

Task Force on Water-land Interface

Date : 13 December 2013 (Friday)
Time : 3:00 p.m.
Venue : Communal Conference Room 1, Ground Floor,
Central Government Offices, Tamar

Minutes of Sixth Meeting

Present

Mr LEUNG Kong-yui Chair

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 Kit-man	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr TAM Po-yiu	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Dr Sujata GOVADA	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Ir Prof CHOY Kin-kuen	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour

Individual Members

Mr Nicholas BROOKE	Individual Member
Mr Vincent NG	Individual Member

Official Members

Mr Thomas CHAN	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Ms Stephanie LAI	Senior Manager (Tourism)2, Tourism Commission (TC)
Ms Stella LEE	Principle Transport Officer / Urban, Transport Department (TD)
Mrs Sorais LEE	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 TSANG Cheuk-yin	General Manager/Planning, Development & Port Security, Marine Department (MD)
Ms Amy CHEUNG	Assistant Director/Territorial, Planning Department (PlanD)
Miss Venus TSOI	Secretary

In attendance

Mrs Winnie KANG
Mr Frederick YU

Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
Assistant Secretary (Harbour) Special Duties,
DEVB

Absent with Apologies

Mr Evans IU Po-lung

Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape
Architects

Mr Louis LOONG

Representing Real Estate Developers Association
of Hong Kong

For Agenda Item 5

Ms April KUN

Chief Town Planner/Studies & Research (Acting),
PlanD

For Agenda Item 6

Mr TSANG Cheuk-yin

General Manager/Planning, Development & Port
Security, Marine Department (MD)

Mr Adrian CHAN

Senior Marine Officer/Planning & Development
(1), MD

Mr P.S. SZE

Senior Assistant Shipping Master/East, MD

Mr Nicholas BROOKE, as the Chair of the Harbourfront Commission (“HC”), welcomed all to the meeting and informed Members that public viewing could not be arranged for this meeting due to technical reasons. The Secretariat would upload the audio recording of the meeting onto the HC’s website as soon as practicable.

Item 1 Election of Chairman

1.1 **Mr Vincent NG** nominated and **Dr Sujata GOVADA** seconded **Mr KY LEUNG** as the Chair of the Task Force. With the support of Members, **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** declared that Mr KY LEUNG was elected as the Chair of the Task Force on Water-Land Interface (“TFWL”). **Mr LEUNG** took over the chairmanship from **Mr BROOKE** and thanked Members for their support.

1.2 **The Chair**¹ informed Members that **Miss Stella LEE** had taken over Miss Carol CHEUNG as the Principal Transport Officer/Urban of the Transport Department (TD); and **Ms Amy CHEUNG** had taken over Mr Raymond WONG as the Assistant Director/Territorial of PlanD. He thanked Miss CHEUNG and Mr WONG for their contribution to the Task Force, and welcomed Miss LEE and Ms CHEUNG to the meeting.

Item 2 Confirmation of Terms of Reference

2.1 **The Chair** invited Members to consider the Terms of Reference (“ToR”) of TFWL tabled at the meeting, which was the same as the one for the last term of TFWL. He said that the Secretariat had received some proposed amendments to ToR on 12 December 2013 from **Mr Tom CALLAHAN**. With HC’s Chair agreement, the Secretariat had circulated **Mr CALLAHAN**’s proposal for Members’ reference and tabled the proposal at the meeting.

2.2 **Mrs Winnie KANG** thanked **Mr CALLAHAN** for his

¹ “The Chair” is thereafter referred to Mr LEUNG Kong-yui as the Chair of TFWL.

proposed amendments to ToR. She considered that there might be policy and resource implications arising from the proposed amendments, but due to the short lead time, the Secretariat had not been able to seek comments from the relevant bureaux and departments. She thus suggested deferring the discussion to the next meeting or a separate closed-door session.

2.3 **Mr Tom CALLAHAN** agreed that the Secretariat should seek comments from the relevant bureaux and departments, including the possible resource implications. He clarified that the intention of the proposed changes was to ensure the consistency across the terms in the ToR, such that the ToR could more clearly reflect the role of TFWL.

2.4 **The Chair** suggested discussing the proposed amendments to ToR in the next Task Force meeting in late February or early March 2014 instead of a separated meeting.

2.5 **Mrs Winnie KANG** supplemented that the Administration could prepare an interim response for Members' reference if the next Task Force meeting was not scheduled after the Chinese New Year.

2.6 **Mr Tom CALLAHAN** welcomed further discussion particularly on the wordings in the ToR and concerns raised by the Secretariat.

2.7 **The Chair** opined that Members should be given sufficient time to consider the proposed amendments to ToR for a more fruitful discussion. He welcomed written departmental responses to be circulated for Members' reference at appropriate timing.

2.8 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** recalled the discussion on the ToR of TFWL in 2012 and considered that there was room for improvement and changes. He opined that Members should have consensus on the proposed changes in the wordings and terms adopted in the revised ToR, preferably in a small group meeting before departmental circulation.

2.9 **The Chair** asked the Secretariat to circulate **Mr CALLAHAN's** proposed amendments to relevant departments and

The

prepare written note for Members' reference. Subject to Members' views, the Secretariat would arrange a separate discussion session for Members.

Secretariat

2.10 **Mr PY TAM** had the following quick observations on the proposal:

- (i) While appreciating that the proposed amendments aimed to give clarity and specifications to the existing ToR, they appeared to be fairly restrictive;
- (ii) on point (a) of the proposal, it might be too specific which left out the industrial functions of and operations within the harbour;
- (iii) on point (b), it should be discussed at the Commission level to decide whether TFWL should develop a framework and guiding principles for other Task Forces to consider water-land interface issues; and
- (iv) on point (d), he enquired the reason for deleting the reference to "tourism" which was a valuable asset of the city.

2.11 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** held the view that Members should have reached a consensus on the proposed amendments to ToR in a close-door meeting before departmental circulation.

2.12 **The Chair** asked the Secretariat to take note of Mr PY TAM and Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN's comments in considering and handling Mr CALLAHAN's proposed amendments to ToR.

The Secretariat

(Post-meeting notes: In response to Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN's suggestion, the Secretariat had arranged a workshop for Members to further discuss the proposed amendments to ToR on 11 February 2014. A revised ToR was produced at the session, which would be tabled at the next meeting for the Task Force's endorsement.)

Item 3 Confirmation of Minutes of the last Meeting

3.1 The draft minutes of the fifth TFWL meeting were circulated to Members for comments on 10 June 2013. The revised draft minutes with Members' comments incorporated were circulated again on 10 December 2013. The draft minutes were confirmed at the meeting without further amendments.

Item 4 Matters Arising

Briefing on the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (PHO) (paragraph 3.4 of the confirmed minutes of the fifth meeting)

4.1 **The Chair** reported that the Secretariat had conducted a briefing on PHO to facilitate Members' understanding on the legal constraints and its implications at a closed-door workshop on 19 June 2013.

4.2 **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** considered that, although the briefing provided the context of PHO, the Commission was still facing challenges in terms of the definition and scope of PHO. He considered that in addition to the briefing in June, there should be a follow-up discussion on how to test different scenarios discussed at the briefing. Both the HC and the community needed more clarifications in terms of what could be regarded as "overriding public need" in the context of waterfront activities. He suggested that the discussion on PHO could be added to the agenda of the coming HC meeting and Members could discuss how they wish to take it forward.

4.3 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** concurred with Mr BROOKE and considered there should be a change in attitude towards PHO matters at the Commission level instead of simply dealing with the law interpretation issues.

4.4 In response to **Mrs Winnie KANG's** enquiry, **Mr BROOKE** clarified that the subject could be put under Any Other Business ("AOB") at the next meeting of the Commission for the Commission to discuss

**HC
Secretariat**

how to proceed with seeking clarifications on PHO.

4.5 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired whether the briefing paper on PHO and a summary of discussion could be presented to the Commission.

4.6 **Mrs Winnie KANG** replied that the discussion on PHO was a closed-door session and the Secretariat would check whether it would be appropriate to disclose the relevant paper and discussion.

**The
Secretariat**

4.7 **The Chair** considered that while the discussion on PHO was not highly confidential, he was concerned that the discussion of the matter at an open meeting might result in unnecessary speculations. **The Chair** hence suggested that it might be more appropriate to put the item under AOB at the Commission. **Mr BROOKE** agreed.

(Post-meeting notes: The issue of PHO was discussed in the 15th HC meeting on 7 January 2014. The relevant briefing materials were also disseminated to Members for reference on 31 December 2013.)

4.8 **Mr Tom CALLAHAN** thanked the Secretariat for preparing the briefing earlier, and considered that it would be useful for the HC to have a further discussion on PHO.

Provision of barrier-free access (BFA) at public landing facilities
(paragraph 4.10 of the confirmed minutes of the fifth meeting)

4.9 **The Chair** reported that the Secretariat had set up an inter-departmental working group to explore the feasibility of installing BFA facilities at public landings in calm and sheltered water, and the working group had reported its findings and sought Members' views at the closed-door workshop on 19 June 2013.

4.10 **Mrs Winnie KANG** updated Members that subsequent to the last discussion in June, the inter-departmental working group was planning to commence a study to refine the preliminary design schemes for BFA at public landings having regard to Members' comments, and to explore a suitable development, operation and management model to

implement the initiatives. The working group would consult the Task Force again at appropriate junctures.

Landing facilities within the former Wanchai Public Cargo Working Area (PCWA) Basin (paragraph 4.12, 4.13 and 4.23 of the confirmed minutes of the fifth meeting)

4.11 **The Chair** advised that CEDD had provided written reply to **Mr Tom CALLAHAN**'s enquiry on the public landing facilities within the Wanchai ex-PCWA Basin in the form of post-meeting notes in the minutes.

4.12 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** was concerned that the public landings steps were proposed outside the ex-PCWA Basin, and considered that it would be more desirable if the public landing steps were built inside the Basin where would be more protected from the waves. He enquired if it would be practicable and effective to include the construction of the public landings inside the pier into the CEDD's Wanchai Development Phase 2 (WDII) project.

4.13 **Mrs Winnie KANG** responded that CEDD had provided a written reply to the RHKYC which stated that the landing steps inside the Basin were to be built by the prospective proponent in future.

4.14 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** stressed that public landing steps inside the basin would be more desirable as it could facilitate safer embarkation / disembarkation within a less wavy area. He opined that CEDD should justify their decision by assessing the cost-effectiveness of constructing the steps by variation of works within the WDII project, or leaving it to the prospective proponent.

4.15 **The Chair** asked CEDD to respond to Mr Paul **CEDD** ZIMMERMAN's comments.

(Post-meeting notes: In view of the Member's comments, CEDD agreed to arrange implementing the landing facilities after HyD's works for the Central Wanchai Bypass project are completed in about 2017.)

Temporary landing facilities in West Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD)
(paragraph 5.6 of the confirmed minutes of the fifth meeting)

4.16 Regarding the timeframe and proposed location of temporary public landing facilities in WKCD, **the Chair** reported that the West Kowloon Cultural District Authority had met with MD and the existing users of the New Yau Ma Tei Typhoon Shelter, and applied to Lands Department (LandsD) for a marine access point at WKCD. Details of the progress had been circulated to Members in the form of post-meeting notes in the minutes on 10 December 2013.

Fire Services Department's (FSD) requirement on waterfront facility in WKCD (paragraph 6.9 (closed-door session) of the confirmed minutes of the fifth meeting)

4.17 **The Chair** reported that the Secretariat had liaised with the FSD and noted that the Tsim Sha Tsui Fireboat Station was one of the strategic fireboat stations to provide emergency marine coverage to the vicinity of Victoria Harbour. FSD did not plan to open the landing for public use having regard to the operational need.

4.18 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** pointed out that Hong Kong was a very densely populated city and many facilities would serve multiple uses. He requested FSD to illustrate in greater details why the landings could not be shared for public use.

4.19 **Mr Thomas CHAN** said that the Secretariat could convey Mr ZIMMERMAN's request for more details on the use of facilities to FSD. Nonetheless, he remarked that Members ought to recognise and respect departments' operational needs based on their professional judgment.

4.20 **The Chair** asked the Secretariat to pass **Mr ZIMMERMAN's** comments to FSD and request for more details from the department.

FSD

(Post-meeting notes: In response to Members' requests, FSD provided a response as follows –

The Tsim Sha Tsui Fire Station Complex (TSTFSC) falls within the site boundary of the West Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD), which will be relocated to facilitate the WKCD development. FSD is liaising with the WKCD Project Management Team on the details and timeframe of the relocation of fire station, staff quarters and fireboat station and pier.

At present, the fireboat station and the landing within the TSTFSC is a strategic fireboat station providing emergency marine coverage to the vicinity of the Victoria Harbour, such as loading and unloading of fire crews and equipment to fireboats responding to emergency calls, staging area for supporting fire appliances & ambulance and triage area for casualties handling. During normal operation, the area is used for routine training of fireboat crews and divers and daily operation of the fireboat station. As FSD has daily and emergency operational needs, the fireboat station and the landing are used exclusively by FSD. Hence, there is no plan to open the landing for public use in the near future.)

Approach and process for harbourfront planning (paragraph 6.21 (closed-door session) of the confirmed minutes of the fifth meeting)

4.21 **The Chair** reported that PlanD would give a presentation on the approach and process for harbourfront planning over the last decade under Agenda Item 5.

Item 5 Planning for Victoria Harbourfront: Approach and Process (Paper No. TFWL/05/2013)

5.1 **The Chair** welcomed **Ms April KUN**, Chief Town Planner/Studies and Research of PlanD to the meeting.

5.2 Prior to the presentation, **Mr Nicholas BROOKE** raised that the discussion paper covered the planning of harbour as a whole which stretched across issues under different geographical Task Forces, and hence suggested that the paper should also discussed at the Commission level, and the discussion at this meeting should confine within the context of water-land interfaces.

5.3 **The Chair** reassured that the discussion at the meeting would be confined within the context of water-land interfaces; and subject to HC Chair's view, the subject could be an agenda item at a future HC meeting.

5.4 In response, **Ms Amy CHEUNG** said that PlanD would arrange the presentation on the subject to HC again. **Ms KUN** presented the Paper with the aid of a PowerPoint. **PlanD**

5.5 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** gave the following comments:

- (i) he recalled that since the discussion on harbour planning first started in 2004, the issue on the territorial demand for marine uses (i.e. facilities needed by marine users for getting onto the land) and water dependent uses (i.e. uses which needed to be located on the waterfront since they needed access to the water, such as cooling pumping station, water pumping station and sewage treatment) had been raised but not been resolved or looked into;
- (ii) he realised that WKCD was the first project that demonstrated substantial efforts to look into the associated marine uses for enhancing public accessibility by means of public marine transport. In contrast, no marine transport was shown in the plans for Kai Tak or other districts;
- (iii) he noted, as illustrated in paragraph 17 of the discussion paper, that a topical approach was suggested to look into water-land interfaces, such as the briefings and stock-taking conducted by the Harbour Unit and the relevant government departments over the last two years; and
- (iv) in terms of marine spatial planning around the harbour, he queried whether PlanD could start the spatial planning exercise for the Victoria Harbour by collecting inputs from various department such as MD, FSD, Water Supplies Department, etc. to formulate and consolidate all demands for land water interfaces required to support marine uses into a strategic plan.

5.6 **Dr Sujata GOVADA** opined that Hong Kong and its great

waterfront had little water transport. In order to better utilise Victoria Harbour such that Hong Kong could match with other renowned harbourfront cities like Sydney, she suggested conducting a study on water transport and water-land interface issues to review the overall plan.

5.7 **Mr Vincent NG** made the following comments:

- (i) he acknowledged the efforts and contributions made by PlanD and several Task Force Members over the past 9 years, including the overview of Victoria Harbour, the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines, the seven district studies and the 22 action areas since 2004;
- (ii) concurring with Mr ZIMMERMAN and Dr GOVADA, he opined that PlanD should be responsible for the planning of water given that the uses of land and water were closely interlinked within Victoria Harbour;
- (iii) noting that most of the district-based studies or reviews had been completed in the past few years, he opined that the Task Force and the Government should consider how to proceed with the planning of water, and enquired whether there was a plan to initiate planning reviews for the remaining harbourfront areas.

5.8 **The Chair** said that the district studies were being followed up under the three geographical Task Forces, and similarly, the district studies for the remaining areas could be discussed in the geographical Task Forces.

5.9 **Mr Vincent NG** said that the approach to follow up the planning review on remaining harbourfront areas would be related to the planning of the entire Victoria Harbour, and suggested that it should be under the ambit of the HC. **The Chair** agreed.

5.10 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** opined that Members in TFWL with the relevant expertise could discuss the technical aspect of marine spatial planning in greater detail before passing the information to other Task Forces.

5.11 In response, **Ms Amy CHEUNG** said that PlanD had actually put a lot of emphasis and efforts in mapping out areas on the harbour surface for different functions, such as the working and leisure harbour. She made the following responses to Members' comments –

- (i) regarding Dr GOVADA's comment on water transport within Victoria Harbour, she said that several departments were involved in the planning of water transport. As for the marine spatial planning proposed by Mr ZIMMERMAN, she opined that existing outline zoning plans ("OZPs") generally did not cover water surfaces and a lot of work would be involved in defining different uses for these water surfaces should they be included; and
- (ii) hence, she considered that it would be useful and practical if the HC or TFWL could specify the desired outcome or product and the required contents and level of details for the planning of water surfaces before deciding who should be in the best position to take the lead in its formulation, noting that a multitude of issues including marine traffic, marine ecology, sports and recreation under the ambit of various bureaux/departments would be involved.

5.12 **The Chair** understood that marine spatial planning was a complicated, multi-faceted issue, and each department had its own legal mandate. He agreed with Ms Amy CHEUNG that the HC or TFWL should specify the desired outcome or products before dividing up the tasks amongst departments, having regard to their responsibilities and expertise. While noting that there were some preliminary, broad-brush attempts to define the western and eastern part of Victoria Harbour as working and leisure harbour respectively, he reckoned that there had not been documents or plans which were legally binding to facilitate mapping out the definite uses of different parts of the harbour.

5.13 **Mr Tom CALLAHAN** said that Members would be willing to work further with PlanD to define the products required by the HC or TFWL.

5.14 **Mr Vincent NG** considered that the HC and TFWL should give support and encouragement to departments to proceed with harbour planning and the issue on whether PlanD should plan the water should be tackled at the policy level. He held that a vibrant harbour not only relied on land-side planning, but also the activities made possible in the adjoining waterbody. Hence, he suggested that TFWL should request the policy bureau to ask PlanD to proceed with the planning of water within Victoria Harbour. The Task Force might help identify the boundary or area to be included in the planning.

5.15 **Mr Andy LEUNG** opined that a holistic plan on marine uses would require joint efforts by PlanD on the land side and MD on the water side, and that the Harbourfront Authority (“HA”) should be the champion to take up the role of marine planning in future. He urged the policy bureau to bring PlanD and MD together to kick-start the marine planning work before the establishment of HA, while the HC or the Task Force would play a monitoring and advisory role.

5.16 Recognising Members’ concerns on “planning” issues related to the harbour, **Mr Thomas CHAN** assured Members that the bureau was fully aware of Members’ aspirations to deal with harbour planning issues in as effective a manner as possible under the existing Government framework. However, he noted that the “planning” issues concerning the harbour raised by Members were much broader than what would typically be considered within the ambit of land use planning, and the bureau would need to contemplate on the overall objectives and possible deliverables to be achieved by holistic planning from a pragmatic angle. He shared with Members some preliminary observations on the three different layers of water-land interface issues that might need to be addressed separately and systematically as follows

-

- (i) the first and foremost aspect was the uses of land abutting the water. The Task Force had discussed different types of land uses along the waterfront and their interfacing issue with the adjoining waterbody. He considered such planning issues would fall within the typical ambit of land use planning and that the current government framework,

through the strategic approach and the district-based overview, should be able to address the planning of these waterfront land uses;

- (ii) the second aspect would be the water-dependent and water-land interface facilities. The Task Force had gone through the planning of various such facilities, for instance public landing or berthing facilities. He understood that TD and MD already had existing mechanism to plan for marine and transport facilities. He noted that the Commission and TFWL would like the Government to focus on the planning of such facilities from a holistic harbour planning point of view including recreational uses and harbourfront enhancement. He considered that, in view of their nature of such facilities, their “planning” would be more appropriately addressed through a facility-based review, starting with, for instance, public landing facilities within the harbour. He added that the planning of such facilities would remain more a transport-driven matter rather than land use planning matter; and
- (iii) as regards activities on the water surface or various uses within the water, e.g. sports activities or marine transport services, he explained that since the use of water was by and large dynamic in nature, it would be more appropriate to consider these uses by a service-oriented analysis instead of the typical land-use planning analysis. For instance, if indeed the Commission and TFWL would like to focus on the planning of marine transport services, a study specific to examine such services would be more appropriate than grinding the land use planning mechanism on the harbour. In any event, such issues would fall beyond the reach of the land use planning framework of the Government and would require a more policy-driven framework.

5.17 **Mr Thomas CHAN** stressed that addressing the three layers of issues above with the right tools making use of the existing framework within the Government as far as possible, rather than inventing something new entirely from scratch, would be more conducive to exploring harbour planning issues and producing outcomes. For the

first layer, the bureau would continue to address the issues on land-side uses through the current land-based planning with any additional reference guidelines proposed by the HC or TFWL. Secondly, for water dependent facilities, the TFWL had already started to look into the public landing facilities. Subject to Members' request, TFWL could examine other water dependent facilities with a view to knitting them into the existing framework. Lastly for the marine transport services, the bureau would bring together with TD and MD to discuss the issue in a service context rather than the marine spatial planning context. The Transport and Housing Bureau (THB) might also need to be involved at the policy level.

5.18 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** agreed with the approach proposed by Mr Thomas CHAN in terms of delivery of solutions to different layers of the water-land interfaces. However, he reckoned that there was a lack of understanding on marine spatial planning. He therefore suggested introducing presentations on marine spatial planning from the World Wildlife Fund ("WWF") on the Baltic Sea and the Nautical Institute of Hong Kong for Members' information, as well as facilitating PlanD to start studying and formulating marine spatial planning for Victoria Harbour.

5.19 **Prof KK CHOY** opined that the discussion paper had reflected a good start on harbour planning, and suggested focusing the discussion on the flexibility and practicality of the planning work involved before putting the proposal to the Government to consider.

5.20 **The Chair** said that the existing organisational setting was not conducive to planning for water-land interface issues and agreed that harbour planning should be tackled at different levels. He concluded that:

- (i) the uses of land adjoining the waterbody should be tackled through proper urban design and planning;
- (ii) marine spatial planning was as a planning tool and more information on the subject for Members' reference was welcomed; and
- (iii) the Task Force should adopt a multi-pronged approach of

handling the different layers of harbour planning issues as discussed.

5.21 **Ms Amy CHEUNG** supplemented that according to her understanding, the research conducted by WWF might be more related to marine ecology and the protection of marine habitat. She added that there were many dimensions of marine spatial planning and it was premature to conclude that PlanD would be the appropriate department in charge of such planning exercise.

5.22 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** clarified that the purpose of bringing in the WWF presentation aimed to introduce an interesting consultative process that worked with different stakeholders to map out marine uses and supporting land uses in the coastal area. He reiterated that a planning exercise to visualise the demand for interfaces for different marine and water dependent uses should be carried out before the delivery of solutions on different aspects.

5.23 In response to Ms CHEUNG's second remark, **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** opined that PlanD was equipped with the tool, experience and capability to conduct the planning exercise. Without PlanD taking the lead, he anticipated that the relevant stakeholders and government departments with various interests and concerns, such as marine safety, vessel safety, transport, water quality etc. could not be coordinated to achieve the desired outcome. Alternatively, he suggested that the HC could consider employing consultants from outside government to conduct the exercise financed by the DEVB.

5.24 **Mr Thomas CHAN** said that Ms Amy CHEUNG's concern was understandable as many of the requirements of the harbour planning raised by Members indeed fell outside PlanD's purview. He added that TFWL had gathered sufficient information on water-land interfaces within Victoria Harbour over the past two years, for instance, marina and berthing spaces, public landing facilities, PCWA etc., which could be overlaid and visualized in plans for Members' easy reference, and Members could then suggest the gaps which the Government should fill.

5.25 **The Chair** concurred with Mr Thomas CHAN and said it was premature to draw a conclusion that PlanD should take up marine planning. To facilitate discussion, **the Chair** asked the Secretariat to prepare a paper to further elaborate the approach as suggested by Mr Thomas CHAN for discussion at future meetings, together with a stock-taking exercise to map out relevant water-land interfaces within Victoria Harbour on the plans, so as to provide context for Members to discuss the gaps to be filled and the way forward.

**The
Secretariat**

(Post-meeting notes: The Secretariat is preparing the paper as requested and will brief Members around the second quarter of 2014.)

5.26 In response to Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN's comment, **Mrs Winnie KANG** said that the Harbour Unit had completed a comprehensive stock taking exercise in 2012 and conducted a number of topical researches on water-land interfaces in the past 12-18 months. The Secretariat could consolidate information from the departments for overlaying water-land interfaces on plans to facilitate Task Force's discussion in the coming meeting.

**The
Secretariat**

(Post-meeting notes: The Secretariat is preparing the plan as requested and will brief Members around the second quarter of 2014.)

5.27 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** suggested inviting the experts to make the presentation on marine spatial planning for Members' reference at the next meeting. **The Chair** agreed.

**The
Secretariat**

(Post-meeting notes: After liaison with the relevant parties, the Secretariat will arrange the presentation on marine spatial planning at the meeting in second quarter of 2014.)

5.28 Noting that there were two on-going studies in the western part of Kennedy Town and Yau Tong industrial area, **Mr Tom CALLAHAN** enquired whether water-land interface aspects could be included in these on-going studies.

5.29 **Ms April KUN** replied that the land use review of the Kennedy Town had consulted the HC in June 2013, and Members'

comments were duly noted. The review of the Comprehensive Development Area zone in Yau Tong industrial area had yet to commence and the study team would draw up the proposal and consult the HC in due course.

5.30 On the land use review on Kennedy Town, **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** recalled that comments from Members largely focused on the traffic aspect, including the road use and pedestrian connectivity. Nonetheless, there was no discussion on the use of western PCWA and piers, and the relevant marine data was unavailable to enable Members to discuss water-land interface issues at the meeting of Task Force on Harbourfront Development on Hong Kong Island (HKTF). **The Chair** replied that the Task Force could help convey Mr ZIMMERMAN's comments to the Secretariat of HKTF.

5.31 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** was doubtful whether HKTF could effectively discuss cargo handling and other water-land interface issues as there were no experts in water-land interface at the meeting.

5.32 **The Chair** replied that water-land interfaces were less relevant in the planning review of Kennedy Town as the latter focused on the land use review. The water-land interface issues might need to be dealt with and discussed in TFWL.

5.33 **Ms Amy CHEUNG** suggested that Members might pass their specific comments or requests to the Secretariat, so that they could be conveyed to the project team of the Kennedy Town planning review for consideration and incorporation.

5.34 **Mrs Winnie KANG** supplemented that in the upcoming urban design study for the Wan Chai north area, water-land interfaces would be incorporated as part of the scope of the study. Following **Ms Amy CHEUNG's** suggestion, **Mrs KANG** welcomed Members to email their specific concerns on the two on-going studies and the Secretariat would convey to the respective study teams.

5.35 **Dr Sujata GOVADA** opined that the study teams should give a presentation to TFWL to allow face-to-face exchange on

water-land interface matters rather than giving comments via email. In addition, she considered that a harbour plan was required, and concerned departments should work together to take this forward.

5.36 **The Chair** said that there were at least nine government departments involved in planning for water sport activities in Victoria Harbour, illustrating the complexity of water-land interface issues. He concluded that the Task Force should adopt a more pragmatic approach to handle harbour planning issues step by step and obtain more information on marine spatial planning to facilitate Members' understanding.

Item 6 Review on Berthing and Sheltered Space for Local Vessels in Hong Kong (Paper No. TFWL/06/2013)

6.1 **The Chair** welcomed **Mr CY TSANG**, General Manger/Planning, Development and Port Security; **Mr Adrian CHAN**, Senior Marine Officer/Planning & Development(1); and **Mr PS SZE**, Senior Assistant Shipping Master/East of MD. **Mr Adrian CHAN** presented the Paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.

6.2 In response to **the Chair's** enquiry on the timeframe of the three proposed facets of the review, **Mr CY TSANG** replied that Facet I would commence in April 2014 for completion by end of the year. Facet II and Facet III would commence in the third and fourth quarters of 2014 respectively, with a view to completing the review in the second quarter of 2015.

6.3 **Mr Vincent NG** noted that the community had various demands and aspirations for the use of water body, which justified the need for a coordinating body for the overall water and land planning at the policy level. Otherwise, the problems and challenges would remain unresolved even after the formation of HA in the future. While MD's effort to conduct the review of berthing spaces was commendable, he was concerned that whether there would be a mechanism in place to coordinate the various aspects of water-land interfaces and a dedicated agency or department to look after the

planning of water, having regard to the public's aspiration for better departmental coordination on the subject.

6.4 **Mr CY TSANG** responded that the management of different types of vessels and the associated marine facilities required was complex. For instance, TD was involved in the management of Class I vessels including ferries and launches from the transportation angle; Class II cargo vessels were overseen from the port logistics perspective; for Class III fishing vessels, the involvement of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department ("AFCD") might be required to understand the needs of these vessels; and lastly for the Class IV pleasure vessels, the department responsible for water sports and recreational facilities in Hong Kong should assess the demand for such facilities. He stated that MD was responsible for assessing vessel safety and the adequacy of sheltering facilities during typhoon, and agreed that different departments should be involved and give inputs for a more comprehensive review.

(Post-meeting notes: LCSD clarified that it had no role to play in berthing spaces for any type of vessel in the territories.)

6.5 **The Chair** recognised that there was no single department responsible for the overall harbour planning under the existing Government framework, and different departments were involved to address the specific demands and provision of facilities in various aspects.

6.6 In response to **Prof KK CHOY's** enquiry on whether private clubs and marinas were subject to MD's regulation, **Mr CY TSANG** explained that the operation of private marinas was governed by land lease / tenancy agreement. MD was responsible for assessing the marine traffic impact in the vicinity, whilst the Port Works Division of CEDD and the Buildings Department would deal with the structure of finger piers of the marinas. In sum, different departments were in charge of different technical or operational aspects of the marinas according to their professional expertise.

6.7 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** supported the proposed

fundamental review, and made the following comments / enquiries:

- (i) while MD had identified some departments overseeing the Classes I, II and III vessels, he noted that no department had been clearly identified for the Class IV vessels and vessels which do not require registration (no engine);
- (ii) the study should recognise the increasing use of open sampan for recreational and fishing purpose by less wealthy yacht users, and study their demands for sheltered and storage spaces;
- (iii) the study should identify and review the demands of land-side facilities required for water and fuel supplies, storage and repair etc.;
- (iv) the demands for the expansion of the sheltered water, such as moving outwards the breakwater at Aberdeen Harbour should also be addressed in the study;
- (v) whether the existing policies on (a) according priority to commercial vessels in sheltered water; and (b) the provision of space for pleasure vessels had been repealed or would be repealed after the study;
- (vi) whether the target delivery date of the study was the second quarter of 2015;
- (vii) when a fine-tuned schedule for public consultation would be available; and
- (viii) MD should resolve the shortage problem of boat storage facilities, noting that the rent for boat storage in the Aberdeen Harbour had gone up dramatically.

6.8 **Dr Sujata GOVADA** considered it desirable to tie in the harbour planning exercise with MD's review. She was of the view that it might be more efficient and effective if there was better coordination among projects when conducting public consultations. **The Chair** advised the Secretariat to take note of **Dr GOVADA's** suggestion when preparing the paper.

**The
Secretariat**

6.9 **Mr PY TAM** enquired whether the review would cover the cross-border visiting vessels from Mainland and overseas, as well as ferries and lounges travelling cross-border within the Pearl River Delta.

He suggested that the demand and supply of land-side facilities for these cross-border vessels should also be reviewed.

6.10 **Mr CY TSANG** responded to Members' comments/enquires as follows:

- (i) the purpose of the review was to identify the actual uses of sheltered spaces by different types of vessels in Hong Kong including Class IV vessels. It was noted that the berthing space requirement for Class IV vessels were dynamic and certain groups of pleasure vessels might be stored on the hardstand in boat clubs which did not occupy water space and fall outside MD's purview and the review;
- (ii) the review was confined to the study of berthing space and would not cover the land side facilities for such as water, fuel supply and repair;
- (iii) there would be assessment of demand and supply of berthing facilities for different classes of vessels including pleasure vessels in the review;
- (iv) the existing policies on equality principle on the provision of sheltered space to either commercial or pleasure vessels were still in place. Having regard to the legal and resource implications, MD would invite relevant bureaux and departments to comment on this policy issue bearing in mind the overriding concern was safety at sea during inclement weather;
- (v) the review was scheduled to complete in the second quarter of 2015, subject to the progress of public consultation and data collation/analyses; and
- (vi) the review would take into account the berthing of cross-border visiting vessels during typhoon; as for cross-border ferries within Pearl River Delta, these vessels would be taken into account if they were registered in Hong Kong.

6.11 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** gave the following recommendations to the proposed review:

- (i) to cover the demand for land-side facilities required by the marine industries in the study and public consultation; and
- (ii) to assess the growing demand for berthing and sheltered space from potential visiting vessels. He suggested TC to provide relevant information and data to facilitate MD's review.

6.12 **Mr CY TSANG** expressed difficulty in taking into account visiting yachts and the request to provide them with designated berthing spaces to accommodate their short period of stay in Hong Kong waters. Currently these vessels could berth at suitable location except the principal fairways and other prohibited anchorages or restricted areas. In addition, logistic support from land-side facilities, such as fuel and repair were not under the MD's ambit as its primary focus was vessel and marine safety. However, for the purpose of data collection, MD would require the consultant to approach different boat centers and marinas to understand their capacity of existing land-side and wet berth facilities, as well as their development plans to expand hardstand capacity ashore in the years to come.

6.13 **The Chair** commented that TD studied the demand and supply of parking space in a holistic and territorial basis, instead of individual vehicle registration, which could be a reference for MD.

6.14 **Mr Tom CALLAHAN** declared his interest as a consultant of GHK. As a Task Force member, he suggested MD to include the requirement of reviewing land-side facilities into the consultancy brief, and request the consultant to review whether there was sufficient berthing and shelter space in the right place with the right facilities.

6.15 **Mr PY TAM** reckoned that tourism was an important and valuable element of Hong Kong's economy, thus the review should also address the necessary facilities for the visiting vessels with a view to attracting more tourists travelling by sea and promote tourism.

6.16 **Dr Sujata GOVADA** was concerned about the financial

viability of the ferry operation in Hong Kong and considered that more ferries would be required for a vibrant harbour as Members desired.

6.17 Having regard to Members' opinions, **Mr CY TSANG** said that MD would welcome TC to contribute input from the tourism angle and ascertain the need to provide berthing space for visiting yachts in the review.

6.18 **The Chair** thanked MD for the presentation and asked the team to take into account Members' suggestions and comments, in particular to consider including the capacity and location of marine and land-side facilities required by the vessels, and the cross-border visiting vessels in the review.

MD

(Post-meeting notes: MD will convey Members' views on different aspects of the Review to the concerned departments and relevant stakeholders under Facet II and III of the Review and invite their input as appropriate.)

Date of Next Meeting

7.1 **The Chair** announced that the next meeting of this Task Force had been tentatively scheduled for the first quarter of 2014. The Secretariat would inform Members of the exact date in due course

7.2 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Secretariat
Task Force on Water-land Interface
March 2014