

# Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island

## Minutes of Third Meeting

Date : 2 December 2010  
Time : 9:30 a.m.  
Venue : Conference Room, 15/F, North Point Government Offices  
333 Java Road, North Point

### Present

Mr Nicholas Brooke	Chairman
Dr Andrew Thomson	Representing Business Environment Council
Mr Leung Kong-yui	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Mr Ken So	Representing Conservancy Association
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 Peter Cookson Smith	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Ir Dr Chan Fuk-cheung	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Louis Loong	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Paul Zimmerman	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Ms Lily Chow	
Mr Eric Fok	
Mr Vincent Ng	
Ms Gracie Foo	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands) <sup>1</sup> , Development Bureau (DEVB)
Ms Stephanie Lai	Senior Manager (Tourism) 2, Tourism Commission
Mr H L Cheng	Chief Traffic Engineer/Hong Kong, Transport Department
Mr Mak Chi-biu	Chief Engineer/Hong Kong 1, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Miss Olivia Chan	Assistant Director (Leisure Services) 2, Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Ms Brenda Au	District Planning Officer/Hong Kong, Planning Department (PlanD)
Mr Chris Fung	Secretary

### In Attendance

Ms Maisie Chan	Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Peter Mok	Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB

**Absent with Apologies**

Dr Frederick Lee	Representing Friends of the Earth
Dr Paul Ho	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr Chan Hok-fung	
Mr Benjamin Cha	

**For Matters Arising – Proposed refinement to the design of Advance Promenade in the new Central harbourfront**

Mr Ko Wai-kuen	Senior Engineer 7 (Hong Kong Island Division 1), CEDD
Mrs Sylvia Lam	Chief Project Manager 103, Architectural Services Department (ArchSD)
Mr Tommy Ng	Director, Atkins China Ltd
Mr Randy Mok	Executive Director, A. Lead Architects Ltd
Mr Rocco Yim	Executive Director, Rocco Design Architects Ltd
Mr Boris Lo	Associate, Rocco Design Architects Ltd

**For Agenda Item 3**

Ms Jacinta Woo	Chief Town Planner/Studies and Research, PlanD
Mr Edward Leung	Senior Town Planner/Studies and Research (Atg.), PlanD
Mr Alan Macdonald	Director, Urbis Limited
Mr David Hung	Town Planner, Urbis Limited

**For Agenda Item 4**

Mr Fung Wai-kin	Senior Superintendent of Police (Support) (Marine Regional Headquarters), Hong Kong Police Force (HKPF)
Ms Janet Ong	Superintendent of Police (1) (Planning & Development), HKPF
Ms Joanna Leung	Senior Estate Surveyor/Hong Kong East (3), Lands Department

**Action**

**The Chairman** welcomed all to the meeting.

**Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting**

- 1.1 The draft minutes of the 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting held on 6 October 2010 were circulated to Members on 21 October 2010. A revised draft, incorporating proposed amendments received, was circulated to the Members on 26 November 2010.

- 1.2 There being no further amendment, the **meeting** confirmed the revised draft minutes.

**Item 2 Matters Arising**

West Ventilation Building of the Central-Wan Chai Bypass

- 2.1 Regarding paragraph 1.2 of the confirmed minutes of the 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting on the West Ventilation Building (WVB) of the Central-Wan Chai Bypass, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** questioned why there had been no feedback by the two parties, although they had previously been requested in the 1<sup>st</sup> meeting to work together to look at the existing and revised WVB proposals and to bring the proposals back to the Task Force within 2 to 3 months.
- 2.2 In response, **the Chairman** pointed out that the Secretary for Development had clearly indicated the Administration's position at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Harbourfront Commission meeting held on 25 October 2010 that there was no room to re-open discussions on the location of WVB and the Commission should focus the discussion on refining and improving the exterior design of the WVB.
- 2.3 In response to Mr Zimmerman's query on whether correspondence addressed to the Harbourfront Commission was always circulated to all members, **the Chairman** said that he had received a letter from IFC and that the Secretary for Development had issued a letter to inform the IFC Development Ltd about the Administration's position on the WVB. He had no objection to circulating the letters to all Members, subject to the view of the Administration. *(Post-meeting note: Copies of the letters were circulated to Members on 3 and 6 December 2010.)*
- 2.4 Regarding paragraph 3.4(c) of the confirmed minutes of the 1<sup>st</sup> meeting on the air purification system to be included in the WVB, **Mr Zimmerman** remarked that as the system would significantly change the height and bulk of the building and might have impact on the air quality, the Highways Department (HyD) should brief the Task Force on the revised design of the building. **The Chairman** responded that the HyD would come back with an enhanced proposal on the WVB for

**Action**

the Task Force's review and he would check the timing of this briefing.

**Progress update on Site 4 Development in the new Central harbourfront**

2.5 On the Chairman's invitation, **Mr Peter Mok** of DEVB updated Members that, as announced by the Secretary for Development at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Harbourfront Commission meeting, the Administration was going to appoint a consultant to carry out a business viability study for the development of Site 4 in the new Central harbourfront, which would also study whether the public-private collaboration (PPC) could be extended to cover the entire Site 7 or part of Site 7. He reported the progress as follows:-

- (a) comments of Members and relevant government departments had been incorporated into the consultancy brief. Invitation letters, together with the revised consultancy brief had been issued to thirteen potential consultants on 26 November 2010 and the deadline for submission of proposal was 17 December 2010;
- (b) it was expected that the assessment of all proposals returned by the potential consultants would be completed by December 2010. DEVB would keep the Task Force informed of the result of the consultancy appointment; and
- (c) the consultant services were targeted to commence from January 2011. It was envisaged that the appointed consultant would submit a preliminary report by the end of February 2011, which would summarise all relevant findings and recommendations based on its assessment of the business potentials of the project. Members would be consulted on the preliminary report when it was available.

**DEVB**

2.6 **The Chairman** requested that revised scope of consultancy be circulated to Members for reference. He looked forward to the appointed consultant's final submission of recommendations. *(Post-meeting note: A copy of the final version of the consultancy brief was circulated to Members on 3 December 2010.)*

**Action**

Proposed refinement to the design of advance promenade in the new Central harbourfront

- 2.7 On the Chairman's invitation, **Messrs Mak Chi-biu** and **Ko Wai-kuen** of CEDD, **Mrs Sylvia Lam** of ArchSD, **Mr Tommy Ng** of Atkins China Ltd and **Messrs Rocco Yim** and **Boris Lo** of Rocco Design Architects Limited presented the proposed refinement to the design of the advance promenade with the aid of PowerPoints and computer animation.
- 2.8 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** expressed thanks to the departments' efforts. He remarked that the physical and visual link between the "Green Carpet" extension fronting the new Central Government Complex (CGC) at Tamar and the waterfront had been improved under the refined design. He also raised the following points regarding the refined proposal:-
- (a) Consideration should be given to whether the areas would be used as performance areas or other purposes;
  - (b) outlets or kiosks selling food, drinks and newspapers etc, instead of vending machines, should be provided in the advance promenade; and
  - (c) more well-designed rain shelters could be provided along the waterfront.
- 2.9 While agreeing with the overall concept of the "Green Carpet", **Mr Andy Leung** raised the following comments:-
- (a) the volume of the pump houses should be further minimised if possible;
  - (b) backdrop and support facilities could be provided in the "Green Carpet" if the lawn was to be open to the public for holding functions; and
  - (c) the design of the shelter facilities should be integrated with the "Green Carpet" to make them more interesting.
- 2.10 **Mr Vincent Ng** opined that the visual and physical connectivity between the "Green Carpet" and the waterfront had been much improved, particularly with the removal of the very obstructing water features. The integration and coordination between the two designs had also been enhanced. However, the design of

**Action**

the advance promenade still appeared monotonous. More imagination was needed in the design of the paving and seating.

2.11 **Mr Leslie Chen** viewed that the design concept of the refined proposal had clearly demonstrated a balanced asymmetry and minimalist approach. A strong and simple signature design of the “Green Carpet” had been adopted, having regard to the concepts of flexibility and multiple-purpose usage. He made the following suggestions:-

- (a) the minimalist design could be further adjusted by balancing the land usage and people’s aspiration; and
- (b) some parts of the “Green Carpet” might be pushed forward to form part of the waterfront promenade in order to improve the variety and functional element within the “Green Carpet”, while not affecting its simple signature design.

2.12 **Mr Eric Fok** made the following suggestions:-

- (a) if larger scale events were to be organized in the vicinity, public access, in particular vehicular access, to the areas should be enhanced;
- (b) more temporary washrooms should be made available in the middle and the east end of the advance promenade; and
- (c) there should be sufficient enabling facilities such as power and water supply etc, if the location would be used in holding large-scale events.

2.13 **Dr Andrew Thomson** supported the enhancements made in the refined design of the advance promenade, particularly its integration with the “Green Carpet”. He also made the following comments:-

- (a) the advance promenade was designed as an emergency vehicle access (EVA), rather than as a promenade;
- (b) instead of just providing vending machines, kiosks could be provided and the design of the facilities should be integrated with the promenade;

**Action**

- (c) enabling facilities such as electricity etc should be provided for holding events;
- (d) reduction of the size of water features and installation of more landscape arts and sculpture along the advance promenade were supported;
- (e) the “Green Carpet” was rightly situated and its relative position to the advance promenade had allowed for greater visual permeability. The designs of the paths under the greening were reasonable; and
- (f) the proposed large-scale fixed planters along the waterfront would pose barriers to access which should be replaced by small informal planting areas.

2.14 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** enquired whether the top part of the pump houses could be accessible or not. It would be a pity if the green roof of the pump houses would not be used for viewing the harbour.

2.15 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** had the following views/enquiries:-

- (a) the roof of the pump house would be the natural destination for people from both Admiralty via the “Green Carpet” and from Central via the promenade, and the ideal viewing platform of the harbour;
- (b) there should be more flexibility in the design so that the courses of footpaths could be adjusted in the future;
- (c) there should be provision of food and beverage outlets and sheltered seating on the east end of the roof top of the pump house;
- (d) he hoped that the project team could offer their view as to the future use of this entire area of “Green Carpet” and the promenade for ceremonial functions. In particular, he wondered if the project team would support the idea that the Golden Bauhinia and the flagstaff be relocated to this location in the future;
- (e) the Administration should come back to the Task Force with three different sets of layout, (i) when fireworks

**LCSD and  
relevant**

**Action**  
**departments**

display was being conducted with crowd control measures in force; (ii) when there was no event, showing the storage of the crowd control facilities (which were continuous blight on other waterfront areas); and (iii) when official ceremonies were taking place;

- (f) the “Green Carpet” was now a high quality park but accompanied with a low quality waterfront promenade. The Government should take into consideration the need to maintain coherence between the design quality of the “Green Carpet” and that of the advance promenade;
- (g) considerations should also be given to a more innovative use of the distinctive features of the front of the pump house including sheltered seating;
- (h) in addition to the proposed staircases on both sides of the pump house, consideration could be given to providing more staircases in front of the pump houses to improve the connectivity between the “Green Carpet” with the promenade;
- (i) there should be close liaison with the People’s Liberation Army (PLA) with a view to expanding the permitted uses of the PLA berth area when no vessel was in town, and to redesigning the structures to avoid “the wall of steel” and to make the area more user friendly; and
- (j) the ground level open space of Central Piers 7 & 8 and in front of Central Piers 9 and 10 should be included in the design of the advance promenade. He also queried the time frame for reassembly of Queen’s Pier.

2.16 In response to the comments and enquiries raised by Members, **Mr Mak Chi-biu** said that the project team would seriously consider these comments in finalising the design. He also clarified that the pump houses at the Tamar Site had already been used for more than 5 years. They indeed posed some constraints to beautification and integration of the “Green Carpet” with the waterfront. The project team would try their best to refine the design and discuss with the bureaux and departments concerned on the way forward.

2.17 In summarizing Members’ comments and enquiries, **the Chairman** remarked that Members were particularly concerned



**Action**

about the following aspects of the "Green Carpet" extension:-

- (a) its use and activities to be held there;
- (b) its carrying capacity; and
- (c) the enabling facilities to support the activities in the vicinity.

2.18 In response, **Mrs Sylvia Lam** of ArchSD said that there was no definite plan on the use of green lawn at the moment. The green lawn would be open for public enjoyment and the public could step on it. Regarding organization of events in the vicinity, it had yet to be planned.

2.19 **Ms Gracie Foo** of DEVB pointed out that the focus of this discussion was on the design of the advance promenade. Organisation of activities above the advance promenade should be separately discussed between LCSD and the concerned bureaux/ departments. She agreed with Members' comments that there should be adequate enabling facilities (e.g. electricity, water supply etc.) to support holding of events/activities on the advance promenade. She also remarked that the future development of the permanent promenade (including the reassembly of Queen's Pier) would depend on the result of the PPC of Site 4 development and hence could be discussed after the commissioning of the consultancy study on Site 4. The Administration would engage the consultant to attend the next Task Force meeting so that Members would have a chance to discuss early the PPC model at Site 4. The scope to expand to Site 7 would depend on the financial viability.

2.20 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** opined that the roof top of the pump house at the east end of the advance promenade could be released early for commercial activities, without having to wait for the completion of consultancy study on business viability on Site 4 and Site 7 of the new Central harbourfront.

2.21 In response to the comments made by Members, **Mr Rocco Yim** of Rocco Design Architects Ltd made the following points:-

- (a) the use of the "Green Carpet" extension and the associated platform could not be planned in isolation. He personally opined that the lawn should not be used for large-scale activities, gatherings and performances;

**Action**

rather it should be intended for informal gatherings and small-group activities. Venues elsewhere in the promenade could better serve the demand for staged performances of larger scale;

- (b) he was personally supportive of ceremonial functions taking place on the lawn and platform, although the problems of crowd dispersion and traffic had to be solved in advance. Without the final design of the remaining part of the waterfront promenade, the crowd control strategy could not be sorted out yet;
- (c) there was plan to erect 7 to 8 sculptures along the “Green Carpet”. Hopefully, a sculptural theme extending all the way from the “Green Carpet” to its extension and the platform could be adopted, subject to the loading and budgetary constraints; and
- (d) the current arrangement of a two-tier connection between the “Green Carpet” and the promenade had some merits, allowing people to view the harbour from two different levels. There should be some connection between the “Green Carpet” and the waterfront, though not all the way along the promenade. There was room for providing more connection between the lower and upper levels on the east side.

2.22 In response to the Chairman’s enquiry, **Mr Mak Chi-biu** said that, in view of the tight schedule, CEDD would issue a variation order to the existing contractor to carry out the works so that the advance promenade could be open to the public for enjoyment as early as possible. Otherwise, the advance promenade would be delayed for a year. He also said that CEDD would provide the final plan of advance promenade for Members’ reference. However, due to time constraints, the information would be forwarded to Members through circulation, rather than by presentation at the next Task Force meeting.

**CEDD**

2.23 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** opined that the site would be a prime site on Hong Kong Island for viewing fireworks display conducted twice a year and therefore the Task Force should be involved in the design of the site. In response, **the Chairman** said that the Task Force would hold a separate session with LCSD and relevant departments to discuss how to operate and manage the

**LCSD and relevant**

“Green Carpet” and advance promenade, including on how the venue would be managed during the fireworks display.

- 2.24 **Mr Ken So** said that the success of the “Green Carpet” would hinge largely on the maintenance of the grass lawn. As the lawn would be one of the largest lawns in Hong Kong, it would certainly attract a large number of people to it. The maintenance of the lawn should be carefully considered at the design stage.
- 2.25 In concluding the discussion, **the Chairman** appreciated once again the project team’s hard work and efforts in refining the design of the advance promenade. As a lot of ideas and comments had been contributed by Members during this meeting, the Chairman hoped that the project team could revisit on how these new ideas could best fit into the final design to be circulated to Members.

**Item 3      Hong Kong Island East Harbour-front Study (Paper No. TFHK/07/2010)**

- 3.1 Before discussion, **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** declared conflict of interest in this item. He worked as a Director of Urbis Ltd which was the consultant being commissioned by PlanD in carrying out the Study. **The Chairman** proposed and **Members** agreed that he could continue to stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion on the item.
- 3.2 On the Chairman’s invitation, **Ms Jacinta Woo** of PlanD and **Mr Alan Macdonald** of Urbis Ltd briefed Members on Paper No. TFHK/07/2010, with the aid of a PowerPoint and a video.
- 3.3 After listening to the presentation, **the Chairman** enquired about the following:-
- (a) the estimated cost which would be involved in taking the proposals forward;
  - (b) whether there would be any prioritisation of projects; and
  - (c) the length of the boardwalk, and whether there would be any anchor points at strategic locations to attract people.

**Action**

3.4 **Dr Andrew Thomson** remarked that there were a lot of excellent works in the Study. He further raised the following questions:-

- (a) how the SkyTrail could be integrated to enhance the patronage of visitors to the Coastal Defence Museum; and
- (b) whether the end-of-path destinations could be approached by vehicles and whether there would be sufficient car-parking spaces thereupon.

3.5 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** opined that the Commission should give full support to the Study so that it could proceed to the next stage and funding approval from the Legislative Council could be obtained in implementing the projects. He had the following enquiries/views:-

- (a) how marine uses would be enabled, and he requested a plan showing how the boardwalk could interface with various piers and marine access points along the waterfront. He opined that it was ideal to connect the boardwalk with all piers for better accessibility;
- (b) the area covered by the Study could be split up into 4 separate action areas to facilitate the implementation of the proposals in the Study. It was envisaged that the 22 action areas would be expanded to 25 once this Study was completed;
- (c) it was regrettable that public access of the existing promenade had met with strong opposition from the Heng Fa Chuen residents. He urged the Administration to consider creating a new waterfront promenade in front of Heng Fa Chuen;
- (d) more waterfront sites for marine supporting uses were needed, however, to improve the use and facilities. A review was needed of the zoning, the lease and tenancy conditions of the sites occupied as shipyards at Shaukeiwan;
- (e) the photograph in the slide showing people cycling within a narrow street should be taken away from the presentation as PlanD would progress to the next stage of

**PlanD**

**PlanD and  
relevant  
departments**

**Action**

the public consultation, as the scenario seemed unrealistic; and

- (f) a clear plan was needed for less desirable water dependent and water related uses such as barging points on Hong Kong Island as Hoi Yu Street – with the highway behind and away from residents could well be a better location than many others.

3.6 On the issue of land-water interface, **the Chairman** informed the meeting that there was an intention to set up a Task Force to look after the matter. The Marine Department would serve as the Secretariat to provide support to the new Task Force. He would report to Members in the next Harbourfront Commission meeting in December 2010 once further information was available.

**MD**

3.7 **Mr Andy Leung** opined the study had laid down an excellent planning framework which would open up many potentials of integration between the harbourfront of Hong Kong Island East and the existing urban fabrics. He also made the following comments/enquiries:-

- (a) whether there would be any plan to integrate the proposed SkyTrail with the Lei Yue Mun Park, while offering more convenient access to the Hong Kong Coastal Defence Museum simultaneously;
- (b) whether there would be any future plans for enhancing the Chai Wan Typhoon Shelter areas; and
- (c) whether the issue of provision of adequate car-parking facilities near the waterfront had been addressed in the Study.

3.8 **The Chairman** remarked that the Administration should be careful in managing the public expectation on the outcome of the Study especially expectation of the residents in the Eastern District given that it was unrealistic to assume that Government would implement all the measures within a short period of time.

3.9 **Mr Alan Macdonald** made the following responses to Members' comments and enquiries:-

**Action**

- (a) on prioritisation of projects, the streetscape improvement projects could be started off first before moving up to the more expensive projects. Implementation of these projects might not be necessarily very costly;
- (b) provision of car-parking and loading/unloading facilities had been addressed in the Study. For instance, underground parking was proposed at the Eastern Harbour Crossing Portal site for Hoi Yu Street development;
- (c) the Chai Wan Public Cargo Handling Basin had a long-term potential for mooring of ships;
- (d) the photograph showing people cycling among pedestrians on a busy narrow promenade would be removed as this was not realistic;
- (e) the interface of the boardwalk with various piers and marine access points could be resolved technically by suitable arrangements such as the construction of bascule bridges;
- (f) it was an excellent idea to link the SkyTrail with the Hong Kong Coastal Defence Museum in order to raise the patronage of visitors to the Museum. This suggestion would be further explored; and
- (g) the harbourwalk or boardwalk was about 2km in length, whereas the SkyTrail was about 600 metres in total length. Retail kiosks would be provided at key locations along the harbourwalk/boardwalk.

**PlanD**

3.10 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** made the following two points:-

- (a) clear policy steer on the financial side was required in implementing the final proposal under the Study; and
- (b) advice from experts was needed to strengthen piers for fireboats so that they could be berthed at the waterside.

3.11 **Ms Jacinta Woo** of PlanD supplemented the following points:-

- (a) as one of the objectives of the Study was to propose a comprehensive plan for the whole Hong Kong Island

**Action**

East Harbour-front area, quite a number of proposals had been put forward under the Study. While some quick-wins projects had been identified, such as the streetscape enhancement projects, some proposals such as the boardwalk and the SkyTrail were only preliminary proposals, implementation of which would be subject to fulfilment of the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance, identification of implementation agents and detailed design and engineering studies etc.;

- (b) PlanD would continue to work closely with LCSD (being the management agent of the Hong Kong Coastal Museum) on the possibility of improving the access to the Museum, and achieving a good integration between the Museum and the proposed SkyTrail;
- (c) on the connection from the SkyTrail to the waterfront promenade at Heng Fa Chuen, there had been strong objection from the local residents at Heng Fa Chuen during Stage 2 Public Engagement Programme of the Study. Alternative alignments to connect to Heng Fa Chuen MTR Station had been explored but the alternative proposals were still objected by the Heng Fa Chuen residents. PlanD would continue to work out possible solution for the proposed SkyTrail with the residents; and
- (d) the suggestion of integrating the SkyTrail with the Lei Yue Mun Park might not contribute to enhancing the harbour-front connectivity as it would divert the public away from the waterfront.

3.12 **The Chairman** concluded that the Commission strongly supported the proposals in the Study and the Commission stood ready to offer assistance to take the Study forward.

**Item 4 Proposed Time Extension - Temporary Government Land Allocation (TGLA) GLA-THK 1059, Marine Police Regional Headquarters and Marine Police Harbour Division Base, Tai Hong Street, Sai Wan Ho, Hong Kong (Paper No. TFHK/08/2010)**

4.1 On the Chairman's invitation, **Mr Fung Wai-kin** of HKPF presented Paper No. TFHK/08/2010.

**Action**

4.2 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** remarked that when the former Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC) considered the proposed extension of the TGLA, a number of questions had been raised such as the Marine Police's overall requirements for waterfront sites and whether all options including Kai Tak had been explored etc. However, these questions had been left unanswered. In general, he supported that the Marine Police should have appropriate and adequate facilities within the harbour to carry out their duties. The proposed location at Chai Wan PCWA did not seem to be an appropriate location for Marine Police operation.

4.3 **Mr Fung Wai-kin** appreciated the Task Force's support and responded that:-

- (a) the Marine Police remained open to the relocation proposal and was willing to move the Marine Police Regional Headquarters (MPRH) and Marine Police Harbour Division Base (MPHDB), so long as the facilities in the new location could enable the Marine Police to provide effective police services to the public;
- (b) the police facilities at Hung Hom were not occupied by the Marine Police and it could be considered as a separate issue. Kai Tak and Junk Bay would be suitable location for the MPRH and MPHDB; and
- (c) the Marine Police had provided to the former HEC information on its facilities within Victoria Harbour and whether these facilities could be relocated. The information could also be provided to the Commission if necessary.

4.4 **The Chairman** suggested that the Task Force support the proposed 4-year extension of the TGLA as the land was genuinely required by the Marine Police for its operations. He also recommended that the Task Force on Land and Water

**Task Force**

4.5 While supporting the extension of the temporary land allocation, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** opined that improvements could be made to the site in terms of better interface with the



**Action**

waterfront. The pavement at the entrance was too narrow and could be set back. The outlook of the overall setting in the west end of the site could also be improved.

4.6 **Mr Fung Wai-kin** explained that, as the site was on temporary land allocation, all facilities thereupon were not permanent and less appealing in outlook. If the MPRH and MPHDB would not be relocated in the near future within the 4-year extension, possible measures to improve the physical outlook of the site could be explored.

**HKPF**

4.7 **Mr Andy Leung** opined that 4 years was very tight in terms of searching the possibility of an alternative site for relocating the MPRH and MPHDB. He recommended that a 6-month or 12-month programme should be worked out to keep track of the progress of the relocation. **Mr Leung Kong-yui** also suggested that report on the progress of site searching should be made to the Task Force on a regular basis. **The Chairman** agreed to such suggestion.

4.8 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** said that if the MPRH and MPHDB were relocated, the piers could be released for projects to improve the vibrancy of the harbourfront. He suggested that ways should be explored to improve pedestrian access to the part of waterfront occupied by that site.

4.9 **Ms Brenda Au** of PlanD said that PlanD had been working very closely with HKPF in searching suitable sites for relocating the MPRH and MPHDB so that the waterfront currently occupied by Marine Police could be released early for public enjoyment. PlanD had conducted a territorial site search. A site near the existing Marine Police base in Ma Liu Shui had been considered but was found unsuitable after thorough study. The site at Chong Fu Road in Chai Wan outside Victoria Harbour was proposed as the site could be made available early. The Marine Police was still considering whether the constraints of the site could be overcome. PlanD could report progress periodically to keep Members informed of this matter, but examining the feasibility of a certain possible site would take quite some time.

**PlanD**

4.10 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** considered that an alternative option was to allocate the current site at Sai Wan Ho to the Marine Police permanently if the site turned out to be perfect location for MPRH and MPHDB. It would be difficult to find an alternative site with two piers within Victoria Harbour.

**Action**

- 4.11 **Ms Brenda Au** of PlanD said that it was PlanD's duty to help the Marine Police to search for a suitable site for relocation of its MPRH and MPHDB. However, if no suitable site was eventually identified as feasible for relocation, the MPRH and MPHDB might have to stay at its existing site in Sai Wan Ho.
- 4.12 **The Chairman** concluded that the Task Force supported the 4-year extension of the TGLA of GLA-THK 1059 to Marine Police who should also take on board Members' comment to enhance the visual appearance of the site.

**Item 5 Any Other Business**

Western Wholesale Food Market

- 5.1 **The Chairman** referred to the site visit conducted in August 2010 to the Western Wholesale Food Market (WWFM). During the visit, Members noted that part of the WWFM and some of its piers were idle. In this connection, he had already requested Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) to give Members updates on possible enhancement initiatives for WWFM at the next meeting.
- 5.2 **Ms Gracie Foo** of DEVB informed the meeting that the AFCD and the Central and Western District Council would jointly organise a carnival at the WWFM on 15 & 16 January 2011. Invitations would be sent to all Commission Members nearer the time. With this carnival, the Administration hoped to get more buy-ins from the operator in opening up part of the WWFM.

Invitation of different parties to the Task Force to make presentations

- 5.3 **The Chairman** briefed Members that a consensus had been reached by Chairmen of the three Task Forces on inviting different parties to make presentations to the Task Forces. In gist, upon circulation of meeting agenda, if one-third of Members considered it useful to hear different views, the Secretariat would invite both the project proponent and other relevant parties (if they could be identified and contacted) to make presentations to the Task Force. However, this arrangement would only be applicable to discussing

**Action**

controversial and major projects only and the purpose of such invitation was not to re-open any statutory processes that the projects had duly undergone. He said that this proposal would be reported to the next Harbourfront Commission meeting in December and subject to its endorsement, the above arrangement would be applicable to all three Task Forces.

Update on 22 Action Areas

- 5.4 **The Chairman** said that “An Overview of Harbour-front Enhancement by Action Areas” as endorsed by the former HEC in August 2009 had been tabled for Members’ reference. Action Areas (a) to (h) were relevant to this Task Force. PlanD had been requested to give an overall briefing on the Action Areas on Hong Kong Island to Members at the next Task Force meeting. The Task Force could study these Action Areas by batches at subsequent meetings and relevant bureaux and departments could be invited to update Members on progress or development.

**PlanD**

Circulation of the General Circular on Harbourfront Enhancement

- 5.5 **The meeting** noted that the Secretariat had circulated to Members of the Commission on 30 November 2010 the General Circular on Harbourfront Enhancement issued by the Chief Secretary for Administration in July 2010 to appeal for support of all policy bureaux and government departments for harbourfront initiatives and to inform them of the establishment of an internal mechanism within the Government to resolve conflicts on harbourfront matters.
- 5.6 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** appreciated that the General Circular issued by the Administration had set out clearly, for the first time, a number of key concepts and principles on harbourfront-related issues for government departments to follow, such as minimisation of footprints for harbourfront facilities, mitigation measures, and strategies for relocating public facilities along the waterfront. It was a good start as the Circular had explicitly set out that this Commission would be involved in the process of public engagement.

Central Barrack and Military Berth of PLA in the Central harbourfront

**Action**

- 5.7 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that there had been rumours that the PLA had been actively looking into the possibility of getting rid of the Central Barrack and leaving the PLA Berth in the new Central harbourfront idle. As such, he intended to raise this issue under “any other business” for discussion in the meeting.
- 5.8 **The Chairman** reminded Members that the 10 days’ notice set out under Section 2 of the Commission’s House Rules for tabling issues for discussion at a meeting should be followed. He further remarked that the issue was beyond the remit of this Commission, he held that it was inappropriate for the issue to be raised for discussion in this Task Force.
- 5.9 While agreeing with the Chairman’s view, **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** said that some clarification could be sought on the position of the Central Barrack.
- 5.10 **Ms Gracie Foo** said that she respected the Chairman’s ruling that the issue was not within the purview of the Commission nor Task Force. Members asked, and she thought that Security Bureau should be the right policy bureau to approach. In response, the Chairman advised if Members so wished, they might seek clarification from the Security Bureau direct.

Date of Next Meeting

- 5.11 **The Chairman** announced that the next meeting had been tentatively scheduled for 27 January 2011 (Thursday).
- 5.12 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:10 p.m.

**Secretariat**

**Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island  
January 2011**