations of the TGUDS. On QP, he opined that reassembling it at its original location should be supported from both the financial and

heritage points of view. **Mr Michael Hui** said that he was delighted to see the “Conserving Central” plan. He supported the Administration moving on to the implementation stage. **Mr Jimmy Kwok** thanked the Administration’s recognition of HEC’s work in the past 5 years. He supported the redistribution of the GFA of Sites 1 & 2 to Site 5, which was HEC’s proposal after lengthy, open and fair discussions and public consultations. He also expressed his support for the Administration to move on to implementation so that the new Central harbourfront could be enjoyed by the public as soon as possible. **Mr Yu Kam-hung** said that HEC had done a lot of discussions and consultations in working out the proposals for the new Central harbourfront, which should be fully supported. He considered that the GFA transfer to Site 5 was conducive to the sustainable development of Central as the CBD of Hong Kong. **Prof Wong Sze-chun** said that TGUDS had spent a lot of time in reaching consensus on the GFA transfer from Sites 1 & 2 to Site 5. He supported the proposal proceeding to the implementation stage. **Mr Samuel Mok** considered that it was acceptable for Sites 1, 2 or 5 to be used for commercial purpose but it was not acceptable if there was no commercial development along the waterfront from HKCEC to Central. He suggested that the future developer of Site 5 should be required to improve the connectivity between Site 5 and Sites 6 & 7. He also asked what “G/IC” facilities were originally planned to be built on Site 5 and where they would be built after Site 5 had been rezoned to commercial use.

1.8 **Mrs Carrie Lam** thanked Members for their views and appreciated Members re-affirming their clear support for the Administration’s final proposals for the new Central harbourfront, especially the GFA transfer from Sites 1 & 2 to Site 5. She also thanked Mr Zimmerman’s remark that if the Administration could provide clear record and information that those previously contemplated reclamation was no longer in force, SPH would agree not to use the incorrect information for future publicity. The Administration would shortly produce that record for all HEC members. *(Post-meeting note: In addition to issuing a map and a fact sheet on reclamation projects to Members on 17 November 2009, a letter was issued by Mrs Lam to Mr Winston Chu, Advisor of SPH on 15 December 2009, setting out in detail the up-to-date facts about reclamations and the Government’s response to SPH’s allegations and comments on the Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront. The letter*

*was copied to Members of the Executive Council, Legislative Council, Town Planning Board and HEC for information.)* The MLP for the CDA sites and the actual parameters for the public-private partnership (PPP) model for Sites 1 & 2 would also be presented to HEC in due course. *(Post-meeting note: A presentation on the conclusion of the Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront is being arranged for the next HEC meeting scheduled for 18 February 2010.)*

1.9 **The Chairman** thanked Mrs Lam for the great importance that she attached to harbourfront enhancement. He welcomed and reiterated HEC's support for the Administration's final proposals for the new Central harbourfront, as almost all of the recommendations put forth by TGUDS and endorsed by HEC, including the reduction of development density of Sites 1 and 2 and transfer of GFA to Site 5, had been taken on board. As stressed by many Members in the meeting, he asked the Government to move on to the implementation phase so that the new Central harbourfront could be enjoyed by the public as soon as possible. The Task Group on Management Model for the Harbourfront (TGMMH) chaired by himself also looked forward to receiving more details about the PPP proposal for developing Sites 1 & 2. He also thanked Ir Dr Greg Wong for his dedicated efforts and leadership in the TGUDS. Noting that the Government had taken on board most of the TGUDS's recommendations, the Chairman concluded that there were no outstanding matters concerning the Study. For matters relating to the implementation of the design proposals for the key sites, the Chairman said that they could be discussed at HEC or TGMMH if it was related to the management model of the key sites. He thanked Mrs Lam again for briefing HEC on the initiatives under DEVB in the Policy Address.

## **Item 2 Confirmation of Minutes of the 28<sup>th</sup> Meeting**

2.1 **The Chairman** said that the Secretariat circulated the draft minutes of the 28<sup>th</sup> meeting to Members on 2 November. With the proposed amendments received from Mr Paul Zimmerman to paragraphs 3.4, 4.7 and 6.2; from Dr Ng Mee Kam to paragraph 4.7; and from PlanD to paragraph 3.1.1(e), the revised draft minutes were circulated to Members on 13 November. As no further amendment was proposed, **the Meeting** confirmed the revised minutes.

### **Item 3 Matters Arising**

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

### **Item 4 Progress Report from Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review (HPR Sub-com) (Paper No. 21/2009)**

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

4.1.1 The 30<sup>th</sup> HPR Sub-com meeting was held on 4 November and the following items were discussed–

- (a) The developer of 14-30 King Wah Road briefed the HPR Sub-com on its proposed residential development, which was the subject of a Section 16 planning application to be considered by the Town Planning Board (TPB). Members had no strong view against the proposed development and generally considered that the current proposal had made some improvements on visual permeability and building height when compared with the previous development proposals for the site; and had taken into account the requirements stipulated in the planning brief recently endorsed by TPB. The HPR Sub-com also discussed generally on the possibility of adopting a PPP approach to develop the public open space to the immediate north of the subject site but no conclusion was reached;
- (b) Water Supplies Department (WSD) briefed the HPR Sub-com on the proposed landscape works for the affected portion of the West Kowloon Waterfront Promenade, arising from the construction works for the “Laying of Western Cross Harbour Main and Associated Land Mains from West Kowloon to Sai Ying Pun”. The

HPR Sub-com supported the project in general but considered that there was scope for further improvement of the proposed mitigation/enhancement measures. The size of the works area and the length of the seawall affected should be kept to the minimum. A quality design of the proposed enhancement measures was necessary and various comments/suggestions were raised by Members at the meeting. The HPR Sub-com noted that concerted efforts from other departments including the Leisure and Cultural Services Department were required to ensure a quality outcome and requested the Harbour Unit to coordinate in that regard; and

- (c) PlanD briefed the HPR Sub-com on the amendments to the approved Cha Kwo Ling, Yau Tong, Lei Yue Mun OZP No. S/K15/17 to facilitate the implementation of the “Lei Yue Mun Waterfront Enhancement Project” initiated by the Tourism Commission. Members generally considered that a holistic approach should be adopted to enhance the Lei Yue Mun waterfront. The existing natural coastline should be preserved. There was concern that the proposed construction of large-scale public landing facilities and a breakwater would involve a larger extent of reclamation as compared with the possible upgrading of an existing jetty at Lei Yue Mun Village, though these proposed features fell outside the harbour limit. Noting that the OZP amendments were meant to provide a planning framework for the project only, the HPR Sub-com agreed to request the project department to brief it when the detailed design of the project was available.

4.2 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** shared the concerns of the HPR Sub-com over reclamation and disagreed with the approach of constructing a large pier at Lei Yue Mun. He also considered that in order to enhance Lei Yue Mun as a tourist attraction, the sewerage there should first be improved.

**Item 5 Progress Report from Task Group on Management Model for the Harbourfront (TGMMH) (Paper No. 22/2009)**

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

5.1.1 No formal Task Group meeting was held during September to November.

5.1.2 At the request of the LegCo Subcom, TGMMH held an informal meeting with some members of the LegCo Subcom on 24 August. At the meeting, TGMMH members shared their observations and findings from the three overseas visits, and their views on the ingredients for a successful harbourfront, such as an overarching body and PPP.

5.1.3 At Members' suggestion, a brainstorming session was held on 6 October to discuss the outstanding issues of the TGMMH Recommendation Report including the institutional arrangements for the proposed Harbourfront Commission, such as the roles, membership and modus operandi. Members generally agreed that the proposed Commission would play an advocacy, oversight and advisory role, exercise overall coordination and monitoring, as well as foster and encourage harbourfront development through various means including public-private partnership. Members recommended that the Commission be composed of lay members as well as senior Government officials, with an independent non-official as Chairman and the Secretary for Development as Vice-Chairman. As the proposed

Harbourfront Commission was not intended to have statutory or executive powers, the Harbour Unit would be responsible for following up recommendations put forth by the Commission as well as the coordination work within the Government. Members also expressed support for a wider application of PPP in the development and management of the harbourfront, noting the wide variety of possible PPP models with different levels and forms of private sector involvement. Members suggested that the Harbour Unit consult TGMMH or the proposed Harbourfront Commission in future on specific sites when PPP opportunities arose. Taking into account the views expressed by Members at the brainstorming session, the Secretariat revised the Recommendation Report and circulated it to Members on 9 November for further comment.

5.2 **Dr Ng Mee-kam** remarked that partnership with the private sector should also include partnership with the community, social organizations, professional bodies etc, apart from the business sector. She said that she had attended the informal meeting with the LegCo Subcom on 24 August and felt that the LegCo Members would expect to be consulted on the future institutional setup of the proposed Harbourfront Commission. She also had an impression that the LegCo Members were also concerned about the PPP approach.

**Item 6 A Living Harbour – Research by Worcester Polytechnic Institute (WPI) on Victoria Harbour Marine Uses and Land/Water Interfaces (Paper No. 23/2009)**

6.1 **The Chairman** said that as in the past two years, the WPI of the USA would send students to Hong Kong again to conduct research relating to the harbourfront and to make presentation to HEC. For the coming project, the research would focus on Victoria Harbour marine uses and land/water interfaces and a paper had been prepared by Mr Zimmerman. He invited Mr Zimmerman to further explain the paper.

6.2 **Mr Zimmerman** said that the students from WPI would come to Hong Kong to conduct the research and it was recommended that the HEC and the Harbour Unit be invited to act as sponsors. The sponsorship did not involve any financial support but Harbour Unit's assistance and facilitation in terms of provision of information, site visits and interviews with relevant departments, etc. and HEC's review of the project brief. The study was to audit and forecast marine uses, determine existing land/water interfaces and make recommendations on future requirements for land/water interfaces. He remarked that although the team was not a professional research firm, the study would certainly lead to positive thinking in the work of HEC.

6.3 **Ms Alice Cheung** said that Harbour Unit had touched base with the relevant departments, which were supportive to the research and stood ready to render assistance to the students as far as possible.

6.4 **The Chairman** concluded that HEC agreed to act as sponsor for the WPI students' study on the understanding that there was no financial implication.

## **Item 7 Any Other Business**

### **Suggestion to invite THB for a briefing on transport infrastructure and the harbourfront**

7.1 **Mr Zimmerman** said that HEC had previously discussed transport infrastructure at the harbourfront and some Members including himself had attended an informal meeting with THB to discuss a number of issues, e.g. carparking sites under Short Term Tenancy along the harbourfront. He suggested that THB should be invited to brief HEC on how considerations regarding harbourfront enhancement were taken into account in transport planning and design. **Mrs Apollonia Liu** responded that subsequent to the informal meeting, THB had reviewed the issues raised by Members concerned and had taken forward a couple of

**THB**

them which were considered viable. She would further discuss with other officers concerned either to submit a paper or give a briefing to HEC on the issues.

### **Achievements and Term-End Report of the HEC**

7.2 **Dr Andrew Thomson** suggested that HEC could prepare some notes outlining what had been done and what needed to be done on harbourfront enhancement. The notes could serve as reference for the proposed Harbourfront Commission. **Ir Dr Greg Wong** considered that Members could contribute on the priorities of tasks for the proposed Commission. **Mr Thomas Chow** cautioned about the need to avoid giving the wrong impression that HEC was to determine what the proposed Commission should do. **Dr Ng Mee-kam** opined that in addition to outstanding tasks, the notes could also include HEC's processes, ways of handling things and partnership culture, etc. which should serve as useful references to the new Commission. **The Chairman** concluded that Members were welcomed to provide their inputs for the Secretariat's compilation of a reference note for the new Harbourfront Commission by the first week of January 2010.

**Members  
and  
Secretariat**

### **Date of next meeting**

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

**Secretariat**

7.4 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:30 pm.

**Harbour-front Enhancement Committee Secretariat  
February 2010**