

36th Meeting of Harbourfront Commission
held at 3:00 pm on 21 October 2019 at the Conference Room
15/F, North Point Government Offices, 333 Java Road, Hong Kong

Minutes of Meeting

Present

Mr Vincent NG	Chair
Mr Michael WONG	Secretary for Development, Vice Chair
Mrs Margaret BROOKE	Representing Business Environment Council
Prof Becky LOO	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Mrs Karen BARRETTO	Representing Friends of the Earth (HK) Charity Limited
Mr Anthony CHEUNG	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Paul CHAN	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Mr Edward LO	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Sr Francis LAM	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr Ivan HO	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Ir Raymond CHAN Kin-sek	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Terence LEE	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Mr Ken SO	Representing The Conservancy Association
Ms Kelly CHAN	
Mr Hans Joachim ISLER	
Mr Karl KWOK	
Ir Janice LAI	
Mr NGAN Man-yu	
Ms Angela SO	
Hon Tony TSE	

Official Members

Ms Bernadette LINN	Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands), Development Bureau (DEVB)
Ms Anny TANG	Senior Manager (Tourism) 21, Tourism Commission (TC)
Mr Eddie LEUNG	Chief Traffic Engineer/Hong Kong, Transport Department (TD)

Mr Ricky LAU	Director of Civil Engineering and Development, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Mr Horman CHAN	Assistant Director (Leisure Services) 1 (Atg.), Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Mr Tony CHAN	Assistant Director/Planning & Services, Marine Department (MD)
Mr Ivan CHUNG	Deputy Director of Planning/Territorial, Planning Department (PlanD)
Miss Rosalind CHEUNG	Secretary

In Attendance

Ms Doris HO	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Miss Teresa SAIR	Press Secretary to Secretary for Development
Mr LEUNG Kong-yui	Chair, Task Force on Water-Land Interface and Harbourfront Activation
Mr Henry LAI	Assistant Secretary (Harbour) 1, DEVB
Ms Jenny WONG	Assistant Secretary (Harbour) Special Duties, DEVB
Mr William CHAN	Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Carlos FUNG	Senior Engineer (Harbour), DEVB
Ms Daphne LI	Architect (Harbour) 1, DEVB
Miss Maggie WOO	Quantity Surveyor (Harbour), DEVB

Absent with Apologies

Mr Mac CHAN
Ms Christina LEE
Ms Vivian LEE
Mr Alan LO

Agenda Item 3

Mr Horman CHAN	Assistant Director (Leisure Services) 1 (Atg.), LCSD
Mr Ken LEE	Leisure Manager (Land-based Venues) 3, LCSD

Agenda Item 4

Mr Paul WONG	Principal Assistant Secretary (Energy), Environment Bureau (ENB)
Ms Fanny CHEUNG	Assistant Secretary (Energy) 1, ENB
Mr Wayne YEH	Research Director, MVA Hong Kong Limited

Welcoming Message

The Chair welcomed all to the meeting. He informed the meeting that –

- Ms Anny TANG, Senior Manager of the Tourism Commission, attended on behalf of Mr Joe WONG;
- Mr Eddie LEUNG, Chief Traffic Engineer of the Transport Department (TD), attended on behalf of Ms Mable CHAN;
- Mr Horman CHAN, Acting Assistant Director of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD), attended on behalf of Mr Vincent LIU;
- Mr Tony CHAN, Assistant Director of the Marine Department (MD), attended on behalf of Miss Agnes WONG; and
- Mr Ivan CHUNG, Deputy Director of the Planning Department (PlanD), attended on behalf of Mr Raymond LEE.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 35th meeting

1.1 **The Chair** said that the Secretariat circulated the draft minutes of the 35th meeting to Members on 14 October 2019. There being no proposed amendment, the minutes were confirmed at the meeting.

Item 2 Matters Arising

2.1 No matters arising were raised at the meeting.

Item 3 Trial Scheme on Inclusive Park for Pets

3.1 **The Chair** welcomed Mr Horman CHAN and Mr Ken LEE of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) to the meeting.

Briefing by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department

- 3.2 **Mr Horman CHAN** briefed Members on the Trial Scheme on Inclusive Park for Pets (“the Scheme”), including the objective of the Scheme, facilities in the selected venues and relevant management guidelines with the aid of a PowerPoint.

Discussion

General Comments

- 3.3 **The Chair** appreciated the introduction of the Scheme which allowed people and pets to share the open space. He recalled that the “pet garden” along Hung Hing Road opened in 2007 was well received by pet owners. Yet, the venue was eventually closed in early 2010 upon the commencement of the construction of the Central - Wan Chai Bypass and Island Eastern Corridor Link.
- 3.4 **Hon Tony TSE, Ir Raymond CHAN, Mr Ivan HO, Mr Anthony CHEUNG, Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** and **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** supported the adoption of the “shared-use” concept which encouraged the use of park facilities by different users, including park visitors, pets owners and their pets, etc. This had created an inclusive environment.
- 3.5 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** pointed out that the public might be confused of the concept of pet gardens and inclusive parks, in which dogs could scamper off leash in the former but must be on leash in the latter. He hoped that LCSD could promote to the public the distinction between the two leisure facilities.

Gathering of Public Opinion

- 3.6 **Hon Tony TSE** opined that apart from receiving comments from venue management and 1823, LCSD should proactively collect views from users and stakeholders through other means, such as workshops and opinion surveys. Users’

Action

feedback could help LCSD to assess whether the Scheme should be introduced to more districts in the future.

- 3.7 **Prof Becky LOO** supported the conducting of a survey too, which could help gather useful statistical information such as the age of park users, number of pet owners, number and size of dogs visiting each park, etc.
- 3.8 **Mr Edward LO** remarked that survey was an effective way in gathering feedback on users' experience, needs and expectation. The survey findings could then facilitate LCSD in assessing the effectiveness of the Scheme and whether the facilities in the inclusive parks were adequate in meeting the needs of stakeholders.
- 3.9 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** stressed that suggestions collected in the community participation and engagement were essential in refining the design of harbourfront. He supported adopting an incremental approach in opening up the promenades for pets on leash and suggested that in the future, the new promenades should be designed to take care of the needs of pet owners and pets as far as possible.

Implementation Details

- 3.10 **Mr Paul CHAN** enquired whether these parks would continue to be open up for the use of pet owners and their pets upon completion of the scheme, and if so whether enhancement works to the park would be carried out.

[Post-meeting notes: These questions have been passed to LCSD for advice after the meeting. The Secretariat will relay the details when received.]

- 3.11 **Ir Raymond CHAN** noted that under the existing policy, pets were not allowed to enter parks. He was concerned that large dogs would cause nuisance and danger to other park users, including children and small pets. He questioned if large dogs should be prohibited from visiting inclusive parks.

Action

- 3.12 **Mr Horman CHAN** understood people's concern over large dogs causing nuisance or imposing threats to people and small dogs. He explained that inclusive parks were not specifically designed for use by pets. Hence, unlike the pet gardens which were designed with separate zones for large and small dogs, there was no segregation for large and small dogs in inclusive parks.
- 3.13 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** and **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** proposed that in order to balance the conflicting needs between various users, a pet-free area should be designated in inclusive parks so that some users, particularly children, could play there at ease. On the other hand, dogs could run freely off the leash in the designated area.
- 3.14 **Mr Horman CHAN** responded that pet owners were required to keep their dogs on leash and under proper control in inclusive parks. He hoped that there could be mutual understanding and respect of the needs of each other for all park users in order to create a harmonious and inclusive environment.

Pet-Friendly and Shared-Use Promenades

- 3.15 **Mr Ivan HO** opined that the design of harbourfront promenades should adopt pet-friendly and shared-use concepts in the long run. He considered that the pet garden of the North Point Promenade which was fenced-off was a negative example of good design of public space.
- 3.16 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** agreed and urged that all promenades should be open to pets. LCSD could consider opening up all promenades for people to visit with pets on leash as a start.
- 3.17 **Sr Francis LAM** and **Ir Raymond CHAN** had reservation on opening the promenades to pets. They were concerned about possible hygiene problems and nuisance caused by the

Action

pets if they were allowed to access the promenade. LCSD was advised to step up publicity and public education to remind pet owners to keep their pets under proper control and restrain them from causing nuisance to other park users.

3.18 **Mr Ivan HO, Mr LEUNG Kong-yui and Sr Francis LAM** welcomed the idea of shared-use of promenade with pets but opined that the arrangement should be site-specific because the design of each promenade is different. **Mr Ivan HO** shared his recent experience of visiting the North Point Promenade where he considered that the 5-metre wide pedestrian passage was too narrow for shared-use by different users. The proponent was advised to take into consideration the width of the pathway and other physical constraints when assessing whether a certain section of a promenade could be open to pet owners and their pets.

3.19 **Mr Horman CHAN** responded that they would keep an open mind towards new ideas and continue to optimise the use of public open space in consultation with relevant stakeholders, including the District Councils, for the benefit of the community.

3.20 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** pointed out that certain pet gardens along the promenades, such as the one in the Quarry Bay Promenade, had no connection with the Quarry Bay Park in the hinterland. He urged LCSD to identify routes for pets on leash to walk from the park in the hinterland to the waterfront.

Way Forward

3.21 **The Chair** thanked LCSD for introducing the pet-friendly policy which was very well-received. Over the years, the HC has received requests urging the government to opening the promenades for pets. He said that HC, entrusted with the task of bringing vibrancy to the harbourfront, fully supported the pet-friendly policy because harbour was not only for leisure and recreation of people, but also for

Action

enjoyment of many other users, including pets. He hoped to see the policy being extended to more harbourfront sites in future.

- 3.22 While more harbourfront sections of the promenades along the Victoria Harbour would be open for public enjoyment in the future, with a view to taking the pet-friendly policy forward, **the Chair** said that HC and its Task Forces could assist LCSD in identifying suitable pilot sites for implementation of the Scheme. He added that the Scheme should be introduced in an incremental manner, for example, starting with dogs being allowed on leash at promenades.
- 3.23 As regards the concern on possible hygiene problems caused by pets, **the Chair** said that the focus should be placed on public education for pet owners as we counted on their support and cooperation for the effective implementation of the Scheme.
- 3.24 **Mr Horman CHAN** responded that LCSD was gauging feedback on the use of inclusive parks, including conducting surveys with pet owners and other users. Upon reviewing the comments, in consultation with the relevant District Councils, the LCSD will carefully consider relevant factors before committing to provide more pet facilities for the existing inclusive parks and extend the Scheme to other parks.
- 3.25 **The Chair** thanked LCSD for briefing Members on the Scheme and invited the department to update Members on the outcome of the Scheme in due course.

Item 4 Measures to Manage External Lighting and Future Developments

- 4.1 **The Chair** welcomed Mr Paul Wong and Ms Fanny Cheung of the Environment Bureau (“ENB”), and Mr Wayne YEH, Research Director, MVA Hong Kong Limited to the meeting.

Briefing by ENB

- 4.2 **Mr Paul Wong** informed the meeting that ENB launched the Charter on External Lighting in 2016 and was now reviewing the effectiveness of the Charter. As part of the review, ENB was now conducting a survey to gauge the views of the general public and other stakeholders. In this context, ENB would like to collect views from the harbourfront perspective.
- 4.3 **Mr Wayne YEH** briefed Members on the measures for managing external lighting and future developments with the aid of a PowerPoint.

Discussion

Implementation Details of the Charter

- 4.4 According to the Charter, participants complying with the switch-off requirement, i.e., switching off external lighting during preset times, would receive awards. **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** said that apart from the switch-off time of the installations, consideration could be given to expanding the criteria for award to include the brightness of such installations and the nuisance caused to residents.
- 4.5 **Prof Becky LOO** concurred and considered that there was room to improve the effectiveness of the existing Charter in tackling light pollution. She suggested including additional compliance requirements in the Charter to control the intensity of external lighting installations.
- 4.6 **Ms Kelly CHAN** considered that the preset switch-off times, starting at 11 p.m., was too late because work-life balance had become increasingly important nowadays with people going to bed earlier than before. To minimise light nuisance caused to residents in the vicinity, she suggested advancing the preset times to 8 p.m.

Action

- 4.7 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** pointed out that the voluntary Charter had failed to regulate the outdoor lighting, resulting in an increase in the number of light nuisance-related complaints over the years. He enquired about the number of complaints received by the Government in recent years and urged the Government to step up measures to tackle this long-standing problem.
- 4.8 **Mr Wayne YEH** replied that the Government received about 400 complaints in 2018 and about 200 in the first half of 2019.

Site-specific standards

- 4.9 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG, Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN, Mr Ken SO, Mr LEUNG Kong-yui, Ms Kelly CHAN, Ir Raymond CHAN and Mr Ivan HO** agreed that external lighting at night would cause nuisance to nearby residents but stressed that lighting at the Victoria harbourfront should be dealt with and regulated differently because its iconic and fascinating night view was a tourist attraction.
- 4.10 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** opined that the Government should define light nuisance before formulating policy on outdoor lighting regulations. He highlighted that the International Commission on Illumination had developed the use of "Lighting Environmental Zone" to control the level of lighting in various zones, such as national parks, residential areas, and areas with high levels of night time activities. He added that lighting hours should correspond with the activities of people in the particular "Lighting Environmental Zone" and Hong Kong could consider adopting these regulatory measures to restrict outdoor lighting.
- 4.11 **Mr Ivan HO** agreed that the intensity of lighting along the harbourfront should be regulated but considered that the standard applicable to the harbourfront should be different standard from that for, say, residential areas as night lighting of the buildings on both sides of the harbour was one of the

key installations that made the night view of our harbour so iconic.

- 4.12 **Ir Raymond CHAN** said that there should be more stringent control on lightings, particularly occulting lighting on video walls, in residential areas to minimise the nuisance to residents in the vicinity. On the other hand, a more lenient approach should be adopted in non-residential areas such as the harbourfront to maintain its attractiveness and vibrancy.
- 4.13 **Mr Paul WONG** noted the importance of balancing the interest of different stakeholders. He explained that in 2015 the Task Force on External Lighting concluded that while the community had yet to develop a consensus on the need for legislation to regulate external lighting, there was a genuine need as well as public support for other measures to alleviate the problems caused by external lighting. As such, the Task Force on External Lighting recommended a multi-pronged approach, including the launch of a charter scheme, to tackle problems caused by external lighting. ENB accepted the Task Force's recommendations and launched the Charter on External Lighting in 2016. Members' comments raised in this meeting would be conveyed to the Working Group. The Working Group targeted to submit their recommendations on tackling external lighting to the Government in 2020.
- 4.14 **The Chair** thanked ENB for the presentation. He understood public's concerns about light pollution but emphasised that HC was tasked to beautify and activate the harbour. He agreed with Members that the harbourfront deserved a different treatment from other areas of Hong Kong and its night-time appeal would be significantly reduced if the same territory-wide regulatory standard was to apply to the harbourfront. He strongly appealed to ENB to consider working out different regulatory standards for the harbourfront and residential areas so as to balance the interest of various stakeholders while maintaining the vibrancy and attraction of our

harbour.

Item 5 Progress Reports from Task Forces
(Paper No. HC/06/2019) (Paper No. HC/07/2019)
(Paper No. HC/08/2019) (Paper No. HC/09/2019)

5.1 **The Chair** remarked that the four progress reports had been circulated to Members for perusal prior to the meeting. Members noted and had nothing to raise.

Item 6 Any Other Business

Relocation of Harbour Office

6.1 **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** informed Members that the Harbour Office would be relocated from the Central Government Offices in Tamar to Wing On Kowloon Centre in Jordan in the coming months. Future meetings would be held at the Conference Room of the new office upon completion of renovation work.

[Post-meeting notes: The Secretariat informed all members that the Harbour Office was relocated to the Wing On Kowloon Centre in Jordan on 24 December 2019.]

6.2 There being no other business, the meeting ended at 4:55pm.

Secretariat
Harbourfront Commission
May 2020