

2nd Meeting of Harbourfront Commission
held at 2:30 pm on 25 October 2010 at the Conference Room
on 15/F, North Point Government Offices, 333 Java Road, Hong Kong

Minutes of Meeting

Present

Mr Nicholas Brooke	Chairman
Mrs Carrie Lam	Vice-Chairman
Mrs Margaret Brooke	Representing Business Environment Council
Mr Leung Kong-yui	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Mr Lam Kin-lai	Representing Conservancy Association
Prof Carlos Lo	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Andy Leung	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Patrick Lau	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Mr Tam Po-yiu	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Dr Peter Cookson Smith	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Ir Peter Wong	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Louis Loong	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Winston Chu	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Mr Benjamin Cha	
Mr Chan Hok-fung	
Ms Dilys Chau	
Ms Lily Chow	
Mr Eric Fok	
Mr Vincent Ng	
Ms Ann So	
Miss Rosanna Law	Deputy Commissioner for Tourism
Mr Joseph Lai	Commissioner for Transport
Mr John Chai	Director of Civil Engineering and Development
Mrs Betty Fung	Director of Leisure and Cultural Services
Mr Roger Tupper	Director of Marine
Mr Jimmy Leung	Director of Planning
Ms Maisie Chan	Secretary

In Attendance

Ms Gracie Foo	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Terence Yu	Press Secretary to Secretary for Development
Mr Chris Fung	Assistant Secretary (Harbour)1, DEVB
Mr Ronald Leung	Assistant Secretary (Harbour)2, DEVB
Mr Peter Mok	Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB
Mr C K Hon	Project Manager/Hong Kong Island and Islands, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Mr Raymond Wong	Assistant Director/Territorial, Planning Department (PlanD)

For Agenda Item 7

Mr Cyrus Wong	Chief Engineer/Railway Development 1-2 (Acting), Highways Department (HyD)
Mr Clement Ngai	Design Manager – SCL (NSL), Mass Transit Railway Corporation Limited (MTRCL)
Mr P H Tang	Project Liaison Manager, MTRCL

Absent with Apologies

Dr Paul Ho	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr Clement Kwok	

Action

Welcoming message

The Chairman welcomed all to the 2nd meeting of the Harbourfront Commission (the Commission).

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 1st Meeting

1.1 **The Chairman** said that the Secretariat circulated the draft minutes of the 1st meeting to Members on 8 September 2010 and received proposed amendments from Mr Tam Po-yiu and Hong Kong Maritime Museum. The revised draft minutes were circulated to Members on 7 October 2010. As no further

amendment was proposed, **the Meeting** confirmed the revised draft minutes.

(Note: As Mrs Carrie Lam, the Vice-Chairman, had to leave at about 3:45 pm for another meeting, the Chairman proposed and the Meeting agreed to discuss agenda items 4 to 6, i.e. the progress reports of the three Task Forces first; and then go back to agenda item 2 “Matters Arising”.)

Item 4 Progress Report from Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island (Paper No. HC/09/2010)

4.1 **Mr Nicholas Brooke**, in his capacity as the Chairman of the Task Force, presented the progress report. He informed the Meeting that the Government would appoint a consultant to study the business case of adopting a public-private collaboration (PPC) model for development of Site 4 in the new Central harbourfront; and study whether the PPC could be extended to cover the entire Site 7 or part of Site 7.

4.2 Regarding the Task Force’s discussion on the tunnel buildings of the Central-Wan Chai Bypass (CWB), **Mrs Carrie Lam** remarked that the CWB was a very important infrastructure to relieve the traffic congestion on the northern shore of Hong Kong Island. The project had gone through detailed discussion, extensive public engagement work and very meticulous statutory and planning procedures, including the engineering and planning study on the alignment, Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and gazettal under the Foreshore and Sea-bed (Reclamations) Ordinance (FS(R)O) and the Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance (R(WUC)O). The project had been authorized by the Chief Executive in Council and obtained funding approval from the Finance Committee of Legislative Council. The project had now reached the construction stage and the works had to progress according to plan in order for the project to complete by 2017.

4.3 **Mrs Lam** continued that at the 1st meeting of the Task Force, although originally the exterior design of the project's tunnel buildings was the target for consultation under HyD's public engagement exercise, the location of the West Ventilation Building (WVB) of the CWB was discussed. While the Administration still had the capacity to accommodate constructive ideas on the exterior design of the building, there was no room to re-open discussion on a different location for the WVB at this advance stage. Not only would it upset the processes which the project had gone through, it would also necessitate re-opening of the whole statutory and authorisation process which would run against public interest.

4.4 **Mrs Lam** said that it was unfortunate that there had been some misunderstanding that there was still time and capacity to re-open the discussion on the issue of the location of WVB, and she assured Members that such situation would be avoided in future. With the benefit of hindsight, the business conglomerate at International Finance Centre II should also be advised at the outset that further deliberation on the CWB should be confined to the exterior design of the buildings, instead of allowing them time to make the presentation on the alternative location of the WVB. HyD and Transport and Housing Bureau (THB) would continue to pursue diligently to refine the exterior design of the WVB and to explore the possibility to create better harmony with the vicinity.

4.5 On the new Central harbourfront, **Mrs Lam** said that as the Central Reclamation Phase III would be completed by the end of 2011, the Administration had made several arrangements in order to achieve the primary objective of allowing public access and enjoyment of the harbourfront as early as possible. For instance, the "Green Carpet" idea would be rolled out at the part in front of the new Central Government Offices Complex at Tamar and an advance promenade would be built in the seafront section of Site 7 on a temporary basis, which would be replaced once a good scheme and design for the permanent promenade was available. In order to expedite the process of taking forward the

development of Sites 4 and 7 on a permanent basis, the Administration had drafted a consultancy brief which was tabled at the meeting for Members' early comment and input so that the Administration could appoint a consultant to study critically the feasibility of the PPC and to draft the terms and launch an Expression of Interest (EOI) exercise to test the market response as early as possible. *(Post-meeting note: The Secretariat circulated the draft consultancy brief on 26 October 2010 to Members for comments.)* As suggested by some Members at the Task Force meeting, the consultancy brief had included the possibility of developing Site 4 together with Site 7. Although there had been reservation about including Site 7 in the PPC as it did not generate much Gross Floor Area (GFA), there were examples where a vibrant harbourfront could be created by a combination of commercial retail facilities and a very nice open area which could bring people flow. Moreover, the Administration would soon promulgate new guidelines on management of public open space (POS) in private developments which advocated limited use of POS for commercial development to enhance the vibrancy of the area where justified. This might make the business case of Site 7 together with Site 4 more viable. As a fallback, the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) had also been asked to manage Site 7 for the time being and to continue planning the project as a Public Works Programme item so that government funding would still be available to implement the permanent promenade if PPC arrangement turned out to be unsuccessful. However, PPC was still the preferred option and the consultancy brief had been drafted and premised on this objective because it was believed that the private sector flexibility and entrepreneurship would help create a top class promenade for Hong Kong.

4.6 **The Chairman** welcomed the Administration's support for allowing early public enjoyment of the new Central harbourfront and taking forward the PPC initiatives in a timely manner. On the WVB, he said that the Commission was still in a learning mode and would concentrate on the issue within the parameters explained by Mrs Lam.

4.7 **Mr Winston Chu** said that the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) of Central was made some 10 years ago but its whole philosophy had been superseded by events like the court judgements on reclamation, the vision statement made by the Town Planning Board, and Harbour Planning Principles (HPPs) promulgated by the former Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC). He opined that the Commission should consider what was best for the future generations of Hong Kong, instead of rushing and proceeding with an outdated OZP. He also commented that a lot of OZPs were not following the HPPs.

4.8 **Ir Peter Wong** enquired about the criteria under which the Commission invited outside parties to present their views on the WVB; and about the rationale behind the request of the Task Force, as an advisory body, for the Administration and the other party to work together to examine the feasibility and constraints of the two proposals for the location of the WVB at the 1st meeting of the Task Force. In his opinion, the location of the WVB was an engineering issue and the current proposal was the best answer from the engineering perspective.

4.9 In response to Ir Peter Wong's enquiry, **the Chairman** said that the Task Force Members were unanimous in making the request because neither party was able to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Task Force that their proposal was feasible at the meeting.

4.10 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** opined that the existing procedures of looking at sites virtually independently following the established OZP approach did not correspond with a large number of HPPs. On Site 4 development, he was of the view that the planning parameters in the draft design briefs constrained the development of the site. The proposed design for the advance promenade could also be improved in terms of variety, diversity and vibrancy.

4.11 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** considered that the CWB was

important for achieving a balance of traffic among the three cross harbour tunnels. Any delay in its completion would entail high cost to the community in terms of both economic benefits and environmental impacts because of the traffic congestion. Building the WVB at the alternative location would require the construction of an underground ventilation duct which due to the congested underground condition would be very deep and be built alongside the Central Ferry Piers. Apart from being risky, dangerous, deep, costly and time consuming in construction, the construction of duct would also take up the frontal of the Piers for several years. It would not be congruent with the objective of enhancing the harbourfront and would cause much inconvenience to the ferry users.

4.12 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** said that the OZP of Central, like other OZPs, needed to be broad-brush by nature. Revamping the OZP at this stage would involve a wholesale engineering review of the constraints already there, including the road alignments and underground infrastructures and it would be not conducive to the early achievement of enhancing the new Central harbourfront. With all these constraints, the Commission should take a pragmatic and balanced approach in reviewing the OZP.

4.13 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** opined that it would be particularly helpful if project proponents could present their proposals to the Commission at an early stage so that the Commission could make constructive comments before it was too late.

4.14 **Mrs Carrie Lam** made the following responses:-

- (a) it had been the working philosophy to involve the Commission as early as possible in harbourfront planning and development proposals;
- (b) one of the Terms of Reference (TOR) of the Task Forces was to provide comments on harbourfront development proposals. When a project or initiative was still in the

proposal stage, comments or suggestions or inputs on it were welcomed. The CWB however was not a proposal but a firmed up project for which the statutory processes had been completed, funding had been sought and contract had been awarded;

- (c) re-opening the whole process for the CWB would create a lot of uncertainty and delay. That aside, it was obvious that there were no advantage under the alternative proposal in terms of safety, risk and impact to the harbourfront and pier users;
- (d) one of the purposes of setting up the Commission was to help the Administration to deliver a world-class waterfront. The Administration welcomed constructive ideas to enhance development potential and viability of harbourfront projects within the established planning parameters. To ensure the quality delivery of Sites 4 and 7 which formed part of Hong Kong's most prominent and visible harbourfront, the Administration wished to involve the Commission as early as possible from day one. Thus, unlike the usual consultancy arrangements under which the relevant bureaux/departments would steer a consultancy and consult relevant advisory committees when inputs were available, the consultant to be appointed for studying PPC on Site 4 (including probably Site 7) would take advice from the Commission in a very interactive mode. This would ensure that Members' ideas about business viability and design could be taken care of by the consultant before it presented the recommendations to the Administration for taking forward the EOI and the tender exercises;
- (e) any future need to review the OZP of Central District Extension was not ruled out since OZPs were evolving documents which might need to be changed with time in the light of changing aspirations and developments; and

- (f) some OZPs were not following the HPPs because Victoria Harbour was not a clean slate but a harbour with pre-existing incompatible uses due to historical reasons.

4.15 **Mr Eric Fok** said that at the 1st meeting of the Task Force, Members spent their time discussing on the location rather than the design of the WVB. With Mrs Lam's clarifications that the WVB's location had already been fixed, Members should focus their time to discuss the design of the WVB in the Task Force's future deliberations. He also suggested that the various outside parties should be advised that the WVB's location had been fixed and they should only come up with alternative proposal on the design of the building.

4.16 In concluding, **the Chairman** said that it was a very useful discussion on the work of the Task Force and the Task Force would focus on the exterior design of the WVB in its future deliberations.

Item 5 Progress Report from Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development (Paper No. HC/10/2010)

5.1 **Mr Vincent Ng** presented the progress report.

5.2 Regarding the Task Force's discussion on its TOR, **Ms Gracie Foo** said that the Secretariat put to the first meetings of the three Task Forces the proposed TOR and those of the other two Task Forces were passed without amendment. As for the proposed TOR of the Kai Tak Task Force, one member raised a suggestion to amend the TOR, namely expanding point (a) to include the Cruise Terminal and land use of Kai Tak runway. She pointed out that all the three Task Forces' TOR were similar and drawn up having regard to members' aspirations on various matters and without references to specific areas or projects. As the TOR had been drafted in broad terms to accommodate discussion of any future proposals on planning, land and marine uses, it was perhaps not necessary to add that particular phrase at

the end of point (a) of TOR of the Kai Tak Task Force. Besides, the Tourism Commission's representative at the Task Force meeting did raise problems such as the Cruise Terminal was not a proposal but a project being implemented. Therefore, she considered it worthwhile to raise the proposed amendment for discussion again at the Commission level.

5.3 **Mr Vincent Ng** responded that the Task Force had not made reference to the other two Task Forces' deliberations when discussing its TOR. At the Task Force meeting, he ruled that the phrase might be included in the TOR because the Cruise Terminal was also part of Kai Tak's harbourfront development. That said, he welcomed Members' further discussion on the point.

5.4 **Mr Winston Chu** explained that he was concerned with the possibility of future expansion of the Cruise Terminal because his research showed that two berths were not enough. Therefore, he wished to ensure that the land at Kai Tak Runway would be reserved for its future expansion, otherwise it could only be expanded by way of reclamation.

5.5 **Ir Peter Wong** remarked that he did not see the need to emphasize a particular project in the TOR of a Task Force. **The Chairman** also opined that the TORs were deliberately worded in generic terms so as to embrace all harbourfront development proposals. Instead of including specific reference to the Cruise Terminal in the TOR, he suggested that the Task Force could discuss the interface with the Cruise Terminal at its later meeting. **Mr Winston Chu** agreed to abide by the Chairman's decision.

Item 6 Progress Report from Task Force on Harbourfront Developments in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing (Paper No. HC/11/2010)

6.1 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** presented the progress report on behalf of Prof Becky Loo, Chairman of the Task Force on Harbourfront Developments in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai

Tsing, who was not able to attend the meeting.

6.2 On Yau Tong Bay Development, **Mrs Carrie Lam** said that the planning brief had not included the marine use of Yau Tong Bay because there was no particular ownership for the policy of marina development in Hong Kong. As such, she would entrust the Commission to look at the issue as its TOR did include marine uses. She opined that marina development could help create jobs and revitalize some of the older harbourfront areas. However, it was also a new area which the Administration needed to handle with care because public perception problems could arise if people related marina development to privileges only for the rich and private clubs. The Administration would conduct some research and meet with people from the marina industry first. The Marine Department could also assist from the marine safety and suitability of water aspects. She looked forward to Members' advice on how to take the issue forward.

6.3 **Mr Andy Leung** said that he had raised the issue of integrated planning for the uses of the water surface with the waterfront land at HEC's Sub-committee on South East Kowloon Development Review a few years ago. For instance, the Kai Tak Approach Channel had very good potential to be developed into an inner harbour. The land and marine interface should be part of the Commission's scope of work.

6.4 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** said that the Harbour Business Forum (HBF) was conducting a marine study into the interface between land and water uses in Hong Kong. HBF would like to bring the study to the Commission when ready to help discussion and take the issue forward.

6.5 **Prof Carlos Lo** pointed out that when exploring the management model for the harbourfront in the past two years, HEC had already incorporated the idea that the Commission should look at the management of both the land and water at harbourfront in a holistic way.

6.6 In response to Ir Peter Wong's enquiry on how to bring the Task Forces' discussion to the Commission for deliberation effectively, **the Chairman** said that while the progress reports could inevitably be summaries of the Task Forces' discussion, Members could find out the details of what had been discussed at the Task Forces as the minutes and papers presented at the Task Force meetings were available on the Commission's website. **Ir Peter Wong** further suggested that the Task Force Chairmen could pick up and comment on any enlightening and innovative remarks made at the Task Forces' discussion for sharing among all the three Task Forces.

6.7 **Mr Roger Tupper** said that land and water interface was an important issue in terms of adding vibrancy to and public interaction with the harbour. The Yau Tong Bay concept was a good starting point and the discussion on using the Kai Tak River for sporting activities was on going. Once the decision was made on the marine uses, the agencies responsible for the management of the water would follow that.

6.8 **Mr Vincent Ng** suggested that the inventory of harbourfront proposals previously provided to the HEC could be restructured in accordance with the three Task Forces' geographical responsibilities and be made available to Members so that they could have an overview of the proposals and projects going on at the harbourfront.

The Secretariat

6.9 **Mr Winston Chu** said that the Commission had a legal duty to protect the Victoria Harbour which was a very precious natural asset of Hong Kong. For land uses at the harbourfront, the first priority should only be given to those facilities which needed to have a sea frontage.

Item 2 Matters Arising

A. Harbourfront Signage Scheme cum Logo Design

Competition (Paragraphs 8.1 to 8.3 of the minutes of the 1st meeting)

2.1 **Ms Maisie Chan** updated Members that CEDD had appointed a consultant in late August 2010 to implement the Harbourfront Signage Scheme cum Logo Design Competition. The consultant was working on the formation of an Organising Committee (OC) for the competition and the Secretariat would soon invite Members to join the OC and jury panel for the design competitions. CEDD and its consultant would consult the OC and report in greater detail to the Commission in December 2010. *(Post-meeting note: The Secretariat issued an email on 29 October 2010 to invite Members to join the OC and the jury panel of the Harbourfront Commission Logo.)*

B. Hong Kong Island East Harbour-front Study (Paragraph 6.1 of the minutes of the 1st meeting)

2.2 **The Chairman** said that the Hong Kong Island East Harbour-front Study had not been discussed at the 1st meeting due to insufficient time. PlanD would brief the Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island as soon as practicable because it was an important harbourfront planning study on the eastern part of Hong Kong Island. *(Post-meeting note: A briefing on the Hong Kong Island East Harbour-front Study was given at the 3rd Meeting of the Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island on 2 December 2010.)*

Item 3 Endorsement of Terms of Reference of Task Forces (Paper No. HC/08/2010)

3.1 With Mr Winston Chu's agreement to remove his proposed specific reference to the Cruise Terminal and land use at Kai Tak runway from the TOR of the Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development (please refer to paragraph 5.5), **Members** endorsed the TOR of the three Task Forces.

Item 7 Briefing on Development of Shatin-Central Link (SCL) (Paper No. HC/12/2010)

7.1 **The Chairman** welcomed Mr Cyrus Wong, Chief Engineer/Railway Development 1-2 (Acting) of HyD and Mr Clement Ngai, Design Manager – SCL (NSL) and Mr P H Tang, Project Liaison Manager of MTRCL.

7.2 **Mr P H Tang** of MTRCL presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.

7.3 **The Chairman** commented that the construction of the SCL would bring much inconvenience to the community but there was little consolation in terms of harbourfront enhancement in the project package. MTRCL should consider the issue from the corporate social responsibility perspective.

7.4 **Mr Vincent Ng** opined that instead of just occupying the harbourfront land for the construction of SCL, MTRCL should also propose some compensation and enhancement measures to improve the harbourfront. Otherwise, it would be embarrassing and difficult for the Commission to support MTRCL's occupation of the works areas and barging points around the harbourfront. He also enquired about MTRCL's programme of occupying the work areas; the connectivity between the hinterland and the Kai Tak area, especially the Cruise Terminal; and whether the MTRCL had any coordination with the Kai Tak Office in planning the project.

7.5 **Mr Andy Leung** declared that his company had been engaged by the MTRCL in the planning of Hung Hom Station area. He would not participate in the discussion on this item.

7.6 On the programming of the project, **Mr Patrick Lau** was concerned whether the project would have any impact on the commitment and timing of delivery in enhancing the waterfront of

Wan Chai and Causeway Bay.

7.7 **Mr Lam Kin-lai** questioned whether MTRCL would propose any landscaping measures to soften the impact to the environment and to make way for the public to enjoy the harbourfront when the project was implemented.

7.8 In responding to the Members' comments, **Mr Tang** replied that:-

- (a) MTRCL would only occupy two pieces of harbourfront land, one at Hung Hom and one at Wan Chai, for the construction of the SCL. Due to safety reasons, it would be difficult to open up the areas for public use during construction. After completion of works, MTRCL could consider implementing certain harbourfront enhancement proposals during reinstatement of the sites. However, these had to be tied in with the overall plan of harbourfront enhancement at the locations and needed further discussion;
- (b) MTRCL would incorporate specifications including greening initiatives in their proposals to mitigate the visual impact at the barging points and works areas as far as possible;
- (c) SCL would be one of major transport infrastructures to support the future operation of the whole Kai Tak area. MTRCL was in liaison with the inter-departmental working group on Kai Tak and maintained very close liaison with the Kai Tak Office and other works agents to coordinate the programming of works at the area; and
- (d) a year-long consultation had been conducted on the cross harbour section of the SCL and the conclusion was that the current proposed extent of temporary reclamation was already the minimum. A proposal had also been gazetted under the FS(R)O in July 2010 for MTRCL to

entrust the construction of a 160-metre section of the SCL tunnel near the Police Officers' Club at Causeway Bay to the CWB project so as to avoid recurrence of temporary reclamation and to minimize disturbances to the users of the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter.

7.9 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** was concerned whether the proposed barging point at Kai Tak would interfere with the possible opening of the runway to improve the water quality of Kai Tak Nullah. As the proposed barging points were not adjacent to the works areas, he also questioned whether MTRCL would conduct Transport Impact Assessment (TIA) to assess the traffic impact brought about by the transportation of wastes via dump trucks.

7.10 **Prof Carlos Lo** commented that MTRCL should have good planning to minimize the temporary occupation of land for the construction of the SCL. During occupation of the land, MTRCL should minimize the environmental impact and damage and maximize the public's well being. After completion of works, MTRCL should return the land to the government with some kind of compensation in terms of enhancement to the waterfront since MTRCL did not have to pay rent for the temporary occupation of land.

7.11 **Mr Benjamin Cha** suggested that MTRCL should provide more details on the timing and programme of works for the relevant Task Forces to study the project's impacts in greater detail.

7.12 **Ir Peter Wong** suggested that MTRCL should try to merge the ventilation buildings with the new structures which had to be built in connection with the project, e.g. re-provisioning of the Police Officers' Club and the swimming pool at Wan Chai.

7.13 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** questioned the difference between works area and works sites; as well as the extent, timing, and the reasons for the temporary reclamation at Causeway Bay

Typhoon Shelter.

7.14 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** enquired whether MTRCL would use precast method in building the tunnel; the location of the casting site; and whether the site would be within harbourfront area.

7.15 **Mr Tang** responded that:-

- (a) MTRCL intended to build the cross harbour section of the SCL by immersed tube method and the current proposed casting yard was at Shek O;
- (b) works sites were the locations where structures would be built while works areas were the supporting areas;
- (c) the whole SCL project was owned by the Government while MTRCL was the implementation agent to build the project under a concession agreement. Therefore, MTRCL did not have to pay rent for the occupation of works sites and works area. That said, MTRCL would not occupy land in excess of requirement and would abide by Lands Department's minimum land take principle;
- (d) MTRCL would try to adopt an integrated design for the ventilation buildings and would consult the Commission and other stakeholders concerned in due course;
- (e) MTRCL would go back to the respective Task Forces when more concrete information on the project was available;
- (f) according to the current plan, the SCL project might be gazetted early next year. The construction of the whole Kowloon section would commence and complete first. As the cross harbour section had to interface with the CWB and Wan Chai Development Phase II, it would be completed later than the Kowloon section; and

- (g) the proposed locations for the barging points had been selected to be as close as possible to the works sites in order to minimize the need for transportation of spoil via dump trucks. MTRCL would also try to use marine transport or other methods for the delivery of spoil in order to reduce the burden on road transport. TIAs were being conducted for the project on Kai Tak and Wan Chai areas.

7.16 **The Chairman** appreciated that MTRCL came to consult the Commission on the SCL project early. He suggested that MTRCL should take on board Members' comments and go back to the Task Forces when more details were available. MTRCL should also draw up comprehensive public relations programmes linking the project's benefits to Hong Kong and the consolation package to mitigate the inconvenience to the public. The messages should be brought to MTRCL's senior management.

MTRCL

Item 8 Delivering the Vision

8.1 **The Chairman** explained that given the community's high expectation on the Commission, some goals, key performance indicators (KPIs) or deliverables which the Commission expected to achieve within its 3-year term should be set out. He suggested the following:-

- (a) drawing up a master plan for waterfront enhancement;
- (b) setting down in quantum terms the amount of additional waterfront which the Commission expected to be accessible by the public;
- (c) establishing an enhanced set of design standard for waterfront developments;

- (d) drawing up a range of potential and proven PPC models, both in practices and for the future; and
- (e) fostering a culture for agents to consult the Commission early on harbourfront development proposals.

8.2 **Mr Winston Chu** said that he fully supported the Chairman's idea. He opined that both the principles and the specific goals should be set out. For the principles, he opined that the harbour should be protected and preserved according to law without further reclamation; and that public enjoyment of the harbourfront should be enhanced. Apart from a master plan for the waterfront, there should also be some ways to implement the HPPs. Ultimately, the Commission should perhaps work towards the establishment of a harbour authority.

8.3 **Prof Carlos Lo** suggested that apart from KPIs, the Commission should also devise some key impact indicators to measure the real impact and how far the stakeholders enjoyed the harbourfront.

8.4 **Ms Dilys Chau** agreed that the Commission needed a comprehensive master plan but Members should be more specific as to what exactly should be included in the plan. An inventory of harbourfront projects and proposals could help Members understand what was going on and what improvements were needed for the harbourfront. The measurement basis in calculating the increase in accessibility of the harbourfront should be properly defined. On PPC, she suggested that the Members could select a few projects which could be implemented within the current term so that clear principles could be defined for the schemes.

8.5 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** opined that the master plan should relate to the HPPs and design parameters and initiatives. The Commission also needed to ensure that the ordinances in relation to environmental protection be used positively in achieving the HPPs.

8.6 **Mr Lam Kin-lai** opined that Members needed to have a proper session to discuss and formalise the vision and goals. In closing, **the Chairman** offered to work out a draft incorporating Members' initial thoughts for discussion at later meetings.

The Chairman

Item 9 Any Other Business

9.1 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:15 pm. The next meeting was scheduled for 21 December 2010.

**Harbourfront Commission Secretariat
December 2010**