

Task Force on Water-land Interface
Ninth Meeting

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

Minutes of Ninth Meeting

Present

Mr LEUNG Kong-yui Chairman

Organization Members

Mr Tom CALLAHAN	Representing Business Environment Council
Mr SO Kwok-yin	Representing Conservancy Association
Mrs Karen BARRETTO	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Franklin YU	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr TAM Po-yiu	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Mr Ivan HO	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Mr Shuki LEUNG	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Ir Prof CHOY Kin-kuen	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour

Individual Member

Mr Vincent NG	Individual Member
Mr Karl KWOK Chi-leung	Co-opted Member
Mr WONG Yiu-kan	Co-opted Member
Prof Raymond FUNG Wing-kee	Co-opted Member (Co-opted Member, Task Force Kowloon, for Agenda Item 3 only)

Official Members

Miss Christine AU	Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Jeffrey CHIM	Senior Administrative Officer (Tourism)2,

Mr LEE Man-ho	Tourism Commission (TC) Chief Transport Officer/Housing Project, Transport Department (TD)
Ms YING Fun-fong	Head (Kai Tak Office), Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Mr CHEUNG Koon-lam	Chief Leisure Manager (Management), Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Mr CHUNG Siu-man	Assistant Director/Planning & Services, Marine Department (MD)
Ms Amy CHEUNG	Assistant Director of Planning/Territorial, Planning Department (PlanD)
Miss Ingrid TJENDRO	Secretary

In attendance

Mr Larry CHU	Assistant Secretary (Harbour)1, DEVB
Mr AU Chin-pang	Town Planner/Studies and Research 7, PlanD

Absent with Apologies

Mr Nicholas BROOKE	Individual Member
Captain CHEUNG Tai-kee	Co-opted Member
Mr Evans IU Po-lung	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects

For Agenda Item 3

Transport and Housing Bureau

Mr Tony CHAN	Chief Assistant Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport)
Ms Ruby ZHU	Senior Economist (Transport) Port, Maritime & Logistics

BMT Asia Pacific Ltd.

Dr Richard D COLWILL	Managing Director
----------------------	-------------------

The Chair welcomed all to the meeting. He informed the meeting that Members of the Task Force on Harbourfront Developments in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing (Kowloon Task Force) were also invited to join the discussion of agenda item 3 for a better understanding of the Strategic Development Plan for Hong Kong Port 2030, which would have land use implication in the Kwai Tsing area.

He announced that **Mr Roger EASTHAM**, co-opted Member from the marine recreation sector, resigned from the Task Force as he had relocated to Australia in November 2014. He thanked Mr EASTHAM's for his contribution to the Task Force and valuable sharing from the marine recreation angle.

He advised Members that **Miss Christine AU**, Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour) of Development Bureau (DEVB) attended on behalf of Mr Thomas CHAN, Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning & Lands)¹; **Mr LEE Man-ho**, Chief Transport Officer/Housing Project of Transport Department (TD) attended on behalf of Ms Stella LEE, Principal Transport Officer/Urban; **Mr CHEUNG Koon-lam**, Chief Leisure Manager (Management) of Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) attended on behalf of Mr Donald CHOY, Assistant Director (Leisure Services)³; **Mr Jeffrey CHIM**, Senior Administrative Officer (Tourism)² attended on behalf of Ms Emily MO, Assistant Commissioner for Tourism 2.

With regard to membership, **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired whether there would be a nomination and replacement for Mr EASTHAM to represent the marine recreation sector. On a separate note, he suggested including a systematic progress report as part of the meeting agenda in the future. He commented that the Secretariat should keep track of all discussion topics in the report for Members' reference so that they could understand the progress made on these issues.

The Chair advised that Mr ZIMMERMAN's suggestion on the progress report was noted. In response to Mr ZIMMERMAN's

**The
Secretariat**

enquiry on membership, **the Chair** reminded Members that the current term of appointment of the Task Force would last until 30 June 2015. He opined that time was insufficient for new appointment. **Miss Christine AU** supplemented that the Secretariat had consulted the Chair and the Chair of the Harbourfront Commission (HC) on this issue. It was agreed that nomination and appointment of new co-opted members would await until the new term. She reassured Members that there were other co-opted Members representing the marine recreation sector in the current term.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the last Meeting

1.1 The draft minutes of the eighth Task Force on Water-land Interface (TFWL) meeting were circulated to Members for comments on 2 February 2015. The revised draft minutes with Members' comments incorporated were circulated again on 25 February 2015. The draft minutes were confirmed at the meeting without further amendments.

Item 2 Matters Arising

An Update on Water-dependent Land Uses in Victoria Harbour (paragraphs 4.12 and 4.13 of the confirmed minutes of the eighth meeting)

2.1 As regard to the overall planning of Victoria Harbour, **the Chair** said that the Planning Department (PlanD) briefed HC Members on "Planning for Victoria Harbourfront: Approach and Process" and a closed-door brainstorming session on this subject was held on 3 November 2014 at the 18th HC meeting. If there were any follow-up actions and issues, **the Chair** suggested discussing them in future HC meetings.

Other Matters (paragraphs 5.3, 5.4 and 5.9 of the confirmed minutes of the eighth meeting)

2.2 With regard to para. 5.3 and 5.4, **the Chair** reported that in response to Members' concern on the safety of public landing facilities

and record of accidents relating to landing steps, TD, Marine Department (MD) and Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) provided written replies in the form of post-meeting notes in the minutes that were circulated on 9 February 2015. Concerning the case of a man overboard incident, which occurred on 20 September 2014, MD replied that the case was still under investigation pending the autopsy report from coroner.

2.3 Noting Members' interest in the public engagement (PE) exercise for the proposed establishment of Harbourfront Authority (para. 5.9 of the confirmed minutes), **the Chair** advised that the Secretariat of the Public Relations Core Group had followed up and issued invitation to HC members for the public forums of Phase II PE. On behalf of the Chairman of the Core Group, the Chair thanked Members for their support in the series of public forums and briefings conducted for stakeholders including the various District Councils.

2.4 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** raised enquiries in the following aspects:

- (i) status of MD's review on berthing and sheltered space;
- (ii) government's response to the promotion of "Water-friendly Culture and Activities" as promulgated in the Policy Address; and
- (iii) whether there was a demand study conducted by the government in relation to community demand for landing steps.

2.5 **Mr CHUNG Siu-man** informed the meeting that the data collection part of MD's berthing study was almost complete. The questionnaire survey of over 5000 boat owners on their berthing habits and locations was completed in February 2015. The Consultant would consolidate the information collected and submit a report to MD in March/April 2015. Members would then have a better understanding on the berthing requirements of local vessels in Hong Kong.

MD

2.6 In response to Mr ZIMMERMAN's query on the idea of a "water-friendly culture", **Miss Christine AU** highlighted for Members'

reference that in paragraphs 178 to 181 of the Policy Address, it mentioned that the government would commission a study this year on how to improve the problem of pollution and odour nuisance caused by the discharge of urban residual pollutants into urban coastal waters. More importantly, it also raised the need to identify venues for water activities along waterfront areas in Kowloon West, Wan Chai and Central. Before and subsequent to the announcement of the Policy Address, Home Affairs Bureau (HAB), Environment Bureau (ENB), Development Bureau (DEVB) and relevant departments had been working collaboratively on the introduction of water-related activities at waterfront areas. The Government would consult the Task Force at a suitable juncture when a clearer work programme was available. Also, relevant bureaux and departments had all along been assessing the provision of temporary water sports facilities in the Kai Tak area.

2.7 **The Chair** viewed that water-based and water cultural activities were crucial to the enhancement of water-land interface. He understood that government departments had been carrying out studies to explore opportunities for developing water-related activities at prominent waterfront locations, especially Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter, Kai Tak Approach Channel and Wan Chai Basin. He invited Members to supplement on this topic.

2.8 **Ms Amy CHEUNG** advised that the Urban Design Study (UDS) for the Wan Chai North and North Point Harbourfront Areas would look into the waterbody along the waterfront areas, and the Consultant would recommend usage in these areas. **The Chair** added that there would be intensive PE exercise for public discussion and for collection views of the community during the UDS.

2.9 **Ms YING Fun-fong** updated Members that, with the collaborative effort of Environmental Protection Department (EPD), Drainage Services Department (DSD) and CEDD, the water quality especially in Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter was substantially improved last year and the *e. coli* concentration level was closer than ever to the limit of 610cfu/100mL for secondary contact recreational uses. She concurred with Miss AU that the provision of temporary water activities in Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter in the near future would be looked into

by relevant departments. On the other hand, as the water quality at the Kai Tak Approach Channel was still below the required standard for general amenity uses, CEDD would formulate further measures with EPD and DSD to effectively reduce the *e. coli* content and improve water quality of the inner part of the waterbody.

2.10 With regard to the demand on landing steps, **Mr CHUNG Siu-man** stated that MD had no record of a formal demand study on landing steps around the waterfront. However, MD would channel demand from the industry for new landing points to PlanD and other related departments for them to consider while conducting relevant studies and reviews. He viewed that landing steps were useful and practical facilities to facilitate water traffic.

2.11 Echoing Mr CHUNG's views, **Miss Christine AU** said that even though there was no territorial review or demand test on landing steps, all departments concerned were aware of the benefits of early planning to allow the provision of such facilities in a district-focused manner for future use. Under the two-pronged approach for harbourfront planning, departments concerned would look into the opportunity to provide landing facilities to address public needs in district-based studies whenever possible. To raise a case in point for illustrative purpose, the UDS for the New Central Harbourfront included the provision of landing steps at the eastern portion of Site 6, i.e. north of Fenwick Pier. Similarly for the UDS for the Wan Chai North and North Point Harbourfront Areas, the Government would try and examine the possibility of providing landing facilities at suitable locations.

2.12 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** gave the following suggestions and comments:

- (i) the Task Force may send out letters to different marine user groups as a friendly gesture to collect suggestions on landings;
- (ii) regarding "Water-friendly Culture and Activities", government departments concerned should brief Members on the overall plan and programme of the initiative in the form of post-meeting circulation;

- (iii) MD should clarify whether non-licensed vessels (e.g. sailing vessels, vessels without engines) were included in the review on berthing and sheltered space; and
- (iv) despite the reconstruction of existing seawall at the West Kowloon Culture District (WKCD), the shape of water edge, the design of the seawall and possible locations for providing landings had not be discussed by the Task Force or the Kowloon Task Force.

(Post meeting notes: HAB would brief Members on "water-friendly culture and activities" at the 10th Task Force Meeting. MD advised that the review on berthing and sheltered space is to seek views from owner of locally licensed vessel to ascertain supply and demand of sheltered / berthing space for local vessels. MD does not have information on unlicensed vessel and it is statistically not practicable to stock take these vessels.)

2.13 **The Chair** advised that Mr ZIMMERMAN's comments were noted and would be followed up accordingly by MD and the Secretariat. On the subject of seawall, he suggested that CEDD could brief Members on the development and standard in building new seawalls. The issue of seawall reconstruction at the West Kowloon Cultural District Authority would have to be separately discussed.

2.14 **Miss Christine AU** advised that CEDD had in place the Ports Work Design Manual which served as a guide on the design of seawalls. Subject to Members' view, the Secretariat would invite CEDD to give a presentation on the subject in the next meeting. **The Chair** agreed.

**The
Secretariat
and CEDD**

(Post meeting notes: Port Works Division of CEDD would brief Members on seawall design at the 10th Task Force Meeting.)

2.15 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** suggested that CEDD might consider having more flexible design of seawall to cater for easy incorporation of land facilities to meet public demand.

2.16 **The Chair** opined that Mr TAM's concern could be raised and discussed during CEDD's presentation on seawalls.

2.17 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** expressed that a draft meeting agenda should be circulated for Members' comment to allow a full coverage on water-land interface issues they would like to discuss.

2.18 **The Chair** noted Mr ZIMMERMAN's comment. He explained that the Secretariat, relevant departments and project teams required ample time to prepare for the meeting, and that scheduling an additional agenda item with a short notice might not be possible. In response to Mr ZIMMERMAN's suggestion, **the Chair** said that a draft meeting agenda could be circulated for Members' reference and Members might advise any specific water-land interface issues for discussion under Any Other Business (A.O.B).

2.19 **Miss Christine AU** clarified that under the existing mechanism, Members were welcomed to raise issues and propose agenda items during and after meetings. However, it was the Chair of respective Task Forces to decide whether any suggested item could be raised for discussion at the level of the Task Force.

2.20 **The Chair** agreed that the existing mechanism was effective and should be retained. He also expressed that the initiative of "water-friendly culture and activities" was kept confidential before the announcement of the 2015 Policy Address. There was insufficient preparation time for the Secretariat and relevant departments to give a formal presentation on the subject at this meeting.

2.21 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** argued that, weeks after announcing the 2015 Policy Address, relevant departments should be able to comment and respond to the initiatives as mentioned in the Policy Address.

2.22 **The Chair** said that government officers were not supposed to discuss the Policy Address before the announcement to prevent public speculation.

2.23 **Mr Vincent NG** expressed that the Policy Address was announced a month ago and there were initiatives that were directly

related to the portfolio of the Task Force. He was pleased to learn that the CE had initiated the concept of a water-friendly culture, which included the improvement of water quality and the promotion of water recreational activities. He believed that Members were looking forward to a presentation on the subject from the government in future meetings.

(Post meeting notes: As mentioned above, HAB would brief Members on "water-friendly culture and activities" at the 10th Task Force Meeting.)

**Item 3 Strategic Development Plan for Hong Kong Port 2030
(Paper No. TFWL/01/2015)**

3.1 **The Chair** advised that Transport and Housing Bureau (THB) and the Consultant, BMT Asia Pacific Ltd. (BMT), had provided an information paper (Paper No. TFWL/01/2015) to brief Members on the finding of the Study on the Strategic Development Plan for Hong Kong Port 2030 (the Study).

3.2 **The Chair** welcomed **Mr Tony CHAN**, Chief Assistant Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport) and **Ms Ruby ZHU**, Senior Economist (Transport) Port, Maritime & Logistics of THB, and **Dr Richard COLWILL**, Managing Director of BMT to the meeting.

3.3 **The Chair** invited Members to declare interests. **Mr Tom CALLAHAN** declared that his company was one of the bidders of the Study. The Chair considered that Mr Callahan's interest was not direct and agreed that he could stay at the Meeting.

3.4 **Dr COLWILL** presented the Papers with the aid of PowerPoints.

3.5 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** opined that the Government should give initial response to the Study and provide follow up plan for Members' information before Members could ask more detailed questions.

3.6 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** raised the following enquiries:

- (i) what would be the role of Hong Kong Port in the Mainland's "Maritime Silk Road Economic Belt" initiative for maritime trade in Asian countries and Indian Ocean;
- (ii) whether the Study had taken into account the Mainland's "One Belt, One Road" project on maritime trade;
- (iii) given that the existing container port facilities at the western part of the Harbour had created considerable traffic congestion at Mei Foo, Kwai Chung and Tsuen Wan, the future Container Terminal 10 (CT10) would worsen the road traffic condition in West Kowloon;
- (iv) whether the Consultant had considered the relationship between Hong Kong with the Pearl River Delta and Pan-Pearl River region in terms of maritime trade;
- (v) whether environmental considerations were taken into account in the suggestion of developing a new container terminal, which was speculated to be in the western part of Lantau, and whether the Study would tie in with the HK\$200 million consultancy study for the central waters; and
- (vi) how to maximise the geographical advantages of the western portion of our Harbour to realise the development plan of Hong Kong 2030 and the vision of Hong Kong in the long run.

3.7 **Mr Shuki LEUNG** treasured the efforts put into the Study, but opined that the government should come up with a vision for expanding port development, considering that Hong Kong was an important maritime city and many activities would need to depend on Hong Kong's water resources. He pointed out that the maritime infrastructure in the past decades was not successful. He also gave the following comments:

- (i) the Study was more of a short to medium term action plan rather than a long-term strategic plan as titled;
- (ii) echoing Mr TAM's view, he agreed that Hong Kong should take a share in the national policy of "One Belt, One Road", which was designed to direct and gear more investment

- decision-making to orient towards Asia in the future; and
- (iii) the Study should look into the implications for logistics industries passing Hong Kong and the competition between the Pearl River Delta Bridge, between Macau and Hong Kong, and also between Shenzhen and Zhongshan.

3.8 **Dr COLWILL** responded to Members' comments and enquiries as follows:

- (i) the Maritime Silk Road was potentially a political branding of an economic reality. There was more transshipment and regional development inter and intra Asia through into India, and such growth had been picked up in Hong Kong with a robust 10% annual growth rate forecast. The Study had factored this into the assessment;
- (ii) the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macau Bridge constituted a relatively small percentage to the increase in cargo because of the substantial cost to bring containers by trucks into Hong Kong when compared to the economies of scale of sea freight. The Study had taken into account both macro and local economic issues as far as possible;
- (iii) given that the timeframe of the Study scope was fixed at 2030, the Study tended not to recommend building new or expensive port facilities at the southeast Tsing Yi region. The Lantau airport area might not be a suitable location for port facilities due to environmental concerns and the significant air draft constraints imposed by the airport. Potentially in the longer term, a site near the Cheung Chau spoil ground might be considered under the strategic study for artificial islands in the central waters, which was a long term opportunity that required vision and of technical expertise; and
- (iv) the progress in delivering key sensible stepwise solutions as mentioned in the Study could provide a starting point for further deliberation. Hong Kong Port remained as a central part of Hong Kong's economy supporting employment in both the port directly and the wider maritime cluster.

3.9 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** reiterated his request for Government's response to the Study and the follow-up plan.

3.10 **Mr Tony CHAN** made the following responses to Members' comments:

- (i) the Government was committed to facilitate the development of Hong Kong Port and maritime transport. THB had been working in close liaison with stakeholders of trade on the operation and development of Kwai Tsing Container Terminals (KTCT) to explore workable solutions to enhance operational efficiency and maintain Hong Kong's position as a leading hub in the region. The Study proposed a series of improvement measures to enhance the efficiency and competitiveness of Hong Kong Port. THB also worked closely with relevant government departments to take forward the implementation of the proposed measures, to work out the necessary arrangements and technical issues involved;
- (ii) the Consultant recommended a few suitable sites for barge berths in KTCT. Some were already under construction and would be completed by mid-2015, while some were still under consideration;
- (iii) the government was also considering upgrading the Stonecutters Island Public Cargo Working Area (PCWA) adjacent to the KTCT to support its operation. For Members' information, MD was conducting a comprehensive review on PCWAs in Hong Kong. Upon completion of the review, the government would be able to have a more informed picture for the implementation of the recommendations as mentioned in the Study by then;
- (iv) due to the changing mode of container trade and increasing transshipment cargo volume, more land for container storage in the Kwai Tsing area was needed to support the operation of the Container Terminals. THB was reviewing the allocation and management mechanism of the port back-up land under short term tenancies (STTs) around Kwai Tsing

port. Upon the completion of the review, THB would consult stakeholders on the findings of the review exercise; and

- (v) to maximize land utilization in Kwai Tsing area, THB has commissioned a consultancy study to explore the feasibility of developing a site into a multi-storey carpark in Kwai Chung for use by container trucks and medium/heavy goods vehicles with a view to releasing some existing STT open-air carparks in Kwai Chung and Tsing Yi ports to provide better support to port operations. The Study commenced in June 2014 is expected to be completed in around mid-2015.

3.11 **Mr WONG Yiu-kan** said that the Study was too focused on one single location i.e. Kwai Tsing, but neglected the territory-wide Hong Kong port development. He raised the following enquiries:

- (i) whether mid-stream sites and river trade terminals were being considered in the Study; and
- (ii) given the increasing international cargo transshipment in Hong Kong, whether the Consultant had considered other possible locations, in addition to Kwai Tsing, for handling maritime trade in Hong Kong.

3.12 **Mr WONG** added that he was against the idea of upgrading the Stonecutters Island PCWA into a modern cargo container terminal for ocean going and river trade vessels. He viewed that the proposal was unfeasible due to the inbuilt limitations of the PCWA and the geographical constraints of Stonecutters Island area. The upgrading works would not make much difference to the existing operation of the Stonecutters Island PCWA in handling river trade vessels. He was also worried that the proposal would deprive the right of existing small scale port operators to use these facilities.

3.13 In response to Mr WONG's comments and enquiries, **Mr Tony CHAN** explained that the Consultant had consulted the stakeholders and representatives who worked in the port and maritime industries in preparing the Study. He said that the report was

considered to be comprehensive and covered a wide scope with various data. The report did not merely focus on the River Trade Terminal (RTT) and mid-stream operation, but also considered the economic viability and feasibility of CT10. With regard to the upgrading of Stonecutters Island PCWA, he added that MD was conducting a review on all PCWAs and only after the completion of the review would the government gain a clearer direction on the way forward. It was too early to conclude at this stage that the Stonecutters Island PCWA and its facilities would cease to operate. In fact, THB and MD had previously discussed with the operators of PCWA and would take on board stakeholders' comments in the review. The government would respond to the operators' need as far as practicable and provide suitable options to address their problems.

3.14 **The Chair** asked for clarification for the meaning of "upgrading the Stonecutters Island PCWA" and the type of "upgrading" works that would be involved.

3.15 **Mr Tony CHAN** replied that Stonecutters Island was a traditional PCWA practising basic cargo operation mode and there were no shore craning facilities. Unlike KTCT, the PCWA handled all kinds of goods and there was no standardization in terms of its cargo operation. In view of the increasing reliance on barges and river trade vessels in transshipment at KTCT, the Study proposed to upgrade the Stonecutters Island PCWA to support the operation of the KTCT. To enhance Hong Kong's competitiveness, there was a need to provide more barge berthing space. THB would further assess if Stonecutters Island PCWA was suitable to install shore cranes and other barging facilities. For Members' information, the Stonecutters Island PCWA operated 14 hours per day, from 7 am to 9 pm.

3.16 **Dr COLWILL** addressed Members' concern about the upgrading of PCWA as follows:

- (i) the upgrading of PCWA could increase cargo handling capacity. Depending on the target market, crane and fender system might need to be strengthened and dredging might be involved; and

- (ii) KTCT accounted for over 75% of all container terminal movement in Hong Kong in 2014 with an annual increase of about 2.7%. The well-developed cargo handling facilities to handle ultra-large container ships in Kwai Tsing could not be found in mid-stream sites or other berthing facilities. Thus, it was reasonable for the Study to place more focuses on the container terminal activities in the Kwai Tsing area.

3.17 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** noted that very few of the recommendations as mentioned in the Study had harbourfront enhancement implications. He made the following enquires and comments:

- (i) multi-storey carpark for lorries, trucks and long vehicles should be encouraged not only in Kwai Chung but also in North Point and Kai Tak;
- (ii) what other aspects in the maritime cluster, except container port operation, had been considered in the Study or would be looked into in subsequent studies;
- (iii) what other areas near Kwai Chung had the Consultant explored which could be used to provide barge berths in the future; and
- (iv) if there was demand for additional berthing space, why a site at Lin Cheung Road next to the Stonecutters Island was to be rezoned for housing use rather than put to use for barges and the maritime industry.

3.18 **Dr COLWILL** replied that the Study covered other aspects such as oil, bulk and recycling materials and their activities. However, the main focus of the Study was on Kwai Chung due to its substantially high utilisation rate as previously mentioned (para 3.16). For the selection of barging locations, he said that operators and customers preferred barging space directly adjacent to container terminals to reduce transshipment cost, and logically sites farther away were less attractive to them.

3.19 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** reiterated his enquiry about the rezoning of Lin Cheung Road site for housing use.

3.20 **Dr COLWILL** explained that the Ling Cheung Road site was on a public road, which was not a favourable location for operators to carry out inter-terminal cargo movement. Driven by the consolidation of container shipping lines, there was the requirement of moving vessels around and within the container terminals. Hence, the efficiency of inter-terminal movement was the key driver in selecting berthing space.

3.21 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** again queried whether the displacement of the Lin Cheung Road site had been considered in the Study.

3.22 **Dr COLWILL** said that apart from New Yau Ma Tei PCWA and Stonecutters Island PCWA, which were the most significant in Hong Kong in terms of throughput, the efficiency of PCWAs had dropped significantly in recent years. The Stonecutters Island PCWA already handled a wide range of cargo and operated almost similarly like a container terminal but was less efficient in cargo movement due to its inbuilt constraints as a PCWA. In order to improve the port and maritime cluster as a whole, the government would need to make the 800,000 meter of seafront work better for the port.

3.23 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** requested for a government response on the justification for the displacement of Lin Cheung Road site for residential development.

(Post meeting notes: According to HKP2030, all sites recommended by the HKP2030 for long term port use to support port operation are exactly adjacent to the KTCT. As Lin Cheung Road site is not adjacent to KTCT, it was not recommended for port use by the HKP2030. A written response was issued separately by DEVB to Mr Zimmerman in relation to his query about this site.)

3.24 **The Chair** reminded Members that the Task Force was not a committee for port development, and drove Members' focus back to the harbourfront enhancement implication of the Study. **The Chair** commented that the findings of the Study provided foresight and were sensible. He particularly pointed out that a balance should be struck

among conflicting uses of waterfront land for recreational and working purposes. **The Chair** thanked the project team for the presentation.

Item 4 Any Other Business

Date of Next Meeting

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

4.2 **The Chair** informed Members that the next meeting was being scheduled in co-ordination with meetings of the Harbourfront Commission and other Task Forces. The Secretariat would inform Members of the meeting details nearer the time.

4.3 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Secretariat
Task Force on Water-land Interface
April 2015