

30th Meeting of Harbour-front Enhancement Committee
held at 2:30 pm on 18 February 2010
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
Prof Carlos Lo	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Vincent Ng	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Kim Chan	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Ir Dr Greg Wong	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Mason Hung	Representing Hong Kong Tourism Board
Mr Louis Loong	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Paul Zimmerman	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour Ltd
Mr Nicholas Brooke	
Dr Anissa Chan	
Mr David Ho	
Mr Jimmy Kwok	
Mr Patrick Lau	
Mr Samuel Mok	
Mr Derrick Pang	
Mr Thomas Chow	Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)
Mr John Chai	Director of Civil Engineering and Development
Mrs Ava Ng	Director of Planning
Mr Herbert Leung	Deputy Director of Lands (General)
Mr Fletch Chan	Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport) ³ , Transport and Housing Bureau (THB)
Ms Alice Cheung	Secretary

In Attendance

Mrs Carrie Lam	Secretary for Development
Ms Gracie Foo	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Terence Yu	Press Secretary to Secretary for Development
Mr Chris Fung	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
Mr Raymond Wong	Assistant Director/Territorial, Planning Department (PlanD)

For Agenda Item 6

Ms Phyllis Li	Assistant Director/Special Duties, PlanD
Ms Fiona Lung	Chief Town Planner/Special Duties, PlanD

For Agenda Item 7

Ms Ying Fun-fong	Chief Engineer/Transport Planning, Transport Department (TD)
------------------	---

For Agenda Item 8

Mr Brian Berard	Worcester Polytechnic Institute (WPI)
Mr Jarrad Fallon	WPI
Mr Santiago Lora	WPI
Mr Alexander Muir	WPI
Mr Eric Rosendahl	WPI
Mr Lucas Scotta	WPI
Mr Alexander Wong	WPI
Ms Becky Yang	WPI

Absent with Apologies

Mr Leslie Chen	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Dr Paul Ho	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr Michael Hui	
Mr Andrew Tsang	Assistant Director (2), Home Affairs Department

Welcoming message

The Chairman welcomed all to the 30th meeting of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC), in particular Mrs Carrie Lam, Secretary for Development, who was attending for Agenda Items 2 to 5; and Mr Fletch Chan, Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport)³ of THB, who would give a presentation on transport infrastructure and the harbourfront under Agenda Item 7.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 29th Meeting

1.1 **The Chairman** said that the Secretariat circulated the draft minutes of the 29th meeting to Members on 7 January 2010, and received one minor proposed amendment from Mr Paul Zimmerman to paragraph 4.2. The revised draft minutes were circulated to Members on 8 February 2010. As no further amendment was proposed, **the Meeting** confirmed the revised minutes.

Item 2 Matters Arising

2.1 **The Chairman** informed Members that the matters arising from the last meeting would be discussed under Agenda Items 5 to 8.

Item 3 Progress Report from Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review (HPR Sub-com) (Paper No. 1/2010)

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

3.1.1 The 31st HPR Sub-com meeting was held on 20 January and the following items were discussed –

- (a) Representatives of THB, Government Flying Service and the Hong Kong Regional Heliport Working Group briefed Members on the operation of the commercial helicopter services at the Wan Chai Temporary Helipad. Members noted the operational rules governing the use of the helipad by the HeliServices (Hong Kong)

Limited. Since its operation in July 2009, only one complaint was received alleging that two commercial helicopter flights had deviated from the designated flight paths. The complaint was found not substantiated. Other issues like noise mitigation measures, community programmes and carbon reduction initiatives of the commercial operator were discussed; and

- (b) Representatives of PlanD briefed the HPR Sub-com on the draft planning brief for the Yau Tong Bay (YTB) “Comprehensive Development Area” zone, which set out the planning objectives, development parameters, planning and other technical requirements and design guidelines for the future development within the zone. Members considered that the planning brief should focus on the unique configurations of YTB. Apart from the provision of a waterfront promenade, the subject site should enable the public use of YTB for water-based recreational activities in future, and the design should integrate with the land and marine uses. To ensure accessibility, some land along the seawall could be carved out from the private development site. A study should be conducted to determine the appropriate marine use and the land-based supporting facilities.

3.1.2 Drainage Services Department (DSD) arranged a site visit to the Sheung Wan Floodwater Pumping Station cum waterfront park at ex-Sheung Wan Gala Point for the HPR Sub-com on 6 January. Members joining the site visit appreciated that the pumping station had integrated well with the park development by putting most station facilities underground with the area above for public use. Some suggestions to improve the facilities were conveyed to DSD and the Leisure and

Cultural Services Department for consideration.

3.2 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** thanked Mr Vincent Ng for his leadership in the HPR Sub-com. On the issue of short term tenancies along the harbourfront which had been discussed at the HPR Sub-com meeting on 20 January, Mr Zimmerman said that he had been approached by residents of Kai Tak Area who had expressed grave concern over the incompatible temporary land uses there. He suggested that those temporary land uses should be reviewed.

3.3 **Mr Vincent Ng** thanked all HPR Sub-com Members' hard work and support over the past years. **The Chairman** thanked Mr Ng for his dedication and leadership in the HPR Sub-com over the past six years.

Item 4 Progress Report from Task Group on Management Model for the Harbourfront (TGMMH) (Paper No. 2/2010) and Recommendation Report on Management Model for the Harbourfront (Paper No. 3/2010)

4.1 **Prof Lee Chack-fan**, in his capacity as Chairman of TGMMH, presented the progress report. The 10th TGMMH meeting was held on 9 December 2009 to discuss the drafting of the Recommendation Report, and the revised design concepts and development approach for Sites 1 and 2 in the new Central harbourfront.

4.2 Regarding the Recommendation Report, **Prof Lee** said that it had been endorsed by TGMMH and sent to all HEC Members on 27 January 2010. He thanked TGMMH members for their hard work and input to the Report, which crystallised the research and findings of TGMMH since its formation in December 2007.

4.3 **Prof Lee** highlighted the following key features of the Recommendation Report –

- There were two key recommendations of TGMMH, namely the establishment of an overarching non-statutory Harbourfront Commission, and advocacy of the wider application of public-private partnership (PPP) in harbourfront development and management.
- Concerning the first recommendation, the proposed Harbourfront Commission would replace the HEC, and assume overall envisioning, advocacy, oversight, advisory, coordination and monitoring roles.
- On membership, the proposed Commission would continue to be chaired by an independent non-official, and the Secretary for Development would take up the Vice-Chairmanship to ensure high-level support from the Government. As with the current HEC, the proposed Commission would comprise both non official individual and organisation members, as well as senior Government officials.
- The Commission would be tasked to advocate, initiate and formulate initiatives, programmes and projects. To assist the Commission in carrying out its functions, the Commission might set up a number of panels to be chaired by and made up of Commission members.
- As the proposed Commission would not be given statutory or executive powers, it was expected to be assisted by the authorities that existed within the Government.
- Operationally, the Harbour Unit would be responsible for following up the work of the Commission and the necessary coordination within the Government. On a site-specific or project-specific basis, the Unit might establish project teams to assist with the work. It would also serve as the Secretariat of the Commission.
- Having researched into different management models and visited various successful harbourfronts overseas, TGMMH also recommended the wider application of PPP, which would allow the Government to tap into the strengths of the private sector in various aspects. The

proposed Commission was expected to assist in devising future PPP arrangements on a project-by-project basis.

4.4 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** remarked that unlike other countries, the harbourfront land in Hong Kong had positive land value and was primarily Government land. The challenge for Hong Kong in creating a world class harbourfront was to coordinate the efforts of different Government departments effectively. He considered that one of the greatest challenges for the proposed Commission was to ensure a world class standard for the Kai Tak Development.

4.5 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** considered the TGMMH's recommendations pragmatic. He opined that the support from both the Administration and the private sector would be important to enable the Commission to coordinate and drive harbourfront enhancement efforts forward. One of the ingredients for successful application of PPP was to avoid being prescriptive in any one PPP model. He shared the same view as Mr Zimmerman's that the Kai Tak Development would be the showcase of Hong Kong's harbourfront development.

4.6 **Dr Ng Mee-kam** said that Members of TGMMH agreed that it would be more effective for the Government to play the coordination role in the present circumstances. However, the Commission would be expected to consider the option of establishing a statutory commission in future. She considered that Hong Kong had to establish a new culture about PPP so that different stakeholders could be engaged in harbourfront planning and development.

4.7 **Dr Andrew Thomson** considered that the TGMMH's recommendations were workable and deliverable. On PPP, he said that no single model could be suitable for all situations.

4.8 **Mr Kim Chan** said that the recommendations represented the consensus of TGMMH Members. He suggested that the Government should launch more civic education to

change the public's concept on PPP, which was always negative and associated with collusion and advantage transfer.

4.9 **Prof Carlos Lo** considered that the recommendations represented the majority view of TGMMH Members. He pointed out that stakeholder engagement and the Government's leading role in formulating the policy vision and strategic focus in harbourfront development and management would be important to the work of the future Commission.

4.10 **Mr Vincent Ng** supported the TGMMH's recommendations and considered that the success lay in the effective coordination among Government departments to ensure effective delivery of a quality harbourfront. To support the work of the Commission, he considered that the staffing resources of the Harbour Unit should be strengthened. He also opined that the new Commission should strengthen public engagement and quick-win projects in order to gain the public's recognition for the Commission.

4.11 **Mrs Carrie Lam** expressed her heartfelt thanks to Prof Lee for his leadership and TGMMH Members for their hard work and dedication over the past two years. She had the following responses to Members' comments –

- The Recommendation Report had laid down a very solid foundation for the future of harbourfront planning, development and management.
- Unlike what Mr Zimmerman thought, land value was not a relevant consideration since the Government had already pledged that harbourfront areas would be devoted as much as possible for public enjoyment.
- The biggest challenge for the time being was the coordination needed within the Administration to put forward harbourfront enhancement efforts. Both the "Conserving Central" initiative and the Administration's pledge to take forward HEC's recommendations of the various beautification options in the 22 Action Areas as

highlighted in the Chief Executive's 2009-10 Policy Address were illustration of the Administration's commitment to harbourfront enhancement.

- The Harbourfront was not a clean slate or a green field site. The biggest challenges which the Administration always faced with harbourfront enhancement were the conflicting demands for waterfront space and the co-existence of incompatible public and private uses along the waterfront. Nonetheless, she was confident that there was sufficient support within the Administration to coordinate and resolve those issues in a more coherent manner.
- Although the future Harbourfront Commission would continue to stay within the DEVB as the lead policy bureau, Members were assured that the entire Administration would support harbourfront enhancement efforts.
- The HEC's existing strengths in having an independent, reputable and credible Chairman, the approach to allow stakeholders to nominate their representatives; and the transparency and openness of the meetings to the public, would be preserved in the future Commission.
- She noted that the TGMMH Report recommended that members of the Commission should be appointed by the Financial Secretary instead of by the Secretary for Development as in the current appointments for HEC, probably due to the reporting line of DEVB. She was glad to take up the proposed Vice-Chairman post of the new Commission so that she could have timely responses to the issues raised.
- As regards the Kai Tak Development, the Government had no plan to set up another authority but funding approval from the Legislative Council (LegCo) had already been secured to create a new post (Deputy Project Manager) to head the Kai Tak Development so that the design matter of Kai Tak would be duly taken care of in a more coherent manner.

- On PPP, the terms and conditions should be set out very clearly, the process should be as transparent as possible and the selection should be based on objective criteria as far as possible. The Administration would continue to pursue PPP opportunities vigorously but the conventional PPP model might not be applicable as the private sector's innovation and expertise than financial resources were more needed. To begin with, a few sites of suitable scale were being identified and the terms and conditions would be drafted for consultation with the new Commission.
- There would inevitably be a short gap between the expiry of the current terms of HEC and the establishment of the Commission. The Administration would try to shorten the gap as far as possible. Hopefully, the Commission could be formally set up in the middle of the year.

4.12 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** asked whether it should be for the HEC or the Administration to brief the Legislative Council (LegCo) on the TGMMH's recommendation to establish the Harbourfront Commission. To avoid the gap, he explored whether it would be feasible for the Administration to further extend the current term of HEC until the establishment of the Commission. **Mr Zimmerman** said that the gap should be as short as possible. He also pointed out that a broad view of PPP projects should be taken, which he demonstrated with four examples including Lei Yue Mun, Hung Hom, Yau Tong Bay and a private site on the Kwun Tong waterfront.

4.13 **Mrs Lam** said that the LegCo Development Panel had set up a Subcommittee on Harbourfront Planning and the Administration had been actively engaging the Subcommittee since its establishment. The Administration would brief the Subcommittee on a range of subjects later, including the proposed establishment of the Harbourfront Commission. On the gap issue, she said that the current term of HEC was extended for a specified period of six months from 1 September 2009 to 28 February 2010, for the specific purpose of allowing more time for TGMMH/HEC to complete the Recommendation Report on

Management Model for the Harbourfront. Since the Report had been completed, there was no more outstanding task for the HEC. The next step would be for the Administration to work out the operational details in the coming months. Nevertheless, the Administration would try its best efforts to shorten the time gap as far as possible. On PPP, she shared Members' view that it should encompass a broader meaning. For this reason, the Administration had specifically added a footnote in the Report to define PPP to include Government's collaboration with organizations from a variety of sectors, including commercial, social enterprises, community-based trusts, special purpose companies and other non-governmental organizations (NGOs). At certain waterfront sites on private land, it was not possible to take harbourfront enhancement efforts forward without involving the participation of the private developers of the sites. She looked forward to Members' encouragement and support for discussion with individual private developers.

4.14 **Mr Lam Kin-lai** suggested that the Administration could consider extending the functions of HEC Members, rather than the term of the Committee, until the setting up of the Commission. Under this proposal, Members would continue to be consulted on harbourfront projects, say by email, but there would be no need to convene meetings in the interim. He also hoped that the Administration could strengthen the support to NGOs in participating in PPP project, especially on the legal aspect.

4.15 **Mrs Lam** explained that the Administration fully respected HEC's nomination system and attached great importance to the formalities in the procedures. Before extending the original term of HEC from 1 September 2009 to 28 February 2010, the Administration had formally written to each organizational as well as individual member to confirm their nomination/willingness to continue to serve on the HEC during the extended term. For the same reason, she would not be at liberty to further extend the extended term of HEC or membership without going back to both the organizational and individual members again. Formalities aside, Mrs Lam also explained to

Members that she dealt with the appointments of HEC seriously and the extended term made last time was due to the need to wrap up the TGMMH Report, which was one of the missions of the current term of HEC. Noting that there was no more outstanding task for HEC, she stressed that the efforts to be carried after the HEC meeting would be to focus on working out the operational details for the Harbourfront Commission and on the production of a concluding publication for HEC, the proposal of which would be discussed under agenda item 5. She would consider appointing Members in their individual capacity as advisor to DEVB on harbourfront matters in the interim, if this was agreeable to Members.

4.16 **The meeting** endorsed the TGMMH Recommendation Report on Management Model for the Harbourfront. **The Chairman** said that a list of possible Chinese names for the Commission was tabled and Members could send their comments or views to the Secretariat after the meeting.

**Members
and
Secretariat**

Item 5 Concluding Publication for HEC (Paper No. 4/2010)

5.1 **The Chairman** said that at the 29th HEC meeting, Members suggested preparing a term-end report outlining HEC's achievements in the past six years, which could serve as a reference for the future Harbourfront Commission. After the meeting, he had met the Secretary for Development to give further thoughts to the approach. In order to share Members' thoughts and views on harbourfront enhancement with a wider readership, it was suggested that a concluding publication in the form of a book with a richer content, nicer layout and more Member's participation be produced. The book would be a compilation of articles written by both non-official and official Members, reflecting on the work of HEC and its sub-committees over the years. Members could contribute articles that they had published in the past few years on their experiences in harbourfront enhancement. They could also contribute new articles that they wished to dedicate to the publication. Both English and Chinese articles were welcome. The proposed content of the book was at

Annex to Paper No. 4/2010. It was also suggested that a small editorial team be set up to oversee the production of the book, which would be co-chaired by a representative from HEC and Principal Assistant Secretary for Development (Harbour). For the purpose of attaining a wider readership, the publication was intended to be distributed to the LegCo, District Councils, relevant NGOs and professional institutions, universities, schools for their libraries and public libraries. Subject to Members' comments, the Editorial Team would start work later in the month and seek contributions of articles and other materials from Members by the end of March 2010, with a view to publishing and distributing the book in June 2010.

5.2 **Mrs Carrie Lam** considered that the publication of a book, rather than a term-end report, was more commensurate with the importance of HEC. The idea of producing a book was also inspired by Mr Vincent Ng's series of newspaper articles, particularly the recent one on the DSD's Sheung Wan Floodwater Pumping Station cum waterfront park at ex-Sheung Wan Gala Point. She hoped that Members would support the idea and she would encourage Government officials involved in the work of HEC to contribute articles as well as photos capturing HEC at work and in local and overseas visits. She suggested that a group photograph of all HEC members should be included in the publication and the Kwun Tong Promenade might be a suitable location for the photo shooting. She suggested combining the photo call with a farewell lunch that she would host for HEC some time in March.

5.3 In response to Mr Nicholas Brooke's enquiries, **Mr Terence Yu** said that the related design, artwork, photography, copy writing, editing and proof-reading etc. would be outsourced to a consultant to ensure the quality of the publication. To take stock of the topics on which Members would like to contribute articles, **Mrs Lam** suggested that Members inform the Secretariat of their suggested topics in the following few days.

**Members
and
Secretariat**

5.4 **Mr Zimmerman** considered the production of a

concluding publication for HEC an excellent idea. He suggested including nice photographs of the harbour and conceptual plans of the future harbourfront in the publication.

5.5 **Mrs Lam** suggested and Mr Vincent Ng agreed to represent HEC as the co-chairman of the Editorial Team since the idea of producing the publication was inspired by his articles. **Mr Vincent Ng** appealed to Members for support and contributions to the publication.

5.6 **The meeting** agreed to proceed with the proposed production of the concluding publication. **The Chairman** said that due to other office commitments, Mrs Carrie Lam had to leave the meeting. He thanked Mrs Lam for attending the final meeting of HEC and her support to HEC in the past six years.

Item 6 Presentation on the Revised Planning and Urban Design Concepts of the Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (Paper No. 5/2010)

6.1 **The Chairman** said that at the last meeting, some members suggested that PlanD should give a presentation on the Revised Master Layout Plan (MLP) of the Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront. He welcomed Ms Phyllis Li, Assistant Director/Special Duties and Ms Fiona Lung, Chief Town Planner/Special Duties of PlanD.

6.2 **Ms Li and Ms Lung** presented Paper No. 5/2010 with the aid of a PowerPoint.

6.3 **Ir Dr Greg Wong** said that the design of the landscaped deck in Sites 1 and 2 was important. The design of the buildings in Site 5 should be compatible with the Central Government Complex (CGC) and LegCo Complex at Tamar. While the Task Group on Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (TGUDS) under HEC recommended that the 58,000 m² commercial GFA from Sites 1 and 2 could be transferred to other locations, such as Site 5, it was not necessary to redistribute all

58,000 m² GFA to Site 5 for the proposed office and hotel development. In addition, the design of Sites 5 and 6 should be further enhanced to improve their connectivity with CGC at Tamar and the Academy for Performing Arts (APA) Extension.

6.4 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** had the following comments –

- Sites 4 and 7 should be broken down into smaller sites to achieve a more interactive development.
- The transport issue between the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre and the Airport Express Station at Central had not been resolved.
- Sites 1, 2 and 3 still appeared to have a very large area at ground level to be used for road infrastructure. There was also a conflict between the ventilation shaft and the landscaped deck at Site 1.
- Site 3 should be split into smaller sites with a view to avoiding a single developer for the entire site.
- The courtyards at Site 4 should face the harbour rather than the road.
- A workable PPP model for alfresco dining facilities should be considered for the development of Site 7.
- Reassembly of the Queen's Pier by the harbour at Site 8 was not supported noting that a large amount of money would be needed.
- The viewing platform next to Pier 10 would block the view of the harbour.
- A deck should be built at Sites 5 and 6 to separate the pedestrians from the high speed traffic.

6.5 **Dr Ng Mee-kam** asked about the status of the current plan and the next steps to take forward the revised design concepts. **Mr Kim Chan** enquired about the different green

areas in the waterfront promenade and suggested integrating the design of the ventilation shafts along Road P2 with the existing buildings.

6.6 Ms Li gave the following responses to Members' comments –

- The landscaped deck at Sites 1 and 2 was required to provide pedestrian connectivity between the CBD core and the waterfront and for holding harbourfront events. The deck would be subject to detailed design to ensure its optimum size and comprehensive landscape treatment.
- There would be a number of at-grade crossings along Road P2. The implementation agent would be required to adopt an integrated design for the Airport Railway Extended Overrun Tunnel ventilation shafts along Road P2.
- In response to public views, the courtyards at Site 4 were adopted and were deliberately designed to face the City Hall so as to provide more greenery as viewed from the City Hall and a landscaped buffer for the leisure and dining facilities at Site 4. It would be subject to detailed design by the implementation agent.
- Planning and design brief would be prepared to guide the proposed office and hotel development at Site 5 to minimize the visual impact of the development and to ensure compatibility with CGC and the LegCo Complex at Tamar. The plot ratio of Site 5 was about 5 which was compatible with the development intensity of the Tamar development and much lower than the existing commercial building to its south.
- The integrated pedestrian walkway system at Site 6 would be designed to enhance pedestrian experience. More at-grade art displays would be encouraged in the proposed district open space in the arts and cultural precinct.

- No landscaped deck was designed at Site 6 as the site was too narrow to accommodate the landing of the deck and a large deck there would block the open view of the harbour.
- The alfresco dining facilities could not be placed right along the waterfront at Site 7 due to the presence of emergency vehicular access and utility structures. The design of the outdoor dining facilities would be subject to overall comprehensive consideration of the design and implementation for the waterfront promenade.
- Provision of environmentally friendly transport modes at Site 7 to enhance east-west connectivity would be considered, subject to detailed assessment and design.
- The viewing platform next to Pier 10 was designed to soften the visual effect of the pumping station beneath it. It would be subject to detailed design by the implementation agent.
- In response to public views, an “urban green” concept would be adopted in the design of the waterfront promenade, with different greening areas, like “urban forest” and lawn area for enjoyment by the public.
- The planning design concepts had been revised to take on board the views of the public and the TGUDS. More detailed planning and design briefs would be prepared for the key sites to take the revised design concepts forward.
- The revised design concepts could be accommodated under the planning framework of the current Outline Zoning Plan, except that for Site 5 which would require zoning amendment.

6.7 **The Chairman** thanked Ms Phyllis Li and Ms Fiona Lung for their presentation. He said that if Members had further views on the topic, they could send their comments to the Secretariat for relay to PlanD after the meeting.

**Members
And
Secretariat**

Item 7 Briefing on Transport Infrastructure and the Harbourfront (Paper No. 6/2010)

7.1 **The Chairman** said that at the 29th HEC meeting, Mr Paul Zimmerman suggested that THB should be invited to brief HEC on how harbourfront enhancement had been taken into account in transport planning and design. He welcomed Mr Fletch Chan of THB and Ms Ying Fun-fong, Chief Engineer/Transport Planning of TD.

7.2 With the aid of a PowerPoint, **Mr Chan** presented Paper No. 6/2010 and also highlighted a few specific transport issues on harbourfront planning which were not mentioned in the paper but had been raised by HEC Members before, namely Nathan Road at-grade crossing, enhancement of integration between the harbour and the hinterland, and improving key waterfront sites under the Hong Kong Island East Harbour-front Study.

7.3 **Mr Lam Kin-lai** remarked that the shortage of parking spaces was a long standing problem. To reduce the need to build road infrastructure at the harbourfront, he added that measures should be taken to reduce the occupation of road by franchised buses. Consideration should also be given to walkways over subways and the use of elevators in improving the connectivity to the harbourfront.

7.4 **Mr Zimmerman** said that the shortage of parking spaces for goods vehicles and coaches had been identified over a decade ago. For private cars, there had been a large surplus of parking spaces in the territory. He did not support the use of waterfront land for any temporary parking spaces, and urged that tenancies would not be renewed, especially those for private car parks. He also noted that there was insufficient consideration in planning waterfront areas for holding areas for visitors' coaches and for equipment for large events, the demand for which was likely to increase with the enhancement of the waterfront.

7.5 **Ms Ying Fun-fong** responded that TD had recently

commissioned a consultancy study to address the parking/loading/unloading problem for goods vehicles on the Hong Kong Island. TD would also work out special transport arrangements with the Police for large scale events so that they could be held in a safe and smooth manner. Regarding pedestrian crossing facilities, it was the current practice to install more lifts for footbridges in order to save space and to assist disabled pedestrians in using the crossing facilities. At-grade pedestrian crossing would be provided as far as possible but in some specific areas where the road traffic was too heavy, the pedestrians and the vehicles would be separated to enhance pedestrian safety.

Item 8 Progress Report by Worcester Polytechnic Institute (WPI) on its Research on Victoria Harbour Marine Uses and Land/Water Interfaces

8.1 **The Chairman** said that the item was proposed by Mr Paul Zimmerman at the last meeting. He welcomed Mr Brian Berard, Mr Jarrad Fallon, Mr Santiago Lora, Mr Alexander Muir, Mr Eric Rosendahl, Mr Lucas Scotta, Mr Alexander Wong and Ms Becky Yang from WPI of the USA.

8.2 **Messrs Muir, Rosendahl and Wong** presented the progress report tabled at the meeting with the aid of a PowerPoint. The following recommendations were made –

- To increase the amount of sheltered water available in Victoria Harbour to meet the demand for both shelter during typhoons and year-round mooring facilities;
- To move the breakwaters in the Causeway Bay and To Kwa Wan typhoon shelters to increase the amount of sheltered water available in Victoria Harbour for both moorings as well as shelter during typhoons;
- To prioritize land around sheltered water for marine users. Sheltered water was crucial for the safe mooring of smaller vessels and the waterfront should be designed to be able to cater to and support marine users

accordingly;

- To recognize the industrial marine uses in Yau Ma Tei, Tai Kok Tsui and Stonecutters, and provide adequate land, access and modern permanent facilities. The conglomeration of marine services, from cargo handling to repairs, guaranteed that the industry could operate efficiently and cost-effectively, and support Hong Kong as a maritime and shipping hub;
- To use the sheltered water in Yau Tong Bay for public marinas to promote community leisure uses of the harbour;
- To utilize the To Kwa Wan typhoon shelter to provide moorings for the tourism-supporting marine users, including harbour tours and water taxis;
- To use the Central-Wanchai Bypass and Sha Tin Central Link construction to improve and expand the Causeway Bay typhoon shelter and adjacent ex-PCWA. Improvements included: enlarging the shelter, improving the mooring system with pontoons, ensuring cleaner water, increasing the water depth, and ensuring access and amenities for community, leisure and watersport uses;
- To use the Kai Tak Approach Channel and Typhoon Shelter for community, leisure and water sports;
- With the development of the West Kowloon Cultural District, Kai Tak, and all other waterfronts, there would be an increase in demand for harbour-based tourism, leisure, and transport. In response to those growing numbers, new piers and landing steps should be created in development areas in order to ensure access to the waterfront;
- To improve the design of piers and landing steps throughout the harbour in land access, signage, ticketing/information, lighting, shelter and safety; and
- To consider a more liberal policy permitting mooring and

berthing of larger vessels along the shoreline adjacent to promenades and pleasure grounds.

8.3 **Mr Zimmerman** remarked that both the physical harbour and the uses of the harbour had to be protected.

8.4 **The Chairman** thanked the students for giving the presentation on their comprehensive survey on the marine uses in the Victoria Harbour.

Item 9 Any Other Business

9.1 Noting that there would be a short gap before the establishment of the Harbour Commission, **the Chairman** asked the Secretary of HEC if there would be any interim arrangements to handle submissions or enquiries to HEC after the expiry of the current term on 28 February 2010.

9.2 **Ms Alice Cheung** said that the Secretariat would take stock of any subsequent public enquiries, project submissions or outstanding matters and refer them to the future Commission for consideration upon its establishment. As of 17 February, the Secretariat had received a few requests which would be referred to the new Commission for consideration. Those included –

- A request from Ir Dr Greg Wong who suggested that the future Commission should look into the following three issues regarding the new Central harbourfront –
 - (a) the design of Queen's Pier on the waterfront to ensure its function and usage;
 - (b) the visual impact of the buildings on Site 5; and
 - (c) connectivity issues regarding the CGC at Tamar, Sites 5 and 6 to APA Extension.

- At the HEC meeting in June 2009, Waterfront Air Limited (WAL) briefed HEC on its seaplane proposal, and THB representatives responded that WAL needed to resolve a range of technical issues before the proposal

could be taken forward. The Secretariat had recently received an update from WAL that it had signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the Shenzhen Airport Ferry Terminal Services Company Limited in January 2010 on the possibility of operating seaplane services from Shenzhen Airport Ferry Pier to various destinations in the Greater Pearl River Delta. WAL hoped to obtain support from HEC for it to operate seaplane services in Hong Kong. As the proposal was an aviation project that involved a ferry pier in Hong Kong, the Secretariat would seek the comments of THB and refer to the new Harbourfront Commission for consideration in due course.

Vote of Thanks

9.3 **The Chairman** thanked Members for their dedication and long-standing contributions to HEC over the past six years, in particular Ir Dr Greg Wong and Mr Vincent Ng, who had contributed so much of their invaluable time as the Chairmen of TGUDS and HPR Sub-com. He also thanked the Secretariat, DEVB and other government colleagues for their strong support to the work of HEC.

9.4 **Mr Vincent Ng** proposed a vote of thanks to Prof Lee for his outstanding leadership in guiding the work of the HEC in the past six years. **The meeting** supported the vote of thanks with applause.

9.5 There being no other business, the meeting ended at 5:40 pm.

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