

HEC Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review

Minutes of Twenty-third Meeting

Date : 28 July 2008
Time : 2:15 pm
Venue : Conference Room, 15/F, North Point Government Offices
333 Java Road, North Point

Present

Mr Vincent Ng (Chairman)	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Dr Andrew Thomson	Representing Business Environment Council
Dr Sujata Govada	Representing Citizen Envisioning @ Harbour
Dr Alvin Kwok	Representing Conservancy Association
Mrs Mei Ng	Representing Friends of the Earth
Dr Chan Fuk-cheung	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers (HKIE)
Mr Mason Hung	Representing Hong Kong Tourism Board
Mr Paul Zimmerman	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour Ltd.
Mr Nicholas Brooke	
Mr Patrick Lau	
Miss Amy Yuen	Principal Assistant Secretary (Planning and Lands) 2, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Jeff Lam	Assistant Director (Headquarters), Lands Department (LandsD)
Mr Raymond WM Wong	Assistant Director/Territorial, Planning Department (PlanD)
Ms Ying Fun-fong	Chief Engineer/Transport Planning, Transport Department
Mr Peter Mok	Senior Engineer/Kowloon 2, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Ms Sally Fong (Secretary)	Senior Town Planner/Studies & Research 3, PlanD

pending and the HEC Secretariat would follow up on the matter.

[Post-meeting note: At its meeting on 18 August 2008, the HEC was informed that the concerned Government bureaux/ departments (including THB) had agreed to provide the relevant information to the HEC Secretariat for dissemination to HEC Members.]

Views of the Sub-committee on various proposals presented at the 22nd meeting (paras. 3 to 7 of the minutes of the 22nd meeting)

- 2.2 The meeting noted that the relevant parts of the meeting minutes confirmed under Item 1 regarding these development proposals would be forwarded to the concerned parties/approving authorities for reference after the meeting.

[Post-meeting note: The relevant parts of the confirmed minutes of meeting were forwarded to the concerned parties/approving authorities for reference on 30 July 2008.]

- 2.3 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested and the meeting agreed that the Inventory should be updated, where appropriate, to reflect the various proposals discussed at the last meeting. **Secretariat**

[Post-meeting Note: The Inventory was updated to include the proposed gas station at To Kwa Wan and the proposed outfall of Tsuen Wan Drainage Tunnel.]

Demolition of the piers at the former Kennedy Town Incinerator and Abattoir (para. 9.2 of the minutes of the 22nd meeting)

- 2.4 The issue would be discussed under agenda Item 5.

Inventory of Known Projects at Harbourfront

- 2.5 The Inventory was emailed to Members in advance before the meeting. **The Secretary** highlighted that 4 new items (No. WHK3, C8, WC6 and KT3) had been added. The project proponent of Item No. WC6 would brief Members on its proposal under agenda Item 3.
- 2.6 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested discussing his proposals to beef up the Inventory under agenda Item 8. Regarding Members' previous proposal of putting the Inventory on-line, **the Chairman** said that it could also be discussed under agenda Item 8.

Item 3 Re-provisioning of Refuse Collection Point at Paterson Street, Causeway Bay (Paper No. 13/2008)

3.1 **The Chairman** invited the following representatives of the Project Team to the meeting:

Mr Wong Kwai-ping)	Food and Environmental Hygiene
Mr Shum Nam-lung)	Department (FEHD)
Mr Lo Chi-sing)	Architectural Services Department
Mr Eric Chan)	Architect, Able Engineering
Mr Choi Siu-wah)	Company Ltd.

3.2 **The Project Team** presented the proposal with the aid of powerpoint slides.

3.3 Members had the following views/questions:

- (a) although the design of the new refuse collection point (RCP) at the subject site was an improvement to the current facility, locating the RCP close to the harbour-front seemed undesirable;
- (b) whether other possible options of locating the RCP, such as to areas underneath the flyover, had been investigated;
- (c) it appeared that selecting the subject site for RCP was not based on the consideration to identify a geographically convenient location to service its catchment areas, as both the current and the proposed locations of the RCP were remote from the immediate residential neighbourhood;
- (d) the subject site offered a good opportunity to enhance access to the harbour-front. However, the current proposal, if implemented, would take away this opportunity;
- (e) whether the capacity of the Paterson Street RCP could be absorbed by other RCPs nearby;
- (f) the RCP approximately 450m to the west along Gloucester Road, which was in poor condition and unsightly, needed upgrading. Whether it was possible to consolidate the two RCPs to the subject site, thus providing opportunity to improve the environment;

- (g) whether any specific use had been identified for the vacant area adjoining the subject site. In determining the future use of this vacant site, consideration should be given to screening off the unsightly equipment of the proposed RCP;
- (h) whether adequate space within the site had been reserved for other RCP-related activities, such as sorting of materials for recycle; and
- (i) FEHD should provide an overview of their harbour-front sites for the Sub-committee's reference.

3.4 In response, **the Project Team** made the following points:

- (a) there was difficulty in finding a suitable "Government, Institution or Community" site within the catchment area to re-provision the existing Paterson Street RCP as the area was densely populated and fully developed. The existing RCP had been serving the local community for over 30 years, and both residents and business operators were accustomed to the current operation. The Wan Chai District Council and respective Area Committees had been consulted and agreed on the proposal;
- (b) according to the HKPSG, a RCP was required to serve the needs of each population of 20,000 persons or areas within a distance of 500m. The subject RCP and the one at Gloucester Road served two different catchment areas;
- (c) it would not be feasible to consolidate the Gloucester Road RCP and the Paterson Street RCP as one facility. The waste handling capacities of the two RCPs totalled 45 tonnes. A much larger site than the subject site would be required to accommodate the aggregated capacity, and more trips for refuse collection vehicles would be anticipated. Hence, there was no plan to combine the two RCPs;
- (d) the purpose of relocating the existing RCP was to facilitate road widening to improve area-wide traffic condition. The new RCP with updated provisions would meet the current standards to guarantee effective delivery of hygienic service to the public. With careful design of the RCP buildings and extensive landscaping, the visual

impact of the proposed development would be minimised;

- (e) based on on-going discussions with concerned Government departments, the vacant land to the south of the subject site would be for landscape features; and
- (f) regarding the future operation of the subject RCP, loading/unloading activities would be handled within an indoor refuse handling area. Moreover, a designated area within the site would be provided to cater for some material recovery activities. The building structure also provided ancillary facilities to house operation staff.

3.5 Members had the following further comments/questions:

- (a) land adjoining the subject RCP would unlikely be an attractive sitting-out area for pedestrians, other than as landscaping uses. Innovative ideas such as the installation of public art or sculpture with an educational theme on waste reduction might be worth considering; and
- (b) the Government should rethink the strategy for refuse collection and waste reduction. Examples could be drawn from overseas countries such as provision of sub-surface disposal facilities.

3.6 **The Chairman** summarised the discussion as follows:

- (a) the Sub-committee appreciated the design of the RCP, but expressed concern on the siting of the facility at a location close to the waterfront; and
- (b) the Sub-committee considered that the subject site and its adjoining vacant land could provide opportunity to enhance public accessibility to the waterfront. However, the siting of the proposed RCP at the subject location might deprive the public of such opportunity. The adjoining vacant land could only be turned into a landscaped area for greening effects.

3.7 **The Chairman** said that the Town Planning Board (TPB) had scheduled to consider the proposal in August 2008 and the Secretariat would convey the Sub-committee's views to TPB.

Secretariat

[Post-meeting note: TPB decided at its meeting on 15 August 2008 to defer consideration of the application at the applicant's request.]

Item 4 Harbour Area Treatment Scheme Stage 2A : Sewage Conveyance System - Layout Design of Facilities at the Eastern End of Fung Mat Road, Sai Ying Pun (Paper No. 14/2008)

4.1 **The Chairman** invited the following representatives of the Project Team to the meeting:

Mr Albert Chan)	Drainage Services Department (DSD)
Mr Keith Tsang)	Metcalf & Eddy - Maunsell
Mr Gary Shing)	Joint Venture

4.2 **The Project Team** presented the proposal with the aid of powerpoint slides.

4.3 Members had the following comments/questions:

- (a) the design of the proposed facilities represented a positive attempt to minimise impacts of the development on the harbour-front environment. The temporary works area however seemed disproportionately large and would block public access to the waterfront;
- (b) the Project Team should further work on the landscape proposal. Consideration should be given to providing more landscape planting than the use of tile/paving as per the draft landscape plan. Soft landscape treatment for the roof-top should also be considered;
- (c) adequate deodorization facility should be implemented to minimise its nuisance on future park uses;
- (d) whether waterfront access was required for the works area and whether the entire frontage currently proposed along the harbour was necessary;
- (e) whether it was possible to locate the temporary works area to the immediate south of the subject site so as to release the waterfront space for public usage;
- (f) even if a strip of waterfront land could be set aside, it

would unlikely attract public usage during the works period. The proponent should be requested to implement the landscaping of the area upon completion of the temporary works; and

- (g) the proponent was encouraged to formulate a comprehensive plan to integrate the landscape design of the subject site with the adjoining open space and secure funding for implementation of the landscape proposal upon completion of the project.

4.4 **The Project Team** had the following responses:

- (a) due to its large scale, the project would be carried out in three contracts. The proposed temporary works area would be shared by two groups of contractors. As a lot of heavy machinery would be required for the project, the current size of the temporary works area was the minimum required;
- (b) the proposed landscape treatment as shown on the draft landscape plan was indicative and could be revised to tie in with the design of the adjacent open space to be developed by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) in future. It was understood from LCSD that there was no programme on the landscape design of the open space at the moment;
- (c) apart from maintenance, there were no other activities associated with the operation of the shaft after commissioning of the HATS Stage 2A Sewage Conveyance System. The shafts would be completely enclosed, and the odour arising from its operation would not be significant. The future underground deodorization unit would provide treatment to the foul air in the junction shaft to the required standard before release;
- (d) marine access would be required to facilitate transportation of machinery and construction materials by sea. The proposed location of the temporary works areas was right next to the Western Wholesale Food Market and at the end of the planned open space, thus minimising its disturbance to the waterfront;
- (e) part of the area to the south of the subject site would be retained as a temporary lorry park to meet the local need

as requested by the Central and Western District Council;

- (f) it was the intention of DSD to secure funding for its project including implementation of the landscape proposal; and
- (g) there were a number of projects being/to be undertaken along the Sheung Wan waterfront, including the Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park (Phase II) and laying of Western Cross Harbour Main. Upon gradual completion of these projects, a continuous waterfront promenade would be realised.

4.5 **The Chairman** concluded the discussion as below:

- (a) the Sub-committee appreciated the design of the facilities to reduce the scale of the aboveground structures to maximise visual porosity and promote permeability, which were generally in line with the Harbour Planning Principles (HPPs);
- (b) the main concern was on the large size of the temporary works area as it was located right on the waterfront; and
- (c) the Sub-committee was aware that a number of projects would be carried out in the Western District and had concern about their impacts on the design integration and programme coordination of the planned open space along the waterfront in the area.

4.6 **The Chairman** said that the Sub-committee's view on the project would be conveyed to the relevant parties for reference. In response to a Member's suggestion, **the Chairman** also requested the Secretariat to include the former Sheung Wan Public Filling Barging Point site in the Inventory for on-going monitoring.

Secretariat

[Post-meeting note: The Former Sheung Wan Public Filling Barging Point site had been included in the Inventory.]

Item 5 MTR West Island Line - Proposed Re provisioning of Kennedy Town Swimming Pool and Temporary Works Areas (Paper No. 16/2008)

5.1 The following representatives of the Project Team were invited to the meeting:

Mr P H Tang) Mass Transit Railway Corporation Ltd.
Mr Clement Ngai) (MTRCL)
Mr Robert Seddon)
Ms Maggie So)

Mr Cyrus Wong) Highways Department (HyD)
Mr Matthew Fung)
Mr James Sze)
Mr Stephen Wat)

5.2 **The Project Team** presented the proposal with the aid of powerpoint slides.

5.3 Members had the following views/questions:

Swimming Pool

- (a) whether it was possible to place the plant room underground so as to minimise the scale of the building structure;
- (b) the design of the swimming pool was creative. Nevertheless, effort should be made to enhance its connectivity with the adjacent park, the waterfront and the inland areas;
- (c) whether the use of solar panels had been considered for the proposed swimming pool, and what were the reasons for having a covered pool rather than an open-air design;
- (d) consideration could be given to employing other energy saving technologies such as heat pump for the pool;

Temporary Works Area

- (e) reference should be made to the HPPs in selecting sites for the temporary works areas;
- (f) whether the works area could be reduced in size and set back to make the waterfront available for public enjoyment;
- (g) given the long time span of the WIL project, whether work could be better scheduled so as to minimise the extent of

the temporary works areas along the waterfront;

- (h) consideration should be given to develop the PCWA site for open space use after its occupation as a works area;
- (i) the project would provide an opportunity for harbour-front enhancement. For instance, the project proponents could be entrusted to enhance the waterfront in conjunction with the project;
- (j) apart from the ex-abattoir site, whether there was any other suitable site to reprovision the HyD's depot;
- (k) of the three existing piers along the ex-abattoir site, consideration should be given to fix up the eastern pier and make it available for public use as soon as possible. As for the central and western piers, attempts should be made to retain them as far as possible, particularly the central pier, and to make them structurally safe for public use in future after completion of the WIL project;
- (l) whether the proposed underground magazine site was necessary, given its possible impacts on the natural landscape; and
- (m) it was noted that, in the forthcoming years, the whole stretch of waterfront along the north-western shore of Hong Kong Island would be subject to construction activities. A composite solution should be considered to mitigate the adverse impacts arising from these works. Moreover, the Sub-committee should be provided with complete information of all the existing and planned works along this part of the waterfront.

5.4 In response, **the Project Team** explained the following points:

Swimming Pool

- (a) potential flooding was a major concern in placing the plant room underground. In designing the swimming pool structure, the Project Team had given consideration to, amongst others, site condition, ease of maintenance as well as timing of the programme. The current design would allow for direct off-road vehicle loading and the above-ground plant room would enable gravity drainage, instead of pumping out the water from the pool, for easy

maintenance upon handing back the completed facility to the Government;

- (b) there were street level pedestrian crossings on Sai Cheung Street and Shing Sai Road to enhance public access. The main entrance to the swimming pool would be from ground level with access to the viewing deck. To provide a 24-hour thoroughfare within the pool on the deck level might not be practicable from management and security point of view;
- (c) the design of the swimming pool had incorporated solar panels to provide some heating to the indoor pool in addition to boilers;
- (d) the indoor multi-purpose pool and training pool could provide year-round facilities to the community. They would complement the all-weather competition pool and training pool at the Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park (Phase II). It was intended that, in the summer months, the glazed area of the indoor pool would be opened to induce natural ventilation. Besides, the structures for the swimming pool could, to a certain extent, act as a sound barrier mitigating its noise impact on the nearby residential buildings;

Temporary Works Area

- (e) it would be difficult to reduce the size of the temporary works area as a number of machinery and equipment for the WIL project would need to be accommodated;
- (f) in terms of programming, construction work of the WIL project would start in 2009 for completion by 2013/2014. It was anticipated that the PCWA could be returned to the Government by 2013 upon completion of the excavation works;
- (g) the suggestion to open up the waterfront for public use at the ex-abattoir site might not be feasible. The site was subject to pollution and the Environmental Impact Assessment carried out was on the premise that the site be used as works area only. Besides, the waterfront, even if opened up, would not provide a pleasant environment for the public to enjoy in view of the on-going construction works;

- (h) there were no other available sites in this part of Hong Kong Island for the reprovisioning of HyD's depot. Upon completion of the WIL, the depot site would be vacated and handed back to the Government together with the other works areas;
- (i) retaining the central and western piers might affect the barging activities to be carried out along that part of the waterfront. The issue would have to be discussed further with concerned Government bureaux/departments; and
- (j) the magazine site was necessary to provide overnight storage of explosives required for the construction works to enable timely completion of the WIL. The site was remotely located, and the potential impact on the natural landscape would not be significant.

5.5 **The Chairman** summarised the discussion as follows:

- (a) the Sub-committee had no major comments on the design of the swimming pool but suggested the project team consider improving the connectivity of the swimming pool with the waterfront and adjoining areas;
- (b) whilst acknowledging the need for works areas related to the construction of the WIL, the Sub-committee had concern on the large size and waterfront location of these works areas. It considered that the Government should require the project proponent to landscape such works areas for public enjoyment upon completion of the WIL project; and
- (c) it was suggested that the eastern pier should be fixed up and make available for community use as soon as possible, whereas the central pier and, as far as possible, the western pier should be retained for public use in future.

5.6 **The Project Team** said that the Sub-committee's suggestion would be considered. However, the initial observation was that, if the central and western piers were retained, the barging activities would have to be carried out further east close to the eastern pier, rendering it more difficult for community use.

**MTRCL
and HyD**

5.7 **The Chairman** suggested the Project Team to further consider Members' comments and thanked them for attending the

meeting.

Item 6 Amendments to the Draft Quarry Bay Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H21/24 (Paper No. 17/2008)

6.1 The following representatives of PlanD and its consultant were invited to the meeting:

Ms Brenda Au) Hong Kong District Planning Office,
Ms Phoebe Chan) PlanD
Ms Sandy Chan)

Ms Alice Cheung) City U Professional Services Ltd.

6.2 **Ms Phoebe Chan** briefed Members on the amendments to the Quarry Bay Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) with the aid of powerpoint slides.

6.3 Members had the following comments/questions:

- (a) the need of preserving views to ridgelines had been advocated for many years, but some excessively tall buildings had still been approved recently. The effectiveness of the existing legislation might need to be reviewed to avoid similar cases in future. In so doing, a proper balance between meeting public aspirations and respecting developers' interests should be considered;
- (b) the proposed building height (BH) control appeared to be arbitrary. It should not be considered alone without regard to the density issue. How the BH control would improve quality of life/liveability and contribute to harbour-front enhancement was also important. Such aspects as environmental pollution, accessibility to day light, accessibility to Harbour, etc. should not be overlooked;
- (c) the current proposal to regulate the skyline of the area was a step towards the right direction. Consideration could be given to allowing some taller buildings at certain locations to make the existing skyline more interesting;
- (d) the suggestion to reduce the BH of built developments recently approved/completed might serve little purpose as they were unlikely to be redeveloped even in a long term; but on the other hand, the proposed tightening of

BH upon redevelopment might undermine the redevelopment potential of some sites and would induce endless legal challenge. The Government should re-think such an approach on imposition of BH control;

- (e) it was suggested to state clearly in the Explanatory Statement of the OZP that harbour-front developments should have due regard to the HPPs. Nonetheless, the HPPs should not be misused and applied to buildings located far away from the harbour-front;
- (f) to enhance air circulation, appropriate control should be stipulated on the OZP to avoid podium structures for buildings at the foothill of Tai Tam Country Park upon redevelopment. More information on how air flows would be improved by the proposed non-building areas should be provided for reference;
- (g) what the current status of some of the waterfront sites in the area were, as these sites had been occupied by temporary uses for many years;
- (h) the existing gross floor area (GFA) and the total GFA of the area covered by the Quarry Bay OZP upon full development should be provided for Members' reference after the meeting; and **PlanD**
- (i) the powerpoint presentation materials should be made available, say, by uploading them onto HEC's website, for public access. **Secretariat**

6.4 In response, **Ms Brenda Au** made the following points:

- (a) the main objective of the amendments to the Quarry Bay OZP was related to the imposition of BH control to prevent excessively tall and out-of-context developments. The BH review had tried to strike a balance between the need for planning control and respecting development rights;
- (b) the imposition of BH restrictions on future redevelopment of some recently completed buildings was considered necessary as a matter of principles and to reflect the overall BH concept and the planning intention district-wide, although such buildings were unlikely to be redeveloped in the near future;

- (c) the guidelines for preserving views to the ridgelines were only promulgated in 2003 upon completion of the study on "Urban Design Guidelines". The current review to stipulate BH control on OZP was undertaken with reference to the guidelines. Whilst developments, such as those in Taikoo Place and City Plaza One Redevelopment, which had already obtained building plans approval would not be affected by the current review, future amendments to approved building plans would be subject to the new BH restrictions;
- (d) the majority of the large scale residential developments in the area, like Taikoo Shing, Kornhill and Nam Fung Sun Chuen, were developed more than 20 years ago. Their floor-to-floor heights were lower than that of the modern standard. The newly imposed BH restrictions would allow some room for these sites to achieve the modern standard upon redevelopment. This, together with the generally taller commercial/office developments in the Taikoo Place area as permitted under the OZP, would help make the existing skyline more interesting;
- (e) in determining the BH restrictions, reference had been made to the HPPs. The main considerations were to strengthen the existing stepped height profile with building height descending towards waterfront and to prevent intrusion by future developments into the 20% building-free zone of the ridgelines. The Quarry Bay waterfront was largely zoned "Open Space" ("O") for public enjoyment. For the two sites zoned "Other Specified Uses (OU) (1)" and "OU(2)" at Hoi Yu Street for low-rise cultural, leisure and tourism uses, any development required planning permission and the HPPs would be duly taken into account in the planning application process;
- (f) to facilitate air ventilation, some non-building areas and building gaps were designated on the OZP based on the recommendations of the air ventilation assessment, detailed information of which could be found on PlanD's website;
- (g) in general, the large scale residential developments in the area had already been built up to their maximum development intensity allowed under the respective

leases. The photomontages indicating the proposed height bands were prepared on the assumption that only those buildings with age over 30 years and had not been built to the maximum permissible plot ratio would be redeveloped. Such buildings mainly concentrated in the south-western part of the OZP area; and

- (h) the "O" sites on the waterfront covered the Quarry Bay Park (including the remaining phase). Part of the "OU(1)" and "OU(2)" sites was used temporarily as public filling barging points until end 2008. However, as the planning of these two sites was subject to legal proceedings, the waterfront might not be readily available for development into its planned use even after the temporary uses had ceased operation.

6.5 **The Chairman** concluded that whilst relevant HPPs had been considered in proposing the BH restrictions, BH control alone could not resolve issues affecting the urban fabric. Members' views expressed at the meeting would be conveyed to TPB for reference. He thanked the representatives of PlanD and its consultant for attending the meeting.

Secretariat

Item 7 Project No. 9327WF - Laying of Western Cross Harbour Main and Associated Land Mains from West Kowloon to Sai Ying Pun

7.1 The following representatives of the Project Team were invited to the meeting:

Mr Jaime Rosario) Water Supplies Department (WSD)

Mr Ching Sai-hung) Mott Connell Ltd.

Mr Fung Yuk-lun)

7.2 **The Project Team** presented the project and its proposed works area in West Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD) with the aid of powerpoint slides.

7.3 Members had the following questions/comments:

- (a) the duration and extent of the works area should be clarified;
- (b) whether the site would be enhanced/reinstated after completion of the project;

- (c) whether public accessibility to the waterfront would be affected; and
- (d) chain link fence could be used to fence off the works areas to allow visual permeability to the Harbour.

7.4 **The Project Team** had the following responses:

- (a) the proposed works would commence in the first quarter of 2009 for a construction period of 36 months, followed by a 12-month maintenance period;
- (b) upon completion of the project, the works area would be reinstated and returned to LCSD;
- (c) the existing footpath would be diverted to maintain continuous public access along the harbour-front; and
- (d) the works area itself might not be visually appealing to the public. WSD would liaise with LCSD to decorate the hoardings to mitigate the visual impact.

7.5 Members had the following further comments/questions:

- (a) the works area would affect a section of the West Kowloon Waterfront Promenade, which was a quick-win project successfully implemented for public enjoyment pending construction of the WKCD development;
- (b) whether such a long construction period would be required for the subject project; whether it was necessary to locate the works area at the waterfront; and what were the differences between works area and works limits; and
- (c) more information on the works site in Sai Ying Pun should be provided for reference. There were other infrastructure projects in the Western District, but there appeared to have little coordination amongst the project departments. The Sub-committee was only presented with piecemeal information from different departments. A coordinator from the Government was required to collate the disjointed information and provide the Sub-committee with an overview.

7.6 In response, **the Project Team** explained the following points:

- (a) the existing North Point Cross Harbour Main and the Silver Mine Bay Submarine Mains would reach the end of their 50 design life years by 2012/13. A new main would be required to maintain continual water supply to Hong Kong Island. Upon completion of the new main, detailed investigation on the physical conditions of the existing pipes would be undertaken to determine whether the pipes could be rehabilitated for further use to increase the water transfer capacity;
- (b) the presence of the Western Harbour Crossing and other existing submarine water mains had limited the possible alignment options for the proposed submarine water main. The availability of land for launching and pulling of the submarine pipeline was also an important factor for consideration. The current alignment had taken into account these factors and was the shortest one to transfer fresh water from Kowloon to Hong Kong Island;
- (c) the proposed works area would mainly be used as working area for launching submarine pipeline, site offices and storage of pipes for laying, whereas works limits served to define the boundary where the contractors were allowed to carry out the main laying and related works;
- (d) the 36-month construction period had included the procurement period for the specially designed submarine pipes, erection of temporary working platforms, carrying out of pre-dredging works and contingencies in the work programme. During the procurement period, the contractors would start preparation works and laying of the land mains for connection with the submarine main;
- (e) the works in Sai Ying Pun mainly included digging up trenches and setting up a winch system to pull the water pipes. The impacts of the project on the Sai Ying Pun area were rather minimal; and
- (f) the need for promoting good harbour-front was fully acknowledged. The water mains would be put underground. Except during the construction stage, no permanent visual impact would be generated once the affected areas were reinstated upon completion of the main laying works. WSD had closely liaised with LCSD

in minimising the size of the works area in WKCD. WSD had also coordinated with DSD on their works sites in Sai Ying Pun so as to minimise disturbances caused to the public.

7.7 **The Chairman** concluded that:

- (a) the Sub-committee had reservation on the proposed works area as it would lead to the partial closure of the West Kowloon Waterfront Promenade, which was a quick-win project championed by HEC;
- (b) Members had queries on the siting, land requirement and duration of the proposed works area. It was generally considered that the works area should be so located to minimise disruption to public use of the harbour-front and that the land should also be enhanced for public enjoyment upon completion of the works; and
- (c) there was grave concern on the absence of complete information on the temporary works areas along the harbour-front and how they were coordinated in terms of land requirements and programming. A stronger coordinator was considered necessary.

7.8 He thanked the Project Team for attending the meeting.

[Post-meeting note: A Member sent further comments on the proposal to the Sub-committee on 29 July 2008, which had subsequently been forwarded to WSD for reference/follow up. On 18 September 2008, WSD submitted additional information on the project, which was forwarded to Members on 19 September 2008. The submission would be further discussed at the next meeting.]

Item 8 Harbourfront Enhancement Opportunities (Paper No. 15/2008)

- 8.1 **Miss Amy Yuen** presented the Paper with the aid of powerpoint slides. She informed Members that an inter-departmental working group would be set up under the coordination of DEVB to explore further opportunities for harbour-front enhancement.
- 8.2 With the Chairman's agreement, **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** showed Members a video featuring the recent short term uses at the Hung Hom waterfront. He expressed concern on the lack of

progress of the planned promenade since it was first discussed by HEC in 2004. He also tabled a submission with suggestions to beef up the lists of quick-wins and the Inventory. Regarding his suggestion to make available the Inventory on-line for Members' easy reference, he suggested that HEC Members might be assigned with a password to retrieve the information.

[Post-meeting note: Regarding the suggestion to put the Inventory on-line for Members' reference, given the HEC website was hosted in the Central Internet Gateway (CIG) web servers, any information uploaded onto the HEC website/CIG web servers should be open to the public for browsing freely on the Internet. The proposal to confine the access of information to HEC Members did not comply with this prevailing CIG practice.]

8.3 Members had the following suggestions/comments:

- (a) DEVB should take the lead to coordinate the planning and development of the harbour-front areas, including acquisition of funding and identification of works/management agents, to expedite implementation of quick-wins;
- (b) more systematic and comprehensive information on all existing and planned public works projects along the harbour-front, as well as the short and long term enhancement opportunities, should be compiled for the Sub-committee's reference. The Sub-committee could then be better informed before consideration of individual projects;
- (c) as a number of sites along the harbour-front were LCSD's project, LCSD should be invited to brief the Sub-committee on the status and implementation programme of these planned open space along the waterfront. Similarly, other departments such as WSD, DSD and HyD could be invited to brief the Sub-committee on how waterfront sites under their control could contribute to harbour-front enhancement;
- (d) availability of funding and identification of works agent were pre-requisites for harbour-front enhancement. Although the Eastern District Council had allocated \$3M to construct the planned 20m wide waterfront promenade at the Ex-North Point Estate site under the District Minor

Works Programme, funding and agents for its subsequent management/maintenance had yet to be ascertained. A more effective approach was to put the harbour-front enhancement initiatives and a works project as a package, similar to the Greening Master Plans (GMPs) undertaken by CEDD, when funding was sought from LegCo; and

- (e) the landscape proposals under the GMPs were another form of harbour-front enhancement and CEDD could share with the Sub-committee on their greening initiatives when they were ready.

8.4 **Mr Raymond Wong** made the following points:

- (a) while the works projects presented at this meeting might cause short term inconvenience to the public, such projects were required to improve utility infrastructures such as water supply and sewage treatment, which were essential to our daily life and had long term benefit to the community. The provisions of these facilities and the public aspiration for enjoyment of the harbour should not be considered as conflicting with each other;
- (b) although the district review study for Hong Kong Island West had yet to start, HPPs/HPGs could serve to provide immediate guidance for on-going developments, permanent or temporary, in the area;
- (c) the purpose of the Inventory was to provide a general overview of the major projects around the Harbour. Detailed information of specific projects could be provided to the Sub-committee if necessary. The Sub-committee could also invite individual project proponents to elaborate on their proposals; and
- (d) regarding the suggestions on the Inventory, most of the additional information suggested was in fact covered in the Inventory, but in slightly different format/terminology. Nonetheless, the Inventory could be modified taking into account Members' suggestions.

Secretariat

8.5 **Miss Amy Yuen** made the following points:

- (a) many harbour-front sites were not readily available for enhancement owing to site specific issues or historical reasons. Incompatible uses could only be relocated when

alternative sites were available. Efforts were therefore focused on those sites with greater certainty for implementation of harbour-front enhancements; and

- (b) it was impossible to implement the list of quick-win projects suggested all at one time, and setting priority for their implementation was necessary. Suggestions from the Sub-committee would be useful. Through the inter-departmental working group, DEVB would liaise with the relevant bureaux/departments with a view to ascertaining the feasibility of the enhancement proposals and identifying the works/management agents for implementation.

8.6 **The Chairman** remarked that relevant Government bureaux/ departments should work in collaboration with HEC for harbour-front enhancement. Whilst the works projects considered by the Sub-committee at this meeting were mainly in the Western District, there were other works projects taking place at different parts of the harbour-front. An overview of the existing and planned works projects should be provided for the Sub-committee's reference. It was also important to expedite implementation of the identified quick-win projects to enable early public enjoyment of the Harbour. He suggested and Members agreed to continue discussing this issue at future meetings when appropriate.

Item 9 Any Other Business

9.1 In the interest of time, the meeting agreed to defer discussion of any AOB. The meeting closed at 7:50pm.

**HEC Sub-committee on
Harbour Plan Review
September 2008**