

3rd Meeting of Harbourfront Commission
held at 2:30 pm on 21 December 2010 at the Conference Room
on 15/F, North Point Government Offices, 333 Java Road, Hong Kong

Minutes of Meeting

Present

Mr Nicholas Brooke	Chairman
Mrs Carrie Lam	Vice-Chairman
Mrs Margaret Brooke	Representing Business Environment Council
Prof Becky Loo	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Mr Lam Kin-lai	Representing Conservancy Association
Dr Frederick Lee	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Andy Leung	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Leslie Chen	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Mr Tam Po-yiu	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Dr Paul Ho	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Dr Peter Cookson Smith	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Ir Peter Wong	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Ms Lily Chow	
Mr Clement Kwok	
Mr Vincent Ng	
Ms Ann So	
Mr Philip Yung	Commissioner for Tourism
Mr K B To	Assistant Commissioner/Urban, Transport Department
Mr John Chai	Director of Civil Engineering and Development
Mr Bobby Cheng	Deputy Director of Leisure and Cultural Services (Leisure Services)
Mr Francis Liu	Director of Marine (Acting)
Mr Jimmy Leung	Director of Planning
Ms Maisie Chan	Secretary

In Attendance

Mr Thomas Chow	Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)
Mr Terence Yu	Press Secretary to Secretary for Development

Mr Chris Fung	Assistant Secretary (Harbour)1, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Ronald Leung	Assistant Secretary (Harbour)2, DEVB
Mr Peter Mok	Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB
Mr C K Hon	Project Manager/Hong Kong Island and Islands, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Ms Jacinta Woo	Chief Town Planner/Studies and Research, Planning Department (PlanD)

For Agenda Item 6

Mr Kam Chak-wing	Deputy Head of Civil Engineering Office (Port and Land), CEDD
Mr Joseph Yung	Chief Engineer/Land Works, CEDD
Mr James Kam	Associate, Mott MacDonald Hong Kong Limited
Mr Ivan Ho	Director, Ivanho Architect Limited
Ms Kelly Tang	Vice President, PR Concepts Asia Limited
Mr Joseph Wong	Executive Director, Ho Wang SPB Limited

For Agenda Item 8

Mr Patrick Lei	Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Water Policy & Science), Environmental Protection Department (EPD)
Mr Mak Ka-wai	Chief Engineer/Land Drainage, Drainage Services Department (DSD)

Absent with Apologies

Mr Louis Loong	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Winston Chu	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Mr Benjamin Cha	
Mr Chan Hok-fung	
Ms Dilys Chau	
Mr Eric Fok	

Action

Welcoming message

The Chairman welcomed all to the 3rd meeting of the Harbourfront Commission (the Commission).

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 2nd Meeting

1.1 **The Chairman** said that the Secretariat circulated the draft minutes of the 2nd meeting to Members on 9 December 2010 and no proposed amendment had been received. As no further amendment was proposed at the meeting, the draft minutes were confirmed.

Item 2 Matters Arising

A. Harbourfront Signage Scheme cum Logo Design Competition (Paragraph 2.1 of the minutes of the 2nd meeting)

2.1 **The Chairman** said that CEDD and its consultant would update Members on the Harbourfront Signage Scheme cum Logo Design Competition under agenda item 6 of this meeting.

B. Inventory of Harbourfront Proposals (Paragraph 6.8 of the minutes of the 2nd meeting)

2.2 **The Chairman** informed Members that as per Mr Vincent Ng's suggestion, the Secretariat had requested the relevant departments to update the inventory of harbourfront proposals previously provided to the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC) according to the three Task Forces' geographical responsibilities; and the updated inventory would be tabled at the Task Force meetings in January 2011 for Members' reference.

C. Briefing on Development of Shatin-Central Link (SCL) (Paragraph 7.16 of the minutes of the 2nd meeting)

2.3 **The Chairman** said that the MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) had advised that their senior management had taken note of the suggestions and comments made by the Commission. The SCL railway scheme had been gazetted on 26 November 2010 and MTRCL would continue the consultation with and engagement of the community.

D. Delivering the Vision (Paragraph 8.6 of the minutes of the 2nd meeting)

2.4 **The Chairman** had prepared a paper on the proposed targets, objectives and performance measurements for the Commission within its 3-year term. The paper would be discussed under agenda item 7 of this meeting.

Item 3 Progress Report from Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island (Paper No. HC/13/2010)

3.1 **The Chairman**, in his capacity as the Chairman of the Task Force, presented the progress report.

3.2 Regarding the advance promenade at the new Central harbourfront, **Mrs Carrie Lam** said that the construction of the new Central Government Complex (CGC) at Tamar was largely on schedule and it would be of great importance to put in place the promenade in good time. The CGC would be open around October 2011. If the public could only gain access to the CGC and the Green Carpet which was relatively small in size against the vast Central harbourfront area, they would feel aggrieved and disappointed. The Administration had therefore attempted to enlarge the harbourfront area which would be accessible to the public by requesting the contractor of the CGC to design and build an extension of the open space at Tamar to bring people closer to the waterfront. CEDD had also been requested to construct a promenade connecting Tamar and the Central Piers.

When consulting the Task Force on the proposed refinement to the design of the advance promenade, CEDD had stressed the importance of making a timely decision, and informed Members that they would request the contractor to proceed with the revised works by variation of contract. Noting the imminent completion of the CGC, Mrs Lam appealed for Members' support for CEDD and ArchSD to press ahead with the advance promenade works.

3.3 Concerning the Task Force's discussion about placing of statues and art works on the open deck in front of Tamar or along the promenade, **Mrs Lam** drew Members' attention to a community-based public arts display project carried out at Kwun Tong Promenade Stage 1. Under the project, some artists were engaged through a non-governmental organisation to place their artwork, including some large sculptures, along the promenade. She opined that the artwork which attracted people to the promenade had added a lot of vibrancy to that part of the waterfront, and similar activities could be arranged at the advance promenade in future. She had suggested that the Secretariat invite the Hong Kong Arts Centre and LCSD to make a presentation to the Commission about their public art collaboration project as it would be a good idea if the Commission could have some form of collaboration with the Centre in future.

The Secretariat

3.4 **The Chairman** said that the Task Force would be pleased to endorse the revised design for the advance promenade, which had been greatly enhanced from the original design. He also supported the idea of collaborating with the Hong Kong Arts Centre on public art displays at the promenade.

3.5 **Ir Peter Wong** asked whether the provision of food and beverage (F&B) facilities was always required to bring vibrancy to the harbourfront as he observed that both the Hong Kong and Kai Tak Task Forces had proposed provision of F&B facilities at the harbourfront under their respective purviews. In response, **the Chairman** said that it would be advisable for the three Task Forces to have a consistent approach on provision of F&B facilities for harbourfront projects.

Item 4 Progress Report from Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development (Paper No. HC/14/2010)

4.1 **Mr Vincent Ng** took Members through the progress report.

(Note: On 18 December 2010, Mr Winston Chu sent a letter to the Commission Chairman and the Secretariat expressing his views on the progress report. As requested by Mr Chu, his letter was tabled at the meeting. Please refer to paragraph 9.1.)

4.2 **The Chairman** said that the Kai Tak Development was a very crucial part of the enhancement of the waterfront and a lot of work had to be done.

Item 5 Progress Report from Task Force on Harbourfront Developments in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing (Paper No. HC/15/2010)

5.1 **Prof Becky Loo** presented the progress report.

5.2 On the issue of inviting presentations from other parties, **the Chairman** opined that the proposed arrangements as set out in the progress report would have resources and logistical implications, but that there were merits for the Commission to listen to different views.

5.3 **Ir Peter Wong** asked why the threshold of one-third of members, but not a simple majority or absolute majority, was proposed for accepting requests for presentation from other parties; and whether the Commission should take up the responsibilities for identifying and contacting all those relevant parties. He also cautioned that the proposal might give rise to false public expectations on the Commission's role.

5.4 Given that the proposal was not meant to re-open any

statutory process and that it would not have any influence on the decision making process, **Dr Frederick Lee** had reservation on the purpose of such presentations.

5.5 **Prof Becky Loo** responded by saying that the presentations to be made by Members and other parties should focus on the subject matters to be discussed under the agenda to be set, and that those agenda items should not be issues that had already been decided upon under any statutory process.

5.6 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** opined that it would be helpful to listen to alternative views in some cases. However, Members should also be conscious of the resources implications and the stage of process that a particular case had reached. She suggested giving the proposal a try for a few meetings.

5.7 **Mrs Carrie Lam** said she had no in-principle objection to the proposal so long as the purpose of listening to public views was not to re-open any statutory process. However, at times it might not be easy to ascertain this given that a statutory process might come in at different stages of a project. Against this, she advised that the Commission should in the first place make sure that the case was not in the midst of any statutory process, and that the Chairman should be consulted before an item was put on the agenda.

5.8 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** further cautioned that in listening to such presentations from other parties, the Commission might be expected to respond or even cast votes on such presentations. It was not uncommon that outside parties would perceive these as the Commission's formal advice or expression of stance. Members therefore should be careful of such consequences.

5.9 In response to the Chairman's question, **Mr Philip Yung** said that Members had raised some questions about the Lei Yue Mun Waterfront Enhancement Project at the first meeting of the Kowloon Task Force, and the Tourism Commission was prepared to respond to those questions at the next Task Force meeting

scheduled for 12 January 2011. The objections received upon gazettal of the project and the relevant outline zoning plan would be considered by the Chief Executive in Council in accordance with the provisions of the relevant ordinances. Having regard to these facts, **Mrs Lam** opined that the project did not fulfil the criterion concerning statutory process for inviting presentations from other parties.

5.10 **Mr John Chai** questioned whether there would be any control measures to guard against presenters from going beyond the subject matter of the agenda item. **Prof Becky Loo** responded by saying that the Task Force Chairmen would have to stop the parties from presenting views that were not related to the agenda item. **The Chairman** also added that the Commission or Task Forces could request a preview of the presentation materials.

5.11 **Ir Peter Wong** had no objection to giving the proposal a try but maintained that the Commission should not take up the responsibilities for identifying all the different views and concerned parties. Instead, he proposed that the Commission should only respond where there were requests made to it for such presentations. **The Chairman** agreed to this approach.

5.12 **Mr Jimmy Leung** supplemented that personal data such as address and telephone number indicated in the representations made to the TPB could only be used for the purpose of the Town Planning Ordinance. The TPB did not have the mandate to share the personal details of the representers with any organisations including the Commission.

5.13 **Mrs Lam** envisaged that the proposal would work as follows - the Commission/Task Force came across an item which was not the subject of any statutory process and included it in the agenda of a particular meeting. When some interested parties were aware that this agenda item was going to be discussed and approached the Commission/Task Force requesting presentation of their views, the Secretariat would consult Members of the Commission/Task Force. If there were a substantive number of members who agreed to hear presentations from the parties, the Secretariat would consult the respective Chairman and, subject to his/her agreement, invite the parties to come and make a presentation.

5.14 In reply to Ir Peter Wong's question, **Mrs Lam** suggested that the parties could be requested to provide synopsis of their cases to ensure that their presentations were relevant to the work of the Commission or the Task Forces.

5.15 In closing the discussion, **the Chairman** said that the Commission would try out the proposed arrangements with care.

5.16 Regarding the action areas proposals, **Mrs Lam** considered that regular reporting on the progress at each and every meeting might not be productive as many of the items had a long timeline. She suggested that the Task Forces prioritise their respective items and that the Administration then follow them up accordingly and report progress of the priority items to the Task Forces. While the items that had a longer timeline would be set aside for the moment, they could be moved into the priority list when it was opportune to do so.

5.17 **Mr Vincent Ng** concurred with Mrs Lam's suggestion and said that it was a practical way to take forward the action areas proposals. As each area had its own issues and difficulties, he agreed that the enhancement proposals for the 22 action areas could not be achieved at the same time. His proposal at the last Commission meeting was meant to identify the priority areas for better monitoring of progress.

5.18 **Prof Becky Loo** supplemented that the intention was to let Members have an initial overview of the action areas proposals first so that they could identify certain priority proposals for further follow-up. She also hoped that new quick-win projects could be added to the proposals already identified.

Item 6 Harbourfront Signage Scheme cum Logo Design Competition (Paper No. HC/15/2010)

6.1 **The Chairman** welcomed Mr Kam Chak-wing, Deputy Head of Civil Engineering Office (Port and Land) and Mr Joseph Yung, Chief Engineer/Land Works of CEDD, Mr James Kam, Associate of Mott MacDonald Hong Kong Limited, Mr Ivan Ho,

Director of Ivanho Architect Limited, Ms Kelly Tang, Vice President of PR Concept Limited and Mr Joseph Wong, Executive Director of Ho Wang SPB Limited.

6.2 **Mr Kam Chak-wing** and **Mr Joseph Yung** of CEDD presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.

6.3 **The Chairman** said that the Scheme was a very important harbourfront enhancement initiative given its high visibility and profile.

6.4 **Prof Becky Loo** noted that the Commission's logo would only be selected from the open group's entries, and asked if this arrangement would preclude the possibility of selecting a suitable design from the student group. On the publicity plans, she suggested that the Organising Committee (OC) consider publicity on public transport such as bus routes to the waterfront; and adding the "Eye on Victoria" link to the Commission's website.

6.5 **Mr Joseph Yung** responded by saying that students had the liberty to take part in the open group of the Competition, and that as such the Commission's logo could come from the design of students.

6.6 In response to the Chairman's question on wider public involvement and participation in the Competition, **Mr Kam Chak-wing** said that the proposed jury panel already consisted of eight members covering a wide spectrum of the community and there would be practical difficulty in expanding the panel. Notwithstanding that, **Mr Joseph Yung** supplemented that before formal adjudication by the jury panel, the DC members from the districts with harbourfront would be invited to view the entries and to mark their comments on a proforma which would be submitted to the jury panel for reference.

6.7 **Mr Ivan Ho** of Ivanho Architect Limited gave the following responses to Members' comments –

- (a) juniors' intellectual property right was one of the major reasons for the Commission's logo to be selected from the open group's entries, as legal advice indicated that there might be problem in implementing any document signed by participants below the age of 18 from the student group; and
- (b) to incorporate the public participation and opinion factor in the adjudication process, the OC would invite DC members to comment on the entries during a three-week period before formal adjudication by the jury panel. The OC was designing some simple proforma for the DC Members to fill in their comments.

6.8 **Mr Clement Kwok** was of the view that the logo needed to reflect the key themes and concepts that the Commission adopted for the harbour as a whole and therefore the concepts and themes should be decided before the logo was chosen. For example, he suggested that in addition to a single overall logo, some sub-logos could also be designed to give indications of different activities, concepts or themes at different parts of the harbourfront.

6.9 **Mr Vincent Ng** said that Mr Kwok's suggestion was inspiring and could indeed be one of the design concepts for the Competition. He suggested that the OC consider encouraging this sort of creativity in the brief for the Competition.

6.10 In response to Dr Peter Cookson Smith's question about the roles and division of work between the main consultant and the graphic design consultant, **Mr Joseph Yung** explained that the main consultant was required to provide the design of the signage including the graphics. The graphic design consultant's role was to integrate, fine-tune and modify the graphic design proposed by the main consultant with the harbourfront icon derived from the winning entry of the Competition to produce a consistent, unified and harmonized signage. **Mr Kam Chak-wing** supplemented that the graphic design consultant

would assist the main consultant in proposing and improving the shape of the carriers including the sign plates.

6.11 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** opined that the division of work between the main consultant and the graphic design consultant was not entirely clear. Regarding Mr Kwok's suggestion, he said that a mascot might be designed and put in different scenes and contexts where necessary.

6.12 In response to Mr Ng's comments, **Mr Ivan Ho** said that from past experience in organising similar competitions, the OC should better leave the selection criteria to the jury panel members who would consider the entries from a range of perspectives. The OC had purposely called the Competition "Eye on Victoria" to avoid placing too much emphasis on the competition element. In the competition document, it had been provided that the winning entry would be used as an icon for Victoria Harbour, subject to modification or adaptation if necessary.

6.13 **Members** had no comment on the proposed criteria for selecting the route and locations of the signage. In closing the discussion, **the Chairman** requested the project team to keep the Commission informed of the progress. The team should also take into account Members' comments and carefully plan the interface of work between the main consultant and the graphic design consultant.

CEDD

Item 7 Deliverables and Performance Indicators for the Harbourfront Commission within its 3-year terms (Paper No. HC/16/2010)

7.1 **The Chairman** presented the paper.

7.2 **Dr Frederick Lee** supported the idea of drawing up a master plan for the harbourfront. However, he was concerned about who was going to produce the master plan; and what authority would be given to the master plan.

7.3 **Mr Clement Kwok** agreed that the Commission should draw up a comprehensive master plan. At the same time, he hoped that the Commission could provide some form of top-down conceptualising steer which he felt was the only way to come up with more creative and imaginative ideas and concepts for the harbour as a whole. This could then be inputted into the work of the Task Forces.

7.4 In reply to Prof Becky Loo's question, **the Chairman** elaborated that at this stage, the master plan in his mind was a conceptual plan primarily linked to land use and allocation at the harbourfront. At the initial stage, the plan should encompass a mix of different issues concerning the harbourfront. It would also provide a holistic conceptual guide on the desirable outcomes at the harbourfront.

7.5 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** opined that the master plan should be a conceptual plan put in writing, which could then be used as a design plan for the harbourfront.

7.6 **Mr Vincent Ng** pointed out that PlanD had conducted a "Planning Study on the Harbour and its Waterfront Areas" in 2003 as well as several harbourfront-related district studies, including the "Hung Hom District Study" and the current "Hong Kong Island East Harbour-front Study", etc. To facilitate Members' further discussion and formulation of a master plan for the harbourfront, he suggested that PlanD conduct a briefing on the various harbourfront studies and plans for Members.

7.7 In response to Mr Ng's suggestion, **Mr Jimmy Leung** said that there were already outline zoning plans guiding the land uses and development around the harbourfront areas. Besides, PlanD had conducted a number of harbourfront studies in which the then HEC was fully engaged. PlanD could give Members a briefing on the overview of the land use framework for the harbourfront areas.

PlanD

7.8 **Mr Clement Kwok** welcomed such briefing which could help Members understand the proposals and constraints at the harbourfront. He also hoped that the Commission could come up with some new and creative ideas for the harbourfront.

7.9 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** said that it would take a long period of time to draw up a master plan which was acceptable to all. He opined that unlike in other harbourfront cities, the mechanism in Hong Kong paralyzed new and good design ideas for the harbourfront.

7.10 **Dr Frederick Lee** opined that the two tasks of formulating the master plan and producing the harbourfront signage should be well coordinated.

7.11 **Mrs Carrie Lam** thanked the Chairman for his ideas for drawing up a master plan for the harbourfront and said that she welcomed innovative and bold ideas for taking forward some of the harbourfront enhancement works. However, she was hesitant for the Commission to devote more time and attention to more plans, guidelines and models. Instead, she hoped that the Commission would be action-oriented in this term. In response to Dr Smith's remarks, she said that Hong Kong did not lack good design for the harbourfront but there was no way to test out an innovative idea and design until suitable sites, models and implementation agents had been identified. After PlanD's briefing to Members on the action areas proposals and the harbourfront studies, she hoped Members could help identify some priority sites which the Administration could take forward within a reasonable timeframe and in accordance with its vision and commitment for harbourfront enhancement. On the other hand, she said that the Commission should devote more time to marine uses, with which Members were keen to press ahead. The Government would like to have the Commission's advice on whether marina development was desirable in Hong Kong and, if so, what the models should be in order to create those water-related uses. In this respect, she was pleased that Marine Department (MD) had kindly agreed to assist the Commission

and, if need be, set up a dedicated task force to look at marine and water-related uses.

7.12 Responding to Mrs Lam's remarks on marine uses, **Mr Tam Po-yiu** suggested that point 3(j) of the paper could be revised as the Commission should encourage and identify new marine uses, instead of just giving support to the retention of existing water-dependent and related uses at the harbourfront.

7.13 Referring to a marine study into the interface between land and marine uses being conducted by the Harbour Business Forum, **Mrs Margaret Brooke** opined that there should be corresponding provisions on the land uses to facilitate the marine uses in order to create a vibrant harbour as well as vibrant harbourfront.

7.14 In closing the discussion, **the Chairman** suggested that he, Mrs Lam and the Task Force Chairmen could sit together to finalise the Commission's objective in this term, with focus on prioritising the action areas proposals and water-related uses of the harbour and harbourfront.

Item 8 Water Quality in Typhoon Shelters (Paper No. HC/18/2010)

8.1 **The Chairman** informed the meeting that this agenda item was raised by Mr Paul Zimmerman. He welcomed Mr Patrick Lei, Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Water Policy & Science) of EPD, and Mr Mak Ka-wai, Chief Engineer/Land Drainage of DSD.

8.2 **Mr Patrick Lei** of EPD presented the paper.

8.3 **Mr Lei** briefed Members on the measures taken by the Government to tackle the water pollution problem at typhoon shelters. Taking the New Yau Ma Tei Typhoon Shelter (NYMTTS) as an example, the following measures would be

carried out –

- (a) as some waste water and sewage from buildings was discharged into the harbour through illegal connections to storm drains, EPD would collaborate with Buildings Department to rectify those improper connections. District Offices' assistance would also be sought if there was difficulty in contacting individual apartment owners;
- (b) DSD would increase the frequency of desilting work at the storm drain outlets leading to NYMTTS from two to three times a year in order to remove the smelly sediments at the outlet of the Cherry Street box culvert. Through collaboration with CEDD and MD, dredging work would also be carried out to remove the smelly sediments accumulated at certain parts of the typhoon shelter, especially those near the storm drain outlets; and
- (c) since 2004, DSD had installed some dry weather flow interceptors to intercept the polluted water from being discharged into the typhoon shelter. Based on EPD's recent review findings on the sewerage system in the West Kowloon area, DSD would examine the feasibility of installing an additional interceptor near the culvert outlet to help intercept polluted water being discharged into the typhoon shelter.

8.4 **The Chairman** asked when the water pollution problem could be addressed permanently. In response, **Mr Lei** reiterated that the Government was tackling the problem through several measures, including stopping illegal discharge from buildings and intercepting polluted water from being discharged into the harbour. In addition to the six existing interceptors, consideration was being given to introducing an additional interceptor to further reduce polluted water being discharged into the typhoon shelter.

8.5 **Prof Becky Loo** asked whether the Government had

drawn up any target compliance rate which could be achieved within a reasonable timeframe for the marine water quality; and whether there was any information on the current compliance rates at different typhoon shelters.

8.6 In response, **Mr Lei** said that the Government had water quality objectives which were laid down by reference to the beneficial use of the waters. For Victoria Harbour, the water quality objectives were designated to protect its major intended use for navigation. For typhoon shelter, there were two key water quality objectives, one relating to the amount of dissolved oxygen at the bottom layer and one relating to dissolved oxygen at the depth-average of the water column. At present, the water quality in NYMTTS and Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter (CWBTS) could meet the bottom layer objective but could not fully meet the depth-average objective. He pointed out that the depth-average objective was stringent and the water quality at the two typhoon shelters could not fully meet the objective mainly because they were located at calm waters, and breakwaters had been installed which restricted the free exchange of water inside and outside the shelters.

8.7 **Mr Lam Kin-lai** opined that the problem stemmed from the design of the typhoon shelters, which could only be solved by improving the water flow. Taking NYTMTS as an example, **Mr Lei** explained that there had been much discussion among government departments on how to avoid water pollution problem when designing the shelter. Interceptors had also been installed at the storm drain to intercept the polluted water being discharged into the shelter. Some DC members and Legislative Council (LegCo) members had also suggested extending and diverting the storm drain system further away from the typhoon shelter catchment area. However, there were some technical problems for this option, which could not be easily overcome. **Mr Mak Ka-wai** of DSD elaborated that increase in flooding risk was the main problem in extending the box culvert several hundred metres beyond the typhoon shelter. If the box culvert was extended, the amount and velocity of water which could be carried through by

the box culvert would be significantly reduced, thus aggravating the siltation problem. From the flooding control point of view, it would be quite difficult to extend the box culvert in a general situation but the feasibility of extension had to be examined on a case-by-case basis.

8.8 In response to the Chairman's question on whether there was any water quality improvement programme for each typhoon shelter, **Mr Lei** said that NYMTTS and CWBTS were the more problematic ones among the typhoon shelters around Victoria Harbour. For Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter (KTTS), a series of improvement works was in the pipeline to ensure that the water quality around the area would be improved when the Cruise Terminal was commissioned. For example, the LegCo had recently approved funding for the Jordan Valley Interception Project, which was targeted for completion by 2013 to 2014 to intercept polluted storm water being discharged into KTTS and the Kai Tak Approach Channel. For CWBTS, some dredging works were being carried out in conjunction with a works project to remove the sediments inside the shelter. When Stage 2A of the Harbour Area Treatment Scheme (HATS) was commissioned in around 2014, the sewage from Hong Kong Island would also be intercepted and conveyed to the Stonecutters Island Sewage Treatment Works (SISTW) for treatment before being discharged into the harbour. The water quality in the harbour would be greatly improved by then.

8.9 In reply to Mr Andy Leung's question about the possibility of having water-based sports and recreational activities in the harbour in the near future, **Mr Lei** said that in recognition of the improving water quality at Tsim Sha Tsui area, dragon boat racing had been re-launched at the area in 2010. EPD had also received enquiry from some swimming associations on whether cross-harbour swim could be re-launched in the near future. Based on EPD's water quality monitoring, although disinfection facilities had been installed to disinfect the treated sewage discharged from the SISTW, the sewage from Hong Kong Island was still not fully treated at present, and hence it was expected

that when Stage 2A of HATS was commissioned in around 2014, the water quality would further improve and be more suitable for the annual cross harbour swim.

8.10 Regarding Mr Lam Kin-lai's question on whether there was any plan to restrict vessels from discharging sewage directly into the sea, **Mr Francis Liu** explained that floating restaurants and harbour cruises were already required under local regulations to have facilities on board to retain and collect their sewage. Under the International MARPOL Convention, ocean-going and international trading vessels were also required to have facilities on board to stop their sewage from being discharged into the sea. However, for reasons outlined in paragraph 7 of the paper, these regulations and convention did not apply to local vessels. With the series of measures to tackle the water pollution problem, it was expected that the water quality could be improved to reach an acceptable standard later on. MD would also work with EPD and DSD to continually review the situation and consider if there were other ways to improve the situation.

8.11 **Prof Becky Loo** suggested that EPD compile a table showing the water quality condition at different typhoon shelters to enable Members to have a better understanding of the seriousness of the problem. **Dr Frederick Lee** also suggested that EPD, if practicable, provide a rough estimate of the pollutant sources at different typhoon shelters as such data would be useful in identifying the solution to the problem.

EPD

EPD

8.12 **The Chairman** said that the presentation was very useful. In concluding the discussion, he requested the team to report progress to the Commission on a regular basis as water quality was an on-going challenge.

EPD/DSD/MD

Item 9 Any Other Business

9.1 **The Chairman** informed the meeting that Mr Winston Chu had sent a letter dated 18 December 2010 to him and the

Secretariat expressing his views on the progress report of the Kai Tak Task Force. As requested by Mr Chu, the letter had been tabled at the meeting. However, as he was not able to attend the meeting due to personal reason, **the Chairman** suggested and **Members** agreed to deal with the letter at the next Kai Tak Task Force meeting.

9.2 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:15 pm. The next meeting was scheduled for February 2011.

Harbourfront Commission Secretariat
February 2011