Task Force on Water-land Interface
Tenth Meeting

Date	:	19 May 2015 (Tuesday)
Time	:	2:30 p.m.
Venue	:	Conference Room (Room 46) at Upper Ground Floor, Hong Kong Heritage Discovery Centre, Kowloon Park, Tsim Sha Tsui

Minutes of Tenth Meeting

Present

Mr LEUNG Kong-yui	Chairman

Organization Members

Mr Tom CALLAHAN	Representing Business Environment Council
Mr SO Kwok-yin	Representing Conservancy Association
Mrs Karen BARRETTO	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Andy LEUNG	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Ir Prof CHOY Kin-kuen	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour

Individual Member

Mr Vincent NG	Individual Member
Captain CHEUNG Tai-kee	Co-opted Member
Mr Karl KWOK Chi-leung	Co-opted Member
Mr WONG Yiu-kan	Co-opted Member

Official Members

Mr Thomas CHAN	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Edward LEUNG	Senior Manager (Tourism)2, Tourism Commission (TC)
Ms Stella LEE Yim-fong	Principal Transport Officer/Urban, Transport Department (TD)
Ms YING Fun-fong	Head (Kai Tak Office), Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Mr CHEUNG Koon-lam	Chief Leisure Manager (Management), Leisure and Cultural Services Department

	(LCSD)
Mr Michael CHAU	General Manager/Planning, Development & Port Security, Marine Department (MD)
Ms Amy CHEUNG	Assistant Director of Planning/Territorial, Planning Department (PlanD)
Miss Ingrid TJENDRO	Secretary

In attendance

Miss Christine AU	Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Adrian CHAN	Senior Marine Officer/Planning & Development (1), MD
Mr Mann CHOW	Senior Town Planner/Studies and Research 3, PlanD

Absent with Apologies

Mr Nicholas BROOKE	Individual Member
Mr Paul YK CHAN	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Mr TAM Po-yiu	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Dr Sujata GOVADA	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Mr Louis LOONG	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong

For Item 3

Mr Gordon PEI	Senior Engineer/District, Port Works Division, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)

For Item 4

Mr Jonathan McKINLEY	Deputy Secretary for Home Affairs(2), Home Affairs Bureau (HAB)
Mr Ivan WONG	Assistant Secretary (Recreation & Sport)1, HAB

Action

The Chair welcomed all attending the meeting. He announced that Ms Jasminia Kristine CHEUNG, alternate representative of the Friends of the Earth (FoE) in the Commission and its Task Forces, had resigned from the Task Force on 1 April 2015. FoE had nominated Ms WONG Mee-chun to replace Ms CHEUNG as their new alternative. Mr CHUNG Siu-man, Assistant Director/Planning & Services of Marine Department (MD), had been succeeded by Mr CHEUK Fan-lun.

He informed Members that **Mr CHEUNG Koon-lam**, Chief Leisure Manager (Management) of Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) attended on behalf of Mr Donald CHOY, Assistant Director (Leisure Services)3; **Mr Edward LEUNG** of Tourism Commission (TC), Senior Manager (Tourism)2 attended on behalf of Ms Emily MO, Assistant Commissioner for Tourism 2. **Mr Michael CHAU**, General Manager/Planning, Development & Port Security of Marine Department (MD) attended on behalf of Mr CHEUK Fan-lun, Assistant Director/Planning & Services (Acting).

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the last Meeting

1.1 The draft minutes of the ninth Task Force on Water-land Interface (TFWL) meeting were circulated to Members for comments on 30 April 2015. The revised draft minutes with Members' comments incorporated were circulated again on 14 May 2015. The draft minutes were confirmed at the meeting without further amendments.

Item 2 Matters Arising

Other Matters (paragraphs 2.12, 2.14 and 2.23 of the confirmed minutes of the ninth meeting)

2.1 In response to Members' concern about the Government's initiative to promote a water-friendly culture and activities in para 2.12

and 2.23 of the confirmed minutes, the Secretariat had invited Home Affairs Bureau (HAB) to brief Members on the subject under agenda item 4.

2.2 With regards to Mr ZIMMERMAN's enquiry about MD's study on berthing and sheltered space, MD responded in the form of post-meeting notes in para 2.12 of the confirmed minutes.

2.3 In response to Members' interest on the design of seawalls in Hong Kong as expressed in para 2.14 of the confirmed minutes, the Secretariat had invited the Port Works Division of Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) to brief Members on the subject under agenda item 3.

Strategic Development Plan for Hong Kong Port 2030 (paragraph 3.23 of the confirmed minutes of the ninth meeting)

2.4 The Transport and Housing Bureau (THB) responded to Mr ZIMMERMAN's enquiry about the suitability of the site at Lin Cheung Road for port use in the form of post-meeting notes. A written response was also issued by the Development Bureau (DEVB) to Mr ZIMMERMAN with regards to the rezoning of the site for residential development.

2.5 Subsequent to MD's response to the stock-taking exercise of unlicensed vessels, **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that MD could get an estimated number of unlicensed vessels and their whereabouts in Hong Kong by contacting various sports associations, and he was willing to offer help if necessary.

2.6 **The Chair** thanked Mr ZIMMERMAN for his assistance and advised that his comments could be conveyed to MD for consideration.

(Post meeting notes: As mentioned in para. 2.12 of the post meeting notes of the 9th meeting minutes, it is not statistically practicable to stock-take unlicensed vessels because of its uncertain population, and it is difficult to estimate the demand of berthing space for these vessels in future projection.

Item 3 An Overview of Design of Public Seawalls within Victoria Harbour (Paper No. TFWL/02/2015)

3.1 **The Chair** said that at the last Task Force meeting, Members expressed interests in learning about the design of seawalls, how they were developed, and the opportunity of having innovative seawall design in Hong Kong. He advised that the Port Works Division of Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) had provided a Paper (Paper No. TFWL/02/2015) to brief Members on this subject.

3.2 **The Chair** welcomed **Mr Gordon PEI**, Senior Engineer/District from CEDD to the meeting. He invited Members to declare interests.

3.3 **Mr PEI** presented the Paper with the aid of a Powerpoint.

3.4 **Captain CHEUNG** thanked Mr PEI for the presentation. From the viewpoint of the marine industry, he shared that the increase in marine traffic would cause fierce wave conditions within Victoria Harbour. He enquired whether CEDD would consider replacing the existing vertical seawalls within Victoria Harbour with wave-absorbing seawalls for safety reasons.

3.5 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** made the following enquiries and comments:

(i) further details should be given on the plan on slide 18 of the Powerpoint, which showed existing public seawalls within Victoria Harbour;
(ii) distribution of the existing or potential seawall projects handled by CEDD;
(iii) longevity (remaining design life) of seawalls around Victoria Harbour;
(iv) whether there would be replacement or maintenance works on dilapidating seawalls in the future;
(v) the government department responsible for the management of seawalls;
(vi) why needs of the community and public enjoyment of the

waterfront was not included as one of the design considerations;

(vii) with regards to para 14 of the Paper, how to decide whether the reconstruction of seawall was economical and justified;

(viii) in terms of the management of seawalls and coordination between government departments, whether marine supporting facilities would be provided and managed in the water edges of Yau Tong Bay and Kwun Tong in a similar fashion as done at the New Yau Ma Tei Typhoon Shelter; and

(ix) clarification of the remits of CEDD on the issue of seawall.

3.6 **Mr Vincent NG** viewed that advanced engineering techniques could make possible diverse designs of seawalls, which could vary depending on the technical feasibility and the functionality of the seawall in a given location. From the viewpoint of the Task Force, he opined that Members were most interested in seawalls which could enhance the interface between the water and the land while achieving the functional purpose of foreshore protection at the same time. Given that the seawalls along reclaimed land were erected before a conscious process of harbourfront planning was conducted, he considered that ongoing projects such as the Kai Tak Fantasy and the Urban Design Study (UDS) for Wan Chai North and North Point Harbourfront Areas would be good opportunities for the government to review the design of seawalls thereat. He hoped that the Task Force could attain a clear position on the scope of possible changes for existing seawalls.

3.7 **Mr Ken SO** noticed that CEDD showed many good examples of eco-shoreline in the presentation, which were unfortunately not practicable within Victoria Harbour. Echoing Mr ZIMMERMAN's comment on the Port Works Design Manual for seawall, he enquired why environmental issue was not included as one of the design considerations. Regarding the Wan Chai UDS focus group discussions, he believed that members of the general public would desire having direct access to the seashore. **Mr SO** raised the following enquiries:

(i) whether the concept of eco-shoreline would be applied to the development of future seawall projects; and

(ii) under the guidelines of the Port Works Design Manual, whether the public were allowed to get close to the seashore or water.

3.8 **The Chair** clarified that Mr PEI represented CEDD as a works department to brief Members on the technical design and issues relating to seawalls in Hong Kong. Members should understand that some of their comments might be beyond the remit of CEDD and should be discussed among the Task Force instead of directing at CEDD for a response. He invited Mr PEI to respond to Members' comments from an engineering perspective.

3.9 **Mr PEI** agreed with Captain CHEUNG that increasing marine traffic coupled with the presence of vertical seawall would lead to strong wave conditions within the Harbour. He said that CEDD had carried out study and recommended that wave-absorbing seawalls should be considered for future development within Victoria Harbour. He also explained that the reconstruction of existing and functional vertical seawalls would incur substantial government expenditure and affect existing users. From CEDD's viewpoint, they would provide technical and engineering support to project initiatives intended by government bureaux and client departments.

3.10 Regarding the design considerations of seawalls, **the Chair** enquired whether technical feasibility of the works project was CEDD's primary factor of consideration.

3.11 **Mr PEI** replied that CEDD would also take into account community needs and environmental concerns in the preliminary design of projects including the building of new seawalls.

3.12 **The Chair** said that non-technical issues of seawalls would be discussed among Members of the Task Force. He asked whether Members had further comments.

3.13 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired about the current status of the seawalls shown on slide 18 of the Powerpoint, such as the remaining design life and schedule of replacement works. The map of

on slide 18 showed that wave-absorbing seawalls were constructed at the new Central harbourfront, but not in Wan Chai and North Point waterfronts. He requested Mr PEI to go through the map in greater details.

3.14 **The Chair** understood from the presentation that wave-absorbing seawalls would be built at the area under Wan Chai Reclamation in the future.

3.15 **Mr PEI** replied that the map showed the current situation of seawalls within Victoria Harbour and confirmed that wave-absorbing seawalls would be built in the new Wan Chai reclamation site. He said that the lifespan of seawall was about 50 years in general. According to CEDD's regular maintenance and inspection, he advised that all existing seawalls maintained by CEDD within Victoria Harbour were under proper maintenance. Thus from an engineering perspective, he advised that there was no need for reconstruction of the seawalls in the near future.

3.16 **The Chair** enquired whether CEDD also carried out routine inspections to ensure the safety of seawalls which were beyond the 50-year usual lifespan.

3.17 **Mr PEI** said that CEDD was responsible for the maintenance of most of the public seawalls and had dedicated staff to carry out routine inspections and maintenance of these seawalls.

3.18 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** asked which seawalls shown on slide 18 of the Powerpoint were beyond the usual lifespan and which were not. He opined that a detailed plan indicating the age of the each portion of seawall could facilitate further discussion. Also, he requested for clarification on the statement made in para 14 of the Paper that the reconstruction of seawall was "uneconomical and unjustified" and the reasoning behind.

3.19 **Mr Thomas CHAN** opined that the main concerns expressed by Members centered around the relationship between seawall designs and the enhancement they could bring in terms of

water-land interface. He summarized that Members' enquires were mainly twofold:

(i) the extent to which new seawalls could address these interface issues; and
(ii) whether there was opportunity for rebuilding or replacing some of the existing seawalls.

3.20 **Mr CHAN** understood from CEDD's presentation that instead of having to tear down the existing seawall, which would be a technically difficult and costly exercise, there were alternatives to provide better access to the water, for instance the installation of pontoons. He invited Mr PEI to supplement possible engineering solutions for improving water-land access in potential locations, such as Kwun Tong Promenade.

3.21 **Captain CHEUNG** said that marine traffic was relatively less busy near new reclamation sites where wave absorbing seawalls were built. He reflected that many accidents caused by fierce and unstable wave conditions were recorded at the western side of the Harbour. He believed that the use of floating barges was a remedy to reduce the undesirable effects caused by vertical seawalls, and urged the Government to improve the design of seawalls especially at the western side of the Harbour.

3.22 **The Chair** clarified that a pontoon was a temporary floating facility for passengers to embark and disembark, not a measure for wave reduction.

3.23 **Mr Tom CALLAHAN** was concerned about the safety of accessing to the water and using the waterbody under wavy conditions in the western side of the Harbour.

3.24 **Mr PEI** explained that one of the major constraints on the reconstruction of seawalls was the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (PHO) since overriding public need would need to be established for reclamation works within the Harbour. He added that in terms of land-side considerations, the construction of sloping seawalls usually

required extra land area behind the water edge. Given that most of the harbourfront areas were already developed, the possibility of replacing the existing vertical seawalls to sloping ones was rather low. As regards wave-absorbing seawall, extra land intake would also be required on the land side and this would be an issue to be dealt with. Echoing the Chair and Mr Thomas Chan's views on pontoons, he stated that pontoons were used for landing purpose, and the government might consider using them in future waterfront projects.

3.25 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** understood that there were constraints on dismantling and rebuilding seawalls. He opined that CEDD could prepare a plan showing the remaining design life of existing seawalls and the adjacent land available to support reconstruction or replacement works. He expressed that there might not be sufficient berthing space in typhoon shelters in the territory and was worried that placing pontoons in typhoon shelters on a permanent basis would reduce the amount of sheltered water available for mooring and berthing of vessels, especially during inclement weather. He reiterated his enquiry about the seawall design, provision of marine supporting facilities, management issues and CEDD's position in relation to the development of Yau Tong Bay.

3.26 **Mr PEI** replied that CEDD was responsible for the maintenance but not the management of seawalls.

3.27 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** questioned which party or department was responsible for managing seawalls.

3.28 **The Chair** presumed that the owner of the land at the immediate adjoining waterfront would oversee the land area including the seawalls.

3.29 Regarding the management and functionality of seawalls, **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that when the former public cargo working area was transformed to Kwun Tong Promenade under LCSD's management, the configuration of the seawall was changed, bollards were removed and a glass balustrade was built on top edge of the seawall. For Yau Tong Bay development, he pointed out that the

boundary of the promenade and the management responsibility of the seawall was not clear.

3.30 **The Chair** said that the Kwun Tong Promenade under LCSD's management was converted from the former public cargo working area. He presumed that LCSD had employed managing agent to manage the seawall. He suggested the Secretariat to clarify with relevant department.

(Post-meeting notes: The seawall at the Kwun Tong Promenade was under the management of LCSD.)

3.31 **Miss Christine AU** supplemented that the application for the Comprehensive Development Area at Yau Tong Bay was approved by the Town Planning Board in January 2015. Three flights of landing steps would be provided as part of the development proposal.

3.32 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** queried what would be built on top of the seawalls in Yau Tong Bay and who would decide the use of the seawall. He repeated that the glass balustrade at Kwun Tong Promenade had reduced the functionality of seawall in terms of support for marine uses.

3.33 **Miss Christine AU** reiterated that CEDD was invited to brief Members on the technical aspects of seawalls. Members' comments on the construction and design aspects of seawall were most welcomed. Regarding the discussion on water access, she recalled that the Secretariat had briefed Members on various water-dependent facilities in Victoria Harbour, including access points such as landing steps and piers. She said that a separate meeting for further discussion on water access could be arranged if required.

3.34 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** viewed that marine users' demand for mooring and tying vessels onto seawalls had been ignored.

3.35 **The Chair** reminded that the purpose of the briefing was about the design and technical issues of the seawalls.

3.36 **Miss Christine AU** referred to slide 22 of the Powerpoint and said that CEDD welcomed innovative design of landings on top of seawalls. Relevant departments could explore the possibility of providing landing facilities along seawalls at suitable and identified locations.

3.37 For the case of Kwun Tong Promenade, **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** queried how a pontoon could be tied onto a glass balustrade and who would manage the pontoon.

3.38 **The Chair** stressed that management issue on the area beyond the seawalls was beyond the purpose of discussion. He added that the discussion on the individual stretch of waterfront could be separate agenda items or discussed at the geographic Task Forces. He invited Members to give views on the technical aspects of seawall.

3.39 **Mr Tom CALLAH**AN learnt from the presentation that the construction of sloping seawalls would take up additional water space. He asked whether sloping and wave-absorbing seawalls could be built by cutting back the existing vertical walls.

3.40 As per the response given by CEDD, **The Chair** repeated that it was technically possible to cut back into the existing seawall but might take up some of the planned area in the hinterland. He supplemented that the frontage of the Kai Tak Cruise Terminal was constructed by cutting back the former sloping seawall. The site had been assigned to the operator of Kai Tak Cruise Terminal and the modification into a sloping seawall was incorporated into the design of the Cruise Terminal.

3.41 **Mr Tom CALLAHAN** shared that there was a vertical seawall underneath a pavement road at the water edge of Kennedy Town. He enquired whether the vertical seawall could be cut back without affecting the loading capacity of the pavement road.

3.42 **The Chair** supplemented that the seawall in Kennedy Town was built more than 50 years ago. He invited Mr PEI to give a conceptual answer on whether vertical seawalls could be transformed

into wave-absorbing seawalls without affecting the road service.

3.43 **Mr PEI** replied that it would be hard to judge the technical feasibility of a project without full information or the support from engineering studies. He foresaw that the project at the mentioned site might encounter a number of issues during construction. **The Chair** noted.

3.44 **Mr Andy LEUNG** opined that Members might have different lines of thought and preferences when discussing seawalls. From a conventional way of thinking, the seawall was a hardline demarcation of the land and the sea. He said that the objective of the Task Force was to introduce something in between land and water so as to enhance the interface. From an engineering point of view, financial and technical issues were the major factors. He expressed that the Task Force was bound by considerations such as PHO and issues on management, maintenance and safety. He suggested that the Task Force should think out of the box and try to introduce interesting interface areas in Hong Kong.

3.45 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that the presentation shared some creative seawall designs in overseas cities which enhanced ecological value. He raised the following enquires:

(i) whether relevant departments could provide a study on alternative seawall designs to enhance the functionality and enjoyment to the community around the seafront in urban areas;
(ii) whether marine supporting facilities, such as bollards, could be built on top or in front of vertical seawalls and wave-absorbing seawalls to facilitate mooring of vessels ;
(iii) what were the limitations and which of the existing seawalls would not be technically feasible for tying up of vessels; and
(iv) which of the existing vertical seawalls could allow vessels to be tied up onto.

3.46 In response to Mr ZIMMERMAN's enquiry about tying up of vessels onto seawalls, **Mr PEI** replied that marine facilities such as

bollards could be built on seawalls if they were incorporated in the initial design of the seawalls. However, it would be more difficult to modify the structure of a wave-absorbing seawall when the construction was completed.

3.47 **Ir Prof CHOY Kin-kuen** said that modification of existing seawalls was technically feasible from an engineering perspective. When considering the case of Kennedy Town, he advised the Government to assess the necessity for realignment of the pavement road if the existing seawall was to be replaced.

3.48 **Mr Tom CALLAHAN** clarified his intention in raising the case at Kennedy Town as an example to illustrate some of the technical and engineering issues involved when rebuilding seawalls; he did not intend to advocate modification works to be done. **The Chair** advised his comment was noted.

3.49 **The Chair** thanked Mr PEI for his briefing on the technical design and design considerations of seawalls. He noted that Members were concerned about a wide range of issues on seawalls, and some of which had not be fully answered at the meeting. The presentation served as a useful starting point for understanding the constraints and current arrangement of seawall construction within the Harbour. Members might be aware that vertical and sloping seawalls were built on both sides of Victoria Harbour, and wave-absorbing seawalls would be used for the Central Reclamation and Wan Chai Reclamation areas in the future. He summarized Members' concerns as follows:

(i) Members viewed that existing seawalls did not necessarily facilitate public access to and from the water;
(ii) Members were aware of the fierce wave conditions and heavy traffic at the western side of the Harbour and would like to have appropriate measures to improve marine safety around the area; and
(iii) provision of landing steps and facilities would be considered during the conduct of district studies.

3.50 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** supported that relevant government departments should investigate further into wave-absorbing seawalls and potentially replacing the existing vertical seawalls with the wave-absorbing type. He suggested that CEDD could make reference to overseas examples of ecologically friendly seawalls for urban areas and brief Members on some alternative seawall deigns for Hong Kong in future meetings. He viewed that mooring and tying up of vessels onto seawalls was a general issue around the Harbour.

3.51 In addition to the Chair's conclusion, **Miss Christine AU** informed Members that the Planning Department (PlanD), the Marine Department (MD) and the Development Bureau (DEVB) was in the process of reviewing the Harbour Plan Study as a whole on the basis of the established two-pronged planning approach. The team would update Members on the outcome of the review at the upcoming Commission meeting in June. She took note to approach MD for provision of data and information on marine traffic situation around the Harbour for Members' reference.

(Post-meeting notes: PlanD, MD and DEVB briefed Members of the Harbourfront Commission on the "Planning for Victoria Harbourfront – Revisiting the Harbour and Waterfront Plan" at the 20th meeting on 15 June 2015. Members of Task Force on Water-land Interface were also invited to the meeting. Members appreciated and endorsed the approach of revisiting the functional zones laid down in the Harbour and Waterfront Plan formulated by PlanD and the Tourism Board in 2003. Plans showing the average navigation pattern within the Harbour can be found at Annex G of the discussion paper (HC/11/2015) and slide 13 of the Powerpoint presented at the said meeting. It was reflected that the marine traffic situation on the western part of the Harbour is extremely busy due to the frequent domestic and cross boundary ferries services.)

3.52 **The Chair** agreed that alternative means to minimize the impact caused by strong waves should be considered and investigated in parallel with the use of wave-absorbing seawalls. He thanked Mr PEI for the presentation again and closed the agenda item.

Item 4 Water-friendly Culture and Activities – Opportunities for Water Sports in Hong Kong (Paper No. TFWL/03/2015)

4.1 **The Chair** mentioned that the idea of a water-friendly culture and activities and the potential of hosting more water-related activities within Victoria Harbour were promulgated in the Policy Address. The Home Affairs Bureau (HAB) had provided a Paper (Paper No. TFWL/03/2015) to brief Members on their preliminary proposal for the initiative. He welcomed **Mr Jonathan McKINLEY** and **Mr Ivan WONG** from HAB to the meeting. **The Chair** invited Members to declare interests.

4.2 **Mr Jonathan McKINLEY** presented the Paper with the aid of a Powerpoint.

4.3 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired what the work done by HAB to follow up on and develop the programme, and the estimated timeline.

4.4 In view of the limited marine space in Hong Kong, **Mr WONG Yiu-kan** advised that HAB and the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) should liaise with the marine industry and current users of the waterbody when introducing water sports in the Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter.

4.5 **Mr Jonathan McKINLEY** said that they were aware that the primary function of the Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter was to provide an area for vessels to take refuge in the typhoon season. He said that MD did not favor the use of typhoon shelters for water sports activities in general. However for Kwun Tong, MD advised that the general utilisation rate of the Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter was not particularly high, and thus they would allow water sports events to be held there on a case by case basis outside the typhoon season. He assured Members that HAB and LCSD would continue to engage and consult relevant stakeholders in the process. In response to Mr ZIMMERMAN's enquiry, he said that HAB was responsible for promoting sport, including water sports. The organization of water sports events should take into consideration factors such as: water quality, marine safety, the

availability of a suitable water body, wind and current conditions for different types of water sports, and ancillary and associated back-up facilities. **Mr McKINLEY** said that a proposal from the Hong Kong Water Sports Council for a temporary water sports centre at Kai Tak was under consideration. HAB noted that under the respective planning studies, there were proposals for the Central and Wan Chai North waterfronts to have facilities that would facilitate public access to the Harbour. HAB would explore opportunities for organising new events at these locations when the related infrastructure works were completed. He added that the future Metro Park and the Kai Tak Fantasy area might also provide water access to the public.

4.6 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** asked which parties were involved in HAB's consultation exercise. In terms of water quality, he enquired whether HAB had set water quality objectives for marine-related recreational use in the identified waterbody.

4.7 **Mr McKINLEY** replied that this meeting represented HAB's first formal consultation on opportunities for more water sports activity within the Harbour under the concept of a "water-friendly culture". HAB would consult the District Councils on the development of individual local facilities were to be developed, and HAB would keep in contact with the Hong Kong Water Sports Council and other sports associations. He clarified that the water quality objectives were set according by the Environmental Protection Department (EPD), and HAB and LCSD would observe these objectives when exploring water-based sports and recreational opportunities. Although some water sports enthusiasts might not be overly concerned about water quality, **Mr McKINLEY** reassured Members that HAB would work with EPD to help drive water quality improvements in areas for potential water sports and recreational uses.

4.8 **The Chair** viewed that the future new acute hospital at Kai Tak might be beneficial in case accidents occurred from water sports activities conducted at Kai Tak.

4.9 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** suggested HAB to broaden their base of parties consulted beyond the Water Sports Council.

4.10 **Mr McKINLEY** clarified that the Hong Kong Water Sports Council was made up of four water sports associations, namely the Hong Kong, China Rowing Association, the Hong Kong Dragon Boat Association, the Hong Kong Canoe Union and the Hong Kong Sailing Federation. HAB would involve all these associations in the consultation process.

4.11 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** opined that the presence of users of sampans around the Harbour should also be included in the consideration of the policy of a water-friendly culture. Echoing Mr WONG Yiu-kan's comment, he said that moorings for sailing boats at the Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter should be catered for. Regarding the potential locations for water sports pointed out at Annex 5 of the Paper, he recommended including the northern part of North Point near Oil Street as one of the potential sites and extending the area at Tsim Sha Tsui East towards Hung Hom. He also said that he could share with HAB a list of suitable locations for water sports and recreational development outside Victoria Harbour after the meeting.

4.12 **Mr McKINLEY** thanked Mr ZIMMERMAN for his views. For the berthing of sailing boats, he said that HAB, LCSD and sports associations would need to be involved when such plans were drawn up so as to help facilitate the organization of sailing events at suitable locations. He said that the proposed events presented to Members were preliminary. HAB welcomed Members' comments and inputs and would look into the possibility of including North Point and Hung Hom waterfronts as potential water sports locations, as suggested in consultation with MD.

4.13 **The Chair** agreed that it was prudent of the Administration to realize the water-friendly initiative in the Policy Address in a gradual manner. He thanked HAB for consulting the Task Force and for collecting views from Members.

4.14 **Mr Tom CALLAHAN** referred to slide 9 of the Powerpoint and enquired whether the plan showed the current *e. coli* levels of Victoria Harbour.

4.15 **Mr McKINLEY** replied that the map on slide 9 of the Powerpoint illustrated EPD's projected *e. coli* levels after the commencement of the early stage of the Harbour Area Treatment Scheme (HATS) Stage 2A. He added that the HATS Stage 2A was expected to be commissioned in Q3 of 2015, and EPD predicted that the water quality within the Harbour would improve by the end of 2015 up to the level as suggested in the plan.

4.16 **Mr Tom CALLAHAN** noticed that *e. coli* content at Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter and Kai Tai Approach Channel remained high even after the implementation of HATS Stage 2A.

4.17 **Mr Ivan WONG** supplemented that EPD's prediction of *e. coli* levels did not include the Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter and Kai Tai Approach Channel as EPD did not install monitoring stations at this water area. He understood that CEDD had carried out water quality improvement works for the area, and that the water quality in Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter was substantially improved and marginally acceptable for secondary contact recreational uses. However, the *e. coli* content at the Kai Tak Approach Channel was still below the minimum requirement.

4.18 **Mr McKINLEY** added that CEDD would have a separate set of data on the water quality at Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter and the Kai Tak Approach Channel.

4.19 **Ms YING Fun-fong** supplemented that CEDD had installed several monitoring stations within the Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter and the Approach Channel. The *e. coli* value obtained at the Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter in the past year was satisfactory. She said that the water quality at the Typhoon Shelter would vary according to the water condition of the Approach Channel. According to the EPD's standard, the annual geometric mean of *e. coli* value of the Typhoon Shelter was slightly less than 610cfu per 100 ml.

4.20 **Mr Tom CALLAHAN** would like to know HAB's further plan on facilitating access to the water and provision of landing steps at Kai Tak.

4.21 **Mr McKINLEY** said that HAB was aware of CEDD's data which showed the distribution of water-land access points around the Harbour, and locations with landing steps and piers in and around of Kai Tak had been identified. HAB would take these access points into account when liaising with sports associations on the organisation of sports events in the future.

4.22 **Miss Christine AU** advised that there were a total of six landing steps along the former Kai Tak runway. She informed Members that Energizing Kowloon East Office's (EKEO) upcoming study on Kai Tak Fantasy would look into the revitalization and long term use of the disused fireboat pier at the eastern side of the runway close to the proposed temporary water sports centre.

4.23 **Mr Tom CALLAHAN** said that Kai Tak was a huge area and asked whether there were the other landing steps in Kai Tak that the temporary water sports centre could use.

4.24 **Miss Christine AU** replied that the disused fireboat pier mentioned earlier would be the nearest to the site of the Water Sports Council's proposed temporary water sports centre.

4.25 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** expressed that HAB's policy initiative was an opportunity to group together government departments to address the issues of planning, management and decision-making for the use of the harbour and supporting uses on the waterfront. He raised that whether the road near the North Apron of Kai Tak could be set back in order to widen the promenade and make way for water sports facilities, and whether the ground level of the Government, Institution or Community (G/IC) sites at the South Apron could be used to support water sports activities.

4.26 **Ms YING** said that CEDD had been actively liaising with departments concerned about the arrangement of setting back the road so as to widen the promenade to about 30m. However, she alerted that the *e. coli* concentration at the Approach Channel in the past years was very high with recorded figure standing at 40,000cfu per 100ml, a level even

higher than that in Shing Mun River Channel. Despite the challenges, she said that relevant departments would continue to attempt further measures to effectively improve the water quality at the inner part of the waterbody.

4.27 **The Chair** thanked Mr MCKINLEY and Mr WONG for the presentation. He invited HAB to take into account Members' inputs and feedback in formulating proposals for a water-friendly culture and activities in the future.

4.28 **Mr McKINLEY** welcomed further views and comments from Members outside the meeting.

Item 5 Any Other Business

Date of Next Meeting

5.1 **The Chair** invited Members to give views and advise on specific water-land interface issues and water-dependent uses for discussion at the next meeting.

5.2 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** opined that DEVB should respond to his enquiry about the land use to the east of the Approach Channel and whether government would consider using the basement of the G/IC sites to facilitate water sports activities.

5.3 **Mr Thomas CHAN** said that HAB had made it clear that the first step in introducing water sports activities within the Harbour would be the temporary water sports centre proposed by the Hong Kong Water Sports Council at the tip of the former Kai Tak runway fronting Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter where water quality was marginally acceptable for such uses. At the same time, CEDD also pointed out that the water quality at the Approach Channel was still far from being suitable for secondary contact recreational use. He raised the following two questions should be answered first before contemplating how water sports uses could be accommodated in the Approach Channel:

(i) whether, and if so when water at the Approach Channel could be improved to a quality that is able to meet the requirement suitable for water sports; and

(ii) the functional requirements by the Hong Kong Water Sports Council and their plans for actual use of the land area to support its activities.

5.4 **Mr CHAN** supplemented that several sites were discussed at the Kai Tak Task Force where elements of water sports could be introduced, and relevant departments would explore where supporting facilities could be accommodated thereat.

5.5 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMN** enquired about the programme for releasing the sites adjacent to the Approach Channel to the market.

5.6 **Ms YING** replied that the sites would not be made disposed to the market in the short run as they would still be reserved as works areas for the construction of Route 6 of Trunk Road T2.

5.7 **The Chair** informed Members that this was the last Task Force meeting for the second term of Harbourfront Commission (HC). The Secretariat would inform Members of the date of the first meeting in the new term in due course. He thanked Members for their contribution and efforts to serve the Task Force in the last two years.

5.8 In response to Members' request for a progress report for the Task Force at the last meeting, **Miss Christine AU** informed Members that the Secretariat had prepared and tabled a list of agenda items discussed at previous meetings. Members may make reference to the list and suggest possible discussion topics for future meetings. **The Chair** thanked the Secretariat for preparing the list.

5.9 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Secretariat
Task Force on Water-land Interface
August 2015