

Harbourfront Commission
Task Force on Harbourfront Developments
on Hong Kong Island

Minutes of Twenty-eighth Meeting

Date : 10 October 2017
Time : 10:30 a.m.
Venue : Conference Room, 15/F, North Point Government Offices,
333 Java Road, Hong Kong

Present

Mr Nicholas BROOKE	Chair, Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island
Mrs Margaret BROOKE	Representing Business Environment Council
Mr LEUNG Kong-yui	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Mrs Karen BARRETTO	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Anthony CHEUNG	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Evans IU	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Dr Eunice MAK	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Sr Francis LAM	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr TAM Po-yiu	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Ir Raymond CHAN	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
Mr Walter CHAN	
Mr Hans Joachim ISLER	
Mr Karl KWOK	
Mr Vincent NG	
Mr NGAN Man-yu	
Mr Tony TSE	
Ms Doris HO	Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands) ¹ , Development Bureau (DEVB)

Mr Edward LEUNG	Senior Manager (Tourism) 21, Tourism Commission (TC)
Mr Tony WU	Senior Engineer/ Housing and Planning, Transport Department (TD)
Mr Wilson MA	Chief Engineer/ Hong Kong 1, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Mr Richard WONG	Assistant Director (Leisure Services)2, Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Mr Louis KAU	District Planning Officer/ Hong Kong, Planning Department (PlanD)
Mr Larry CHU	Secretary

In Attendance

Miss Christine AU	Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
Miss Rosalind CHEUNG	Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour) (Designate), DEVB
Mr Ian CHENG	Assistant Secretary (Harbour)2, DEVB
Ms Jenny WONG	Assistant Secretary (Harbour) Special Duties, DEVB
Mr Peter MOK	Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB

For Agenda Item 5

Mr Patrick FUNG	Senior Town Planner/ Studies and Research 5, PlanD
Ms Wendy LEE	Town Planner/ Studies and Research 3, PlanD
Mr Kenny CHAN	Associate Director, AECOM
Mr Avery WAI	Assistant Urban Planner, AECOM

For Agenda Item 6

Mr Simpson LO	Assistant Commissioner for Tourism
Mr Alan FANG	Chief Executive Officer, Formula Electric Racing (Hong Kong) Limited (FERHK)
Ms Tiffany YIU	Project Director, FERHK
Ms Vivian LEE	Managing Director, ActionHouse International Limited
Ms Bernice TSANG	Senior Account Executive, ActionHouse International Limited
Mr LI Wai-sing	Associate Director, MVA Hong Kong Limited
Mr Tommy LAU	Principal Traffic Engineer, MVA Hong Kong Limited

Welcoming Message

Mr Nicholas BROOKE, Chair of the Harbourfront Commission, welcomed all to the meeting.

Item 1 Election of Task Force Chair

- 1.1 Mr Vincent NG and Mr LEUNG Kong-yui nominated and Members supported Mr Nicholas BROOKE to be the Chair of the Task Force. Mr Nicholas BROOKE accepted the nomination and officially took over the chairmanship of the meeting.
- 1.2 The Chair¹ welcomed Mr Karl KWOK and Mr Tony TSE; as well as Dr Eunice MAK, representing the Hong Kong Institute of Planners; Sr Francis LAM, representing the Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors; and Mr Terence LEE, representing the Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong for joining the Task Force.
- 1.3 The Chair introduced Ms Doris HO, Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands), who had taken over the post from Mr Thomas CHAN; and Mr Wilson MA, Chief Engineer of CEDD, who had taken over the post from Mr Alfred WONG, for attending the Task Force meeting for the first time.
- 1.4 The Chair informed Members that Mr Edward LEUNG, Senior Manager of TC, attended the meeting on behalf of Mr Simpson LO, Assistant Commissioner for Tourism, who had taken over the post from Ms Emily MO; and Mr Tony WU, Senior Engineer of TD, attended the meeting on behalf of Mr Peter MAK.

¹ “The Chair” thereafter referred to Mr Nicholas BROOKE as the Task Force Chair.

Item 2 Confirmation of Terms of Reference of the Task Force

- 2.1 **The Chair** said that the terms of reference (ToR) of the Hong Kong Task Force of the last term were tabled for Members' reference. As there was suggestion at the last Kai Tak Task Force meeting that the ToR of the HC and all Task Forces should be reviewed, he agreed to look into the matter after the meeting.
- 2.2 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that he had suggested adding adjacent waters, alongside harbourfront areas, to the purview of the Commission. This could be considered during the review exercise.

Item 3 Acknowledgement of Minutes of the 27th Meeting

- 3.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the draft minutes of the 27th meeting were circulated to Members of the last term on 15 September 2017. The revised draft minutes with Members' comments incorporated were circulated to Members again on 6 October 2017. Due to changes in membership, Members of the current term were invited to acknowledge the minutes.

Item 4 Matters Arising

A. *Proposed Boardwalk underneath the Island Eastern Corridor – Stage 2 Community Engagement (paragraph 2.21 of the minutes of the 27th meeting)*

- 4.1 **Miss Christine AU** briefed Members on the latest development of the proposal as follows-
- (a) the project team presented the revised scheme of the proposed Boardwalk underneath the Island Eastern Corridor (IEC) at the last Task Force meeting on 29 May 2017. Subsequently, CEDD received comments

from the Eastern District Council (EDC) and the latter would also discuss the issue at its meeting in the afternoon of the same day;

- (b) according to the paper submitted by some EDC members, they supported going ahead with the 10m wide boardwalk scheme as proposed under the Stage 2 Community Engagement (CE) exercise as the scheme had attained general community support, and that a boardwalk scheme of 7.5m might not provide a safe environment for cyclists and pedestrians;
- (c) the government would continue to maintain close liaison with EDC members. In the meantime, the government would proceed to launching the CE3 as originally planned after devising a scheme which is agreeable to most; and
- (d) the government would keep the Task Force informed of developments and would try to facilitate communications between HC and EDC members.

4.2 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** opined that given the negative sentiment from some EDC members on the revised width of the boardwalk design, clarification on some misunderstanding and provision of more background information to them would be needed. He saw room to compromise on the issue as long as both sides could agree to three principles, namely according priority to public enjoyment; putting as much boardwalk under the IEC footprint as possible; and providing as many connections to the hinterland as possible. In this connection, a meeting between EDC and HC would be essential.

4.3 **The Chair** asked and **Ms Christine AU** agreed to line up a meeting between HC and EDC to resolve the issue.

DEVB
CEDD

Item 5 Progress Report on the Urban Design Study for the Wan Chai North and North Point Harbourfront Areas

- 5.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives of the study team to the meeting.
- 5.2 **The Chair** asked and **Dr Eunice MAK** declared that she was no longer a member of the study team of the Urban Design Study for the Wan Chai North and North Point Harbourfront Areas (UDS). **The Chair** decided that Dr Eunice MAK could remain in the meeting.
- 5.3 **Mr Patrick FUNG** indicated that a written reply providing responses to Members' previous enquiries and comments was circulated on 7 October 2017. He further briefed Members on the latest progress of the study and outlined the key responses with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 5.4 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** made the comments below-
- (a) a good wave attenuator should provide typhoon protection to the basin and at the same time allow marine access to the area. The proposed floating structure, which would be a fixed breakwater, would give rise to implications under the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (PHO). Meanwhile, no sensible proposal could be identified. He suggested extending either one side or both sides of the existing breakwater into a permanent structure;
 - (b) the East Coast Park Precinct was suitable for holding dragon boat race and many other water sports activities. In this connection, sufficient supporting infrastructures including bollards and landing steps along the North Point promenade would be needed;
 - (c) water quality and sewerage discharge issues in the Revitalised Typhoon Shelter Precinct should be seriously addressed;
 - (d) the footpath along the harbourfront should be

widened;

- (e) shared-use of space for pedestrians and cyclists was preferred to a dedicated cycle track; and
- (f) drainage facilities such as dry weather flow interceptors should be incorporated into the Harbourfront Enhancement Proposals (HEPs) of the Revitalised Typhoon Shelter Precinct.

5.5 **Mr Hans Joachim ISLER** made the following comments-

- (a) engagement of marine consultants and specialists was essential on issues like breakwater and land-water interface for marine uses such as fuel and water supply as well as sewerage treatment; and
- (b) he enquired about the progress of resolving the site constraint near Noonday Gun.

5.6 Noting that the land along Wan Chai north and North Point harbourfront would only be available by phases for harbourfront enhancement, **Mr TAM Po-yiu** was concerned about the pedestrian connectivity between the harbourfront and the hinterland, particularly the Wan Chai waterfront where there was a large works site for the Shatin to Central Link.

5.7 **Mr Patrick FUNG** highlighted the following points before responding to Members' specific comments on the HEPs-

- (a) the current study was an urban design study. It was not an engineering feasibility study. The proposals put forth in this study would need to be further examined and developed into detailed architectural design, supported by engineering feasibility studies at the implementation stage;
- (b) one important task of the study team was to balance between different interests and aspirations, which

were conflicting in some cases. When formulating the HEPs, different factors including urban design, aesthetics, functionality, amenity value, visual impact and use of public funds and resources etc. would need to be taken into consideration. Since the commencement of the study, the team had been engaging the Commission closely, attaching great importance to and taking on board Members' comments as far as possible. For example, the shared use concept had been adopted in the waterfront design and to resolve site constraints in many bottleneck areas; the cantilevered boardwalk proposal had been put on hold to minimise the PHO implications; provision for different marine supporting uses including harbour steps, bollards, floating pontoons, seating and shading facilities, etc. had been incorporated into the proposals; and

- (c) PlanD would need to rely on other relevant B/Ds' support and inputs in tackling issues that were beyond the department's expertise. For example, the department would need to rely on the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) to handle matters on water quality and sewerage discharge. The department would continue to work closely with the relevant B/Ds in taking forward the HEPs.

5.8 **Mr Kenny CHAN** responded to Members' comments on the HEPs as follows-

- (a) on breakwater, a more flexible approach to avoid permanent structure and hence PHO implications was preferred. Marine consultants commented that the proposed wavebreak system was regarded as flexible, practical and efficient in handling waves of up to about two metres in the Wan Chai water basin. The proposal would be further examined when a detailed assessment on wave attenuation measure was carried out at implementation stage;

- (b) on East Coast Park Precinct, the UDS did not preclude the option of holding water sports activities in the area. Marine supporting facilities in terms of landing steps and bollards along the North Point harbourfront had been included in the HEPs;
- (c) on fuel supply, ships and vessels had all along been getting fuel at other locations. The study team would recommend maintaining the current arrangement until further discussion with relevant departments;
- (d) on cycle track, the study team concurred with Members that a shared-use concept should be adopted as far as possible, unless the pathway concerned would be able to provide sufficient space to pedestrians alongside a dedicated cycle track;
- (e) on construction of dry weather flow interceptors, EPD had been carrying out a related study on the feasibility of intercepting effluent flow in stormwater drains / drainage channels and divert it to the sewerage system;
- (f) on Noonday Gun, since the owner, Jardine Matheson, did not have an intention to relocate it, the study had explored other design options in the subject harbourfront;
- (g) Members' concerns about implementation and site availability were well-noted and the study team had been closely liaising with the Harbour Unit of DEVB on the implementation framework and arrangements; and
- (h) on pedestrian connectivity between Wan Chai ferry pier and the hinterland, apart from the advanced promenade along the Wan Chai harbourfront, the existing footbridge near Tonnochy Road would remain open for public use until the proposed landscape deck came into service.

- 5.9 **Mr Patrick FUNG** supplemented that on sewerage discharge, PlanD considered it more appropriate to address the water pollution issue in the context of EPD's coastal water quality study. PlanD would continue to closely liaise with EPD to explore means to resolve the issue.
- 5.10 **The Chair** asked and **the study team** agreed to set out their responses to Members' comments made at the meeting in writing and incorporate them into the table on "Response to Comments" circulated to Members on 7 October 2017.
- 5.11 **The Chair** enquired about the expected completion time for the UDS.
- 5.12 **Mr Patrick FUNG** responded that the study team aimed at concluding the refinements to the HEPs and completing the UDS by early 2018.
- 5.13 **The Chair** commented that a champion would be needed to take forward the harbourfront enhancement projects proposed in the UDS.
- 5.14 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** echoed with the Chair and enquired if there was any vision statement for the UDS.
- 5.15 **Ir Raymond CHAN** enquired if there was any funding earmarked for carrying out an engineering feasibility study for the UDS.
- 5.16 **Miss Christine AU** responded that the UDS had provided a creative and aspirational framework for future engineering feasibility study. The implementation agents/ models for the HEPs would be identified in consultation with Members. She remarked that the Harbour Unit was transforming into the Harbour Office with staffing reinforcement, which could serve as the champion of harbourfront enhancement projects.

- 5.17 **The Chair** opined that the private sector might not be very interested in participating in these leisure facility or open space projects which are not financially attractive.
- 5.18 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** opined that only the Harbourfront Commission or the Harbourfront Authority would have the motivation to take forward these projects in collaboration with the government.
- 5.19 **Mr Vincent NG** echoed that a champion would be crucial in successfully implementing the UDS and other harbourfront enhancement projects. He opined that the current institutional structure should be reviewed.
- 5.20 **Mr Tony TSE** shared Members' views above of establishing a dedicated authority which would accord priority to implementing harbourfront enhancement projects.
- 5.21 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** said that only a Harbourfront Authority with statutory power and funding could accord priority in delivering harbourfront enhancement projects.
- 5.22 **Sr Francis LAM** echoed with the views expressed by the Chair and Members above.
- 5.23 **Mr Hans Joachim ISLER** agreed with Members' views above. Besides, he said that the study team should promptly follow up on the issues of breakwater, fuel supply and sewerage discharge before it was too late to resolve them.
- 5.24 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** made the following comments-
- (a) in response to the letter from the Designing Hong Kong to the Chief Executive on the suggested Energizing Central Office, the Secretary for Development replied on 18 August 2017 that "*the*

Government had announced its plan to partner with the Commission and to implement harbourfront enhancement initiatives through a dedicated team with dedicated funding. The current Harbour Unit would be transformed into a dedicated and multi-disciplinary Harbour Office to support the Commission and holistically plan, design, construct, operate, manage and maintain selected harbourfront sites. The proposed Harbour Office is akin to the Energizing Kowloon East Office in terms of its intended mission and broad set-up”;

- (b) he said that the government had made it clear the current Harbour Unit (future Harbour Office) was responsible for implementing the harbourfront enhancement projects;
- (c) he requested an overview of the harbourfront sites which had yet to be allocated to management agents; and
- (d) he did not agree that the UDS was only aspirational in nature. The Commission’s aspiration in developing the Wan Chai North and North Point harbourfront areas had already been set out in 2007 by identifying the various precincts. Since then, the study team and relevant government departments had been examining the HEPs from a feasibility angle and this was the reason for amending some parts of the UDS, including minimizing the proposed width of the deck between the Wan Chai pier and the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre to take into account the requirements of the Highways Department and the Transport Department.

5.25 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** commented that an implementation agent should be identified to implement the project to the satisfaction of the public.

5.26 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** raised the comments below-

- (a) to enhance the design of the Celebration Precinct, the study team might consider providing a community hall or other kinds of community facilities in it;
- (b) the design of the Revitalised Typhoon Shelter Precinct might need to be enhanced by adding more vibrancy and activities there;
- (c) the East Coast Park Precinct would need some structures for indoor activities, in addition to the open park; and
- (d) other suggestions on the HEPs included enhancing accessibility between the waterfront and the hinterland as well as doing more planning on the water.

5.27 Upon Members' enquiry, Mr Patrick FUNG reiterated the vision statement formulated under the UDS - "*Our vision is to develop an urban harbourfront reconnecting people to the water*". He said that the vision statement had gone through public engagement and most public members had agreed to it.

5.28 **Dr Eunice MAK** concurred with Members' comments that a champion would be needed for taking forward the UDS and the government should implement the quick-win projects as early as possible.

5.29 In response to Members' comments, **Ms Doris HO** said that it would be most suitable for the Commission to serve as the champion in taking forward the harbourfront enhancement projects and agreed that the Harbour Unit would be responsible for supporting HC in its work. She undertook to prioritise projects for implementation, get high level attention with a view to soliciting support from relevant departments and identify quick-win projects for forming the basis for future discussion between HC and the government.

5.30 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** commented that if the Harbour Office was the proponent, the HC could serve as an advisory body. Otherwise, the Harbour Office should be supporting the Harbourfront Authority to be the champion when it was established.

5.31 **The Chair** thanked the study team for the presentation and looked forward to an early dialogue with the Secretary for Development on taking forward the UDS.

Item 6 2017 FIA Formula E Hong Kong E-Prix (Paper No. TFHK/05/2017)

6.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives from TC and the organiser to the meeting. **Mr Alan FANG** and **Ms Tiffany YIU** updated Members on the latest plan, zonings and arrangements of the 2017 FIA Formula E Hong Kong E-Prix with the aid of a PowerPoint.

6.2 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** made the following comments-

- (a) he enquired about the amount of waste generated in last year's event and the breakdown of the type of waste materials;
- (b) he enquired about the estimated amount of waste to be produced this year and considered that the waste should be reduced; and
- (c) he said that the race should not be held at the harbourfront as it would drastically reduce the waterfront space for public enjoyment. The race would also promote private car ownership which was not in line with the government transport vision. He added that car racing should not be encouraged as it was unsafe and a nuisance to the city.

6.3 **Mr Walter CHAN** said that he was glad to note the enlarged public participation this year. He noted that in last year's event, media outlets from across the world broadcasted the event to over 18 million spectators globally. He anticipated that the coverage of the race should be wider this year.

6.4 **Mr Alan FANG** made the following responses-

- (a) Member's concern about reduction of waste was well noted and would be followed up by the organiser;
- (b) last year's event was broadcasted to around 18 million spectators and brought major international media to Hong Kong. Media from 43 countries would be coming to Hong Kong this year; and
- (c) the organiser was working with local broadcasting media to make this year's event available for the free enjoyment of local people.

6.5 **Mr Simpson LO** supplemented as follows-

- (a) according to the information collected by the organiser last year, the event had brought more than 20,000 visitors with one-fourth of them from overseas; and
- (b) this year, the government had allocated around HK\$2 million to the Hong Kong Tourism Board to help promote the event in order to bring more visitors to the city.

6.6 **The Chair** thanked TC and the organiser for updating Members on the event.

Item 7 Any Other Business

A. Update on the Transition of the Hong Kong Observation Wheel Site

- 7.1 **Miss Christine AU** reported the latest progress of the transition between tenants of the observation wheel site with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 7.2 **Mr Tony TSE** opined that the transitional arrangements in particular the suspension of the wheel service was not desirable and ways to maintain the service to the public during the transitional period should be explored in the future. He added that whether to include an observation wheel in the permanent development of Site 7 should be further considered.
- 7.3 **Sr Francis LAM** concurred with Mr Tony TSE that the transitional arrangements were not satisfactory. He commented that public views had reflected that the wheel should be made a long-term tourism spot for Hong Kong and he supported retaining the wheel for another 10 years.
- 7.4 **Mr Ken SO** said that provision of usage figures of the previous wheel to Members would be helpful for them to consider whether retaining the wheel at the harbourfront permanently was worthwhile.
- 7.5 **Miss Christine AU** responded that the wheel and the adjacent Central harbourfront event space had attracted more than 5 million visitors in the past three years. The subject short-term tenancy had brought vibrancy and attraction to the Central harbourfront. The government would listen to public views on deciding whether to make the wheel a permanent tourist spot. The government would also explore a suitable location, size and type of the wheel if it was to be kept permanently.
- 7.6 **Mr Ken SO** enquired if visitor questionnaires had been / would be done for the government's reference in considering the long-term arrangement of the wheel.

7.7 **Miss Christine AU** responded that the incoming tenant would be advised to conduct visitor questionnaires as appropriate.

B. Industrial Building Development at Hoi Yu Street in Quarry Bay

7.8 **Miss Christine AU** reported to the meeting that the lot owner of a site at Hoi Yu Street in Quarry Bay had commenced construction works for an industrial building in accordance with the building plans approved in 2001. She briefed Members on the background and the latest progress of the industrial building development with the aid of a PowerPoint.

7.9 **Mr Vincent NG** expressed strong disappointment towards the decision of the lot owner in taking forward an industrial building development at such a prominent harbourfront site. He said that the development was not in line with the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines and would hinder the Commission from achieving the goal of providing a continuous promenade along the Victoria Harbour.

7.10 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** concurred with the views of Mr Vincent NG. He would like the government to explore possible ways in achieving a “win-win” situation with the lot owner.

7.11 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** opined that the government should address the sentiments from the Eastern District Council and local residents about towards the project. He also suggested the government to explore the option of land exchange with the lot owner.

7.12 **Mr Tony TSE** was disappointed with the industrial building development and requested the government to

further negotiate with the lot owner on the issue.

7.13 **Miss Christine AU** responded that the government had communicated with the lot owner from time to time in the past years, appealing to them for taking harbourfront enhancement into consideration when developing the subject site. The government would keep liaising with the lot owner on the issue.

7.14 **The Chair** concluded that Members were very disappointed with the subject industrial building development which was not in line with the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines.

7.15 There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 1:15 pm.

Secretariat

Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island

Harbourfront Commission

January 2018