

HEC Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review

Minutes of Twenty-seventh Meeting

Date : 18 March 2009
Time : 10:00 am
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 |
| Mr Kim Chan | Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners |
| Mr Yu Kam-hung | Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors |
| Mr Mason Hung | Representing Hong Kong Tourism Board |
| Mr Paul Zimmerman | Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour Ltd. |
| Mr Patrick Lau | |
| Ms Alice Cheung | Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), Development Bureau (DEVB) |
| Mr Jeff Lam | Assistant Director (Headquarters), Lands Department (LandsD) |
| Mr Raymond Lee | Chief Town Planner/Studies & Research, Planning Department (PlanD) |
| Ms Ying Fun-fong | Chief Engineer/Transport Planning, Transport Department (TD) |
| Mr Peter Mok | Senior Engineer/Kowloon 2, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) |
| Ms Sally Fong (Secretary) | Senior Town Planner/Studies & Research 3, PlanD |

In Attendance

| | |
|--------------|--|
| Ms Lydia Lam | Assistant Secretary (Planning) 3, DEVB |
|--------------|--|

Absent with Apologies

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| Mrs Mei Ng | Representing Friends of the Earth |
| Dr Chan Fuk-cheung | Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers |
| Mr Nicholas Brooke | |
| Mrs Ann Ho | Chief Executive Officer (2) 1, Home Affairs Department |

Action

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 26th Meeting

- 1.1 The draft minutes of the 26th meeting held on 21 January 2009 were circulated to Members for comment on 13 March 2009. A revised draft incorporating comments received was issued to Members on 17 March 2009. The meeting confirmed the revised draft minutes without amendment.

Item 2 Matters Arising

Working Meeting on Temporary Uses and Inventory (paras. 2.17, 4.7 and 5.8 of the minutes of the 26th meeting)

- 2.1 **The Chairman** said that at the working meeting held on 4 March 2009, Members identified several quick-wins for enhancement, including the Hung Hom waterfront promenade and adjoining open space, waterfront promenade/open space at the ex-North Point Estate site, temporary enhancement in Kai Tak and removal of advertising billboards in Wan Chai near the Cross Harbour Tunnel. The Secretariat would circulate the meeting notes to Members in due course, and the Sub-committee would monitor the progress of the matter in subsequent meetings. **Secretariat**
- 2.2 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested, and the meeting agreed, to arrange another working meeting to review the Inventory with LandsD and PlanD. **Secretariat**

[Post-meeting note: Two working meetings on the Inventory were held on 26 March 2009 and 1 April 2009.]

Views of the Sub-committee on various proposals presented at the 26th meeting (Items 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 of the minutes of the 26th meeting)

- 2.3 The meeting noted that the relevant parts of the confirmed

Action

minutes of meeting would be forwarded to the concerned parties/approving authorities for reference after the meeting.

[Post-meeting note: The relevant parts of the confirmed meeting minutes were forwarded to the concerned parties/approving authorities on 19 March 2009.]

Short Term Tenancies in the Harbour-front Areas (paras. 4.4(b) and 4.6 of the minutes of the 26th meeting)

2.4 **Mr Jeff Lam** said that an updated list of short term tenancies (STTs) would be provided to the Sub-committee for reference at the next meeting. The revenue generated from the STTs in the harbour-front areas amounted to about \$125M per annum. **LandsD**

2.5 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** pointed out the importance of proper use of vacant land along the harbour-front and suggested LandsD to expand the list of STTs to cover vacant land along the harbour-front. **LandsD**

Proposal to improve waterfront connectivity in Tsuen Wan (para. 8.1(a) of the minutes of the 26th meeting)

2.6 The meeting agreed to discuss the proposal outlined in Mr Paul Zimmerman's email of 20 January 2009 under Item 8.

Central Kowloon Route (para. 8.1(c) of the minutes of the 26th meeting)

2.7 **Mr Peter Mok** assured Members that the proposed alignment of the Central Kowloon Route would not render the waterfront inaccessible to the public. Attempts were being made to providing cycling facilities and pedestrian footpaths underneath the proposed flyover of the Central Kowloon Route without compromising traffic safety or requiring any reclamation. HEC would be further briefed on the matter in due course.

2.8 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested CEDD to explore the possibility of enhancing the Kai Tak Nullah into a quality waterfront similar to the Marina Bay in Singapore or Darling Harbour in Sydney, with facilities for water taxis, entertainment uses beneath the flyover, etc. **CEDD**

Action

Proposal to allow commercial helicopter operators to use Wan Chai Temporary Helipad (para. 3.10 of the minutes of the 26th meeting)

2.9 Referring to the post-meeting note, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the specific requests made by the Sub-committee in its letter dated 20 February 2009 to the Transport and Housing Bureau as below should be recorded in the minutes for public information:

- (a) commercial helicopters using the Wan Chai Temporary Helipad should shut down their engines after landing, except when emergencies were declared;
- (b) Sunday was acknowledged as a rest day and all operators should refrain from using the Wan Chai Temporary Helipad except for emergencies; and
- (c) the operations of the Wan Chai Temporary Helipad be reviewed on a regular basis to consider whether the conditions governing the use of the helipad were too restrictive for operators, created a hindrance to GFS services or required to be changed in the interest of the public.

2.10 **Ms Lydia Lam** remarked that the Sub-committee's letter basically recapitulated those points as recorded in para. 3.8 of the minutes of last meeting, which would be available for public viewing at the HEC's website.

Inventory on Known (Planned and Proposed) Projects at Harbourfront

2.11 **The Secretary** highlighted the following:

- (a) 2 new sites (SW11 and WC7) relating to upgrading of existing facilities under the Harbour Area Treatment Scheme (HATS) had been incorporated in the Inventory. The Drainage Services Department (DSD) would brief Members on the proposals under Item 4;
- (b) for Site C4, a new s.16 application (No. A/H24/15) for proposed bank, retail shop, fast food shop, restaurant and services trades uses at various shops at Central Piers No. 7 and 8 and the Central Terminal Building was

Action

submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). A replacement page 8 had been incorporated into the Inventory tabled at the meeting; and

- (c) for Sites No. KC3, WK1 and WK10, the Mass Transit Railway Corporation Ltd. (MTRCL) and Highways Department (HyD) would brief Members on the temporary facilities for the construction of the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link under Item 6.

2.12 Referring to Site C4, **Dr Andrew Thomson** said that in addition to encouraging a diversity of uses to enhance vibrancy along the harbour-front, the Sub-committee should also examine ways to ensure that the types of uses permitted could reflect the character of the waterfront in the locality. His view was shared by **Dr Sujata Govada** who considered that due regard should be given to the harbour vision and the Urban Design Guidelines.

2.13 **The Chairman** pointed out that the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines (HPPs/HPGs) had provided guidance on the use and development of the harbour-front areas. They were living documents and if required, could be revised to strengthen on those aspects as suggested by Members. However, given the current workload of the Sub-committee, the suitable timing to embark on a review of the HPPs/HPGs, which would require intensive efforts, should be considered carefully.

Item 3 Cycle Track between Tsuen Wan and Tuen Mun - Investigation (Paper No. 8/2009)

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

Ms Lucy Ho) CEDD
Mr Ho Kai-ho)

Mr Eric Chan) Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd
Mr Tim Lam)

3.2 After a powerpoint presentation by the Project Team, Members raised the following comments/questions:

Action

- (a) accessibility to this part of the harbour-front was impeded by the existing roads. The current project offered a good opportunity to enhance public accessibility to the harbour-front. The project should not merely provide an engineering solution to the provision of cycle tracks. Rather, it should formulate its objectives and proposals with harbour-front enhancement in mind;
- (b) the standard requirements for constructing a cycle track with a separate sidewalk in accordance with the Transport Planning and Design Manual should be waived to allow shared use of the cycle track by other users;
- (c) using elevated structures for the cycle track would deprive public direct access to the water's edge and the shore. Construction of a boardwalk outside the existing seawall should be considered. The "over-riding public need" could be established through public debates;
- (d) it was important to define who the end-users were. The cycle track might be a popular training route for marathon runners or casual joggers, a trail for recreational cycling, sight-seeing for families or tourists, etc. Ancillary facilities should be provided to meet different needs of the users. Given the considerable length (22km) of the track, more resting places with refreshment kiosks, look-out points and other supporting facilities should be provided;
- (e) existing bicycle rental operators should be consulted on their operational requirements so that the provision and operation of cycling facilities could be made sustainable;
- (f) sufficient public transport facilities should be provided at both ends of the cycle track to cater for cyclists who used public transport for return trips. The traffic impact on the existing road network should also be assessed;
- (g) matters concerning safety and emergency should be properly addressed;
- (h) compensatory planting should be provided for any trees to be felled;

Action

- (i) air pollution problem should be addressed as users of the cycle track would be exposed to vehicle emissions from the roads nearby; and
- (j) the Government should implement the project as soon as possible.

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

- (a) the intention of the project was to provide a recreational outlet for the general public particularly for families;
- (b) safety of users of the cycle track should be a key consideration not to be compromised and thus shared use of the cycle track by other users was considered inappropriate. A smooth gradient not exceeding 4% would be maintained throughout the cycle track as far as practicable;
- (c) a length of 22km was not too long for cycling purpose. A mid-way bus interchange at Tai Lam was under planning. Three entry/exit hubs with public toilets, refreshment kiosks, first-aid kiosks, etc. were evenly distributed along the cycle track. Resting places with basic facilities like seating benches were also proposed wherever suitable;
- (d) extensive consultation with local residents, relevant District Councils and cycling associations had been carried out since the commissioning of the Investigation Study in September 2008. Whilst the project was generally supported by the consultees, members of the cycling associations had raised concern as they could not use Castle Peak Road for training purpose after completion of the project; and
- (e) all comments received would be considered in the course of the Study.

3.4 While some Members supported the proposed cycle track, some Members also suggested the provision of cycling facilities along the Harbour (rather than a rigidly designed cycle track), which could allow shared use by others (e.g. pedestrians and joggers), to enhance harbour-front connectivity.

Action

3.5 **Ms Ying Fun-fong** pointed out the need for suitable separation of the cycle track and footpath for pedestrian safety.

3.6 **The Chairman** summed up the discussion as follows:

- (a) cycling along the harbour-front was supported from harbour-front enhancement point of view;
- (b) Members generally had no in-principle objection to the project, but considered that the mere construction of a cycle track might not lead to harbour-front enhancement. A place-making approach should be adopted in enhancing this part of the harbour-front to become a destination for public enjoyment;
- (c) it was important to identify the end-users and their needs. Mixed uses including eating places and other supporting facilities should be incorporated to enhance vibrancy;
- (d) transport planning guidelines should not be rigidly applied in designing the cycling facilities. Shared use of the cycle track by other users should be considered; and
- (e) public transport arrangements and safety matters should be thoroughly considered.

Item 4 Harbour Area Treatment Scheme Stage 2A - Upgrading of Central and Wan Chai East Preliminary Treatment Works (Paper No. 5/2009)

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

Mr C M Choi) HATS Division, DSD
Mr Michael Leung)

Mr S Y Chan) Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd
Mr Paul Clarke)
Mr Roy Stevens)
Mr Paul Taylor)

4.2 After a powerpoint presentation by the Project Team, Members raised the following comments/questions:

Action

- (a) consideration should be given to realigning the Western Fire Service Street so as to provide a wider waterfront promenade;
- (b) the possibility of setting back the boundary walls of the Central Preliminary Treatment Works (PTW) to incorporate some commercial activities or vibrant uses for public enjoyment should be explored;
- (c) as the Wan Chai waterfront could become more popular in future, opportunity should be taken to set back the boundary walls of the Wan Chai East PTW and widen the pavement to facilitate pedestrian circulation;
- (d) consideration should be given to reduce the footprints of the developments and to allow public access to the rooftops for enjoying harbour view;
- (e) whilst solar panels were not proposed in view of their glare impact, whether wind turbines had been considered as an alternative source of sustainable energy for the PTWs;
- (f) advertising signboards should not be allowed at the rooftop of the Wan Chai East PTW after the upgrading works;
- (g) incongruous design should be avoided. Apart from glass panels, what other materials had been considered for the façade; and
- (h) opportunities should be taken to enhance the streetscape of the surroundings adjoining the subject sites by planting more trees to provide shading and improving the paving, street furniture, lighting, railing, etc.

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

- (a) technically, it was difficult to realign the Western Fire Service Street as it was a one-way loop road providing access to the nearby Sheung Wan Fire Station and electricity sub-station. Besides, there was level difference between the road and the site of the Central PTW;
- (b) as the sites were already very cramped, it was unlikely to

Action

have scope to further reduce the footprints of the developments;

- (c) for the Central PTW, recesses proposed in the boundary wall facing the Harbour could be set back by 1m. The new building had been set back by 2.5m from the existing boundary wall giving a greater provision for planting. The aesthetic design of the boundary wall facing Sun Yet Sen Memorial Park would be similar to that shown in Enclosure 7 of the Paper. Existing trees within the site would be retained as far as possible;
- (d) the existing advertising panel at the rooftop of the Wan Chai East PTW would be removed under this project;
- (e) the use of wind turbines as an energy source for the PTWs had been considered and was found to be not effective;
- (f) the proposed curtain wall could make the sites more transparent to the public; and
- (g) provision of seating areas, street sculptures, etc. could be further considered after consultation with the local community.

4.4 **The Chairman** remarked that the Project Team's efforts to improve the visual quality of the sites were appreciated, and noted that some suggestions made by Members on improving the urban design of the area as a whole might be outside the scope of the subject project.

4.5 In response to a Member's suggestion, **the Project Team** agreed to arrange a site visit to the Central and Wan Chai East PTWs for the Sub-committee.

DSD

[Post-meeting note: A half-day site visit to the 2 PTWs was arranged by DSD on 21 April 2009. The following additional comments on the design of the PTWs as raised by Members joining the site visit had been conveyed to the Project Team for consideration:

- (a) setting back of fence walls to provide wider pedestrian footpath along waterfront was recommended;

Action

- (b) the design of fence walls should enhance visual permeability, such as low fence walls with high transparency;
- (c) the proposal on more greening of the grounds and roofs was acknowledged; and
- (d) if possible, a pedestrian thoroughfare should be provided between the Central PTW site and Sheung Wan Fire Station to enhance physical permeability of the area.]

Item 5 Draft Planning Briefs for "Comprehensive Development Area (1)" Site (KIL 11205) and "Comprehensive Development Area (2)" Site (KIL 11111) on Draft Hung Hom Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K9/21 (Paper No. 6/2009)

5.1 The following representatives of PlanD were invited to the meeting:

Mr Eric Yue) District Planning Office/Kowloon
Mr Wilson Chan)
Ms Christine Cheung)

5.2 After a powerpoint presentation by Mr Wilson Chan, Members raised the following comments/questions:

- (a) the design of the future developments at the "Comprehensive Development Area" ("CDA") sites should integrate with that of the nearby "Open Space" ("O") sites;
- (b) building setback from Hung Luen Road should be stipulated in the planning briefs;
- (c) shared access from Hung Luen Road serving the "CDA" sites and the "O" site to the west should be considered;
- (d) whilst the non-building areas (NBAs) proposed at the "CDA(2)" site would increase building permeability, the long frontage of the "CDA(1)" site might induce the creation of a wall of buildings which might in turn hinder visual permeability and air circulation;
- (e) the NBAs should be open 24 hours for public use. Whether NBA(2) should be widened to 30m, i.e. the same

Action

width as NBA(1);

- (f) outside seating accommodation (OSA) for alfresco dining should be clearly delineated in the planning briefs to facilitate prospective operators to obtain relevant licences from the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department;
- (g) whether there were measures to minimise “dead wall”, which did not promote activities, along the boundary of the public transport interchange (PTI) and the “CDA” sites;
- (h) more activities e.g. retail/ dining should be encouraged at the NBAs to activate this part of the waterfront and serve as an interface between the “CDA” developments and the waterfront promenade;
- (i) open space and greening opportunities should be maximised; and
- (j) which party would be responsible for managing the waterfront promenade adjoining the “CDA” sites.

5.3 In response, **Mr Eric Yue** made the following points:

- (a) a number of NBAs had already been specified in the planning briefs. It would create further design constraints if the future developments were also required to set back from Hung Luen Road. When compared with the NBAs along the waterfront promenade, a building setback from Hung Luen Road would offer less scope for public enjoyment;
- (b) NBA(1) and NBA(2) would serve as wind corridors to facilitate penetration of sea breeze. Their widths were based on their intended functions, the building gap stipulated on the Hung Hom Outline Zoning Plan for the future “Residential (Group A) 2” development and the width of Oi King Street to the north. NBA(1) was wider as it would serve as the primary walkway to facilitate 24-hour public access to the waterfront. Whereas, NBA(2) was basically a building gap and internal pedestrian walkway within the “CDA(2)” site. A width of 10m was considered appropriate and the future developer have the discretion to decide upon its opening hours;

Action

- (c) vehicular access to the future “CDA(2)” development would be made from Kin Wan Street, which was an existing road serving the nearby hotel development. Two access points were proposed at Hung Luen Road for the future hotel development and PTI at the “CDA(1)” site;
- (d) to enhance the attractiveness and vibrancy of the waterfront promenade, alfresco dining would be allowed within the NBAs along the southern boundary of the sites;
- (e) to minimise the visual impact of the PTI on the surroundings, façade treatment to the podium edge and landscape treatment along the eastern side of the “CDA(1)” site were required. Besides, a terraced design should be adopted for the podium structure to enhance integration with the proposed urban park to the east;
- (f) detailed urban design requirements had been specified in the planning briefs to enhance integration of the “CDA” sites with the surrounding areas, waterfront connectivity and visual permeability;
- (g) detailed landscape requirements had been specified in the planning briefs that the future developers should maximise greening opportunities and demonstrate the landscape design in the Landscape Master Plans to be submitted for TPB’s approval; and
- (h) the adjoining planned open space and waterfront promenade would be developed and managed by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department.

5.4 Members had the following further views:

- (a) design constraint was not a sound argument for not setting back the future developments from Hung Luen Road to provide more public space;
- (b) NBA(2) should be widened to the same width as NBA(1) and open 24 hours for public use;
- (c) in addition to façade and landscape treatments of the PTI podium, more active uses like OSA should be specified

Action

in the planning briefs to activate the area alongside the park;

- (d) whether the location of the PTI was suitable;
- (e) the possibility of integrating the “O” zone west of “CDA(2)” site with the waterfront promenade by realigning Kin Wan Street should be explored; and
- (f) standards on greening ratio should be introduced to address district-wide issues, like heat island effect.

5.5 **Mr Eric Yue** made the following responses:

- (a) the location of the future PTI was identified by TD. It would be close to the ferry piers and such integrated planning of public transport facilities could enhance convenient interchange between land and marine transport;
- (b) design requirements on enhancing the interface between the PTI and the nearby open space could be strengthened in the planning briefs, where appropriate; and
- (c) the issue of a greening ratio standard was a general one and this might need to be considered further separately.

5.6 **The Chairman** pointed out that the Hung Hom District Study had recommended a land use framework for the Hung Hom waterfront, and the subject planning briefs mainly focused on the planning and design requirements for the “CDA(1)” and “CDA(2)” sites. He concluded the discussion by summarising Members’ views as follows:

- (a) the planning briefs should include appropriate requirements to ensure that the future developments at the “CDA” sites would integrate with the surroundings;
- (b) the proposed NBAs could enhance permeability and were in line with HPPs/HPGs;
- (c) building setback from Hung Luen Road should be further considered;
- (d) in addition to serving as a green edge, the NBAs

Action

adjoining the waterfront promenade should be activated by introducing mixed uses to enhance the vibrancy of the waterfront; and

- (e) a minimum greening requirement should be stipulated in the planning briefs to guide the future developments.

Item 6 Hong Kong Section of the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link - Temporary Construction Facilities at Works Area at Harbour Fronts and Sea Wall Modification at West Kowloon Seafront (Paper No. 7/2009)

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

Mr Tang Pak-hung) MTRCL
Mr Calum Smith)

Mr Li Kin-tung) HyD

6.2 After a powerpoint presentation by the Project Team, Members raised the following comments/questions:

- (a) whether the land requirement of the proposed works area and the barging facilities, particularly that on the seafront, was minimum; and whether off-site disposal of spoil had been considered;
- (b) shared use of the proposed construction/barging facilities with the West Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD) project should be considered;
- (c) it was difficult for the Sub-committee to comment on the proposed works area in the absence of complete information on the land requirement and development programme of WKCD;
- (d) an integrated planning of the entire area covering WKCD, the West Kowloon Terminus of the Express Rail Link (XRL) and the surrounding developments, including measures to enhance interface of various land uses, at-grade crossings, etc., was essential;
- (e) whether MTRCL was prepared to compensate for the

Action

temporary use of the seafront for construction of XRL by carrying out beautification/enhancement of the harbour-front; and

- (f) the powerpoint presentation materials should be distributed to Members for reference.

[Post-meeting note: The powerpoint presentation materials were sent to Members on 24 March 2009.]

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

- (a) MTRCL was not in a position to explain the overall planning of the whole West Kowloon area as it was only entrusted the design and construction of the Hong Kong Section of XRL;
- (b) unlike general building works, the excavation works of XRL would generate an enormous amount of spoil (about 4.83 million m³). The existing road network in the area was unable to accommodate the additional traffic, and hence marine transport should be relied upon for onward disposal of the spoil;
- (c) the proposed works area in Annex 3 of the Paper was indicative only. As soon as the excavation works were completed, some barging facilities along the seawall could be removed. More land could be released when the WKCD project commenced; and
- (d) MTRCL would make every effort to enhance the temporary work sites. Subject to availability of funding from the Government, MTRCL could consider implementing enhancement proposals for other waterfront sites, where possible.

6.4 Members considered that the Sub-committee should be briefed on the overall planning and programme of the WKCD development, including its interface with the surrounding land uses and developments. They requested DEVB to coordinate the matter.

6.5 **Ms Alice Cheung** said that Members' concerns could be relayed to the Home Affairs Bureau (HAB) and the WKCD Authority.

Secretariat

6.6 **The Project Team** supplemented as follows:

- (a) a high-level coordination committee chaired by HAB, with members from relevant Government departments and MTRCL had been set up to oversee the XRL and WKCD projects;
- (b) HyD had obtained HAB's agreement on using the proposed works area until the commencement of the WKCD project; and
- (c) Members' concern on occupying a vast tract of waterfront as works area was understandable. However, there appeared to be no better alternative given that disposal of such a huge amount of spoil by land transport would add too much burden to the existing road network, which was already quite congested. Besides, roads works would be carried out during the construction of the West Kowloon Terminus.

6.7 **The Chairman** remarked that the role of the Sub-committee was to promote harbour-front enhancement. The Sub-committee had great concern on the size of the proposed works area along the seafront. Without a comprehensive picture on the future development and implementation programme of the WKCD including its interface with the surrounding developments, the Sub-committee, instead of lending support, could only take note of the proposed works area.

Item 7 Hong Kong Island East Harbour-front Study - Progress Report and Stage 1 Public Engagement Programme (Paper No. 9/2009)

7.1 The following representatives of the public engagement consultants of the subject study, were invited to the meeting:

Professor Bernard Lim) Centre of Architectural Research for
Mr Andy Wong) Education, Elderly, Environment and
Excellence Ltd (CARE)

7.2 Members raised the following comments/questions after the powerpoint presentation by Mr Raymond Lee and Professor Bernard Lim:

Action

- (a) the revision of the study scope to include the possible pedestrian linkage to Heng Fa Chuen and Siu Sai Wan areas and the provision of cycling facilities along the harbour-front was appreciated;
- (b) the road structure and private lots along the existing shoreline had posed constraints to harbour-front enhancement. Engagement activities would provide opportunities for soliciting public feedback on the boardwalk proposal, which might help establish an “over-riding public need” to enhance the harbour-front;
- (c) instead of proposing only green space without any activities, an appropriate mix of uses should be considered at suitable locations to bring vibrancy to the harbour-front;
- (d) the study should explore enhancement proposals in the short, medium and long terms, with an implementation plan, where appropriate;
- (e) there was a need to collaborate with the community and the Eastern District Council (EDC). The outcomes of the design competition organised by EDC for the ex-North Point Estate site should be incorporated as appropriate;
- (f) it was important to ensure that the findings of the public engagement programme would serve as inputs to the study;
- (g) the proposed drawing campaign was an interesting activity to engage the public. It would be desirable to make good use of the results; and
- (h) sustainability assessment should be carried out at an early stage to facilitate better understanding of the social, economic and environmental issues and the trade-off involved to ensure a robust output.

7.3 In response, **Professor Bernard Lim** said that CARE would work closely with EDC. Results of the drawing campaign would be uploaded onto the study webpage, and the winners would be invited to elaborate their ideas during the brainstorming workshop.

Action

- 7.4 **Mr Raymond Lee** pointed out that whilst noting the requirements under the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (PHO), the Study would examine enhancement opportunities to the harbour-front including those that might involve reclamation. The public would be engaged to discuss the related proposals during the public engagement process. The PHO implications would be duly considered in formulating the study recommendations.

Item 8 Any Other Business

Improving waterfront connectivity in Tsuen Wan

- 8.1 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the proposed outfall of the Tsuen Wan Drainage Channel gazetted on 19 September 2008 had failed to improve waterfront connectivity as suggested by the Sub-committee on 21 May 2008. He was disappointed that the matter had to be resolved through a formal objection by Designing Hong Kong under the Foreshore and Sea-bed (Reclamations) Ordinance.

- 8.2 Referring to the schematic drawing prepared by DSD on a proposed footbridge over the outfall (as attached to his email dated 20 January 2009), **Mr Zimmerman** suggested that the connectivity issue along the Tsuen Wan waterfront should be considered by CEDD in the cycle track project discussed under Item 3.

CEDD

[Post-meeting note: The suggestion had been conveyed to CEDD for consideration.]

- 8.3 There being no other business, the meeting closed at 1:45 pm.