

4th Meeting of Harbourfront Commission
held at 2:30 pm on 9 February 2011 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 |
| Prof Becky Loo | Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong |
| Mr Lam Kin-lai | Representing Conservancy Association |
| Mr Franklin Yu | Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects |
| Mr Leslie Chen | Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects |
| Mr Tam Po-yiu | Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners |
| Dr Peter Cookson Smith | Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design |
| Mr Louis Loong | Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong |
| Mr Winston Chu | Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour |
| Mr Chan Hok-fung | |
| Ms Dilys Chau | |
| Ms Lily Chow | |
| Mr Eric Fok | |
| Mr Clement Kwok | |
| Mr Vincent Ng | |
| Ms Ann So | |
| Mr Philip Yung | Commissioner for Tourism |
| Mr Joseph Lai | Commissioner for Transport |
| Mr C K Hon | Director of Civil Engineering and Development |
| Mr Bobby Cheng | Deputy Director of Leisure and Cultural Services (Leisure Services) |
| Mr Roger Tupper | Director of Marine |
| Mr Jimmy Leung | Director of Planning |
| Ms Maisie Chan | Secretary |

In Attendance

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| Mr Thomas Chow | Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands) |
| Ms Gracie Foo | Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, Development Bureau (DEVB) |
| Ms Fannie Kong | Press Secretary to Secretary for Development (Acting) |
| Mr Chris Fung | Assistant Secretary (Harbour)1, DEVB |
| Mr Ronald Leung | Assistant Secretary (Harbour)2, DEVB |
| Mr K B To | Assistant Commissioner/Urban, Transport Department (TD) |
| Mr Stephen Tang | Head/Kai Tak Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) |
| Mr Raymond Wong | Assistant Director/Territorial, Planning Department (PlanD) |

For Agenda Item 6

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Ms Jacinta Woo | Chief Town Planner/Studies and Research, PlanD |
|----------------|--|

For Agenda Item 7

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Mr Stephen Bradley | Marine Study Team Manager, Harbour Business Forum (HBF) |
|--------------------|---|

Absent with Apologies

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Prof Carlos Lo | Representing Friends of the Earth |
| Dr Paul Ho | Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors |
| Ir Peter Wong | Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers |
| Mr Benjamin Cha | |

Action

Welcoming message

The Chairman welcomed all to the 4th meeting of the Harbourfront Commission (the Commission). He informed the meeting that Mr C K Hon had taken over the post of Director of Civil Engineering and Development with effect from 6 January 2011 from Mr John Chai who had proceeded on pre-retirement leave. He welcomed Mr Hon and put on record the Commission's appreciation of Mr Chai's contribution to the

Commission.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 3rd Meeting

1.1 **The Chairman** said that the Secretariat circulated the draft minutes of the 3rd meeting to Members on 21 January 2011 and received proposed amendments from Mr Clement Kwok. The revised draft minutes were circulated to Members on 28 January 2011. As no further amendment was proposed at the meeting, the revised draft minutes were confirmed.

Item 2 Matters Arising

A. Presentation on Public Art Collaboration Project (Paragraph 3.3 of the minutes of the 3rd meeting)

2.1 **The Chairman** informed the meeting that the Secretariat had invited the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) and Hong Kong Arts Centre to make a presentation on their public art collaboration project at the next (i.e. the 5th) Commission meeting.

B. Overview of Land Use Framework for Victoria Harbourfront (Paragraph 7.7 of the minutes of the 3rd meeting)

2.2 **The Chairman** said that PlanD would make a presentation on the overview of land use framework for Victoria harbourfront under Agenda Item no. 6 of this meeting.

C. Water Quality in Typhoon Shelters (Paragraphs 8.11 and 8.12 of the minutes of the 3rd meeting)

2.3 **The Chairman** said that a brief note prepared by the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) summarising the water quality in the typhoon shelters located within Victoria Harbour and their common pollution sources was sent to

Members on 21 January 2011. In response to a Member's further comments, EPD, Drainage Services Department (DSD) and Marine Department (MD) had prepared a supplementary note that was tabled for Members' reference. He considered that it was an on-going issue which should be kept under monitoring. EPD, DSD and MD had been requested to revert to the Commission in due course to brief Members on their measures to improve the water quality in different typhoon shelters.

EPD/DSD/MD

Item 3 Progress Report from Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island (Paper No. HC/01/2011)

3.1 **The Chairman**, in his capacity as the Chairman of the Task Force, presented the progress report.

3.2 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** asked whether Site 8 had been included in the consultancy brief of the "Business Viability Study for Development of Site 4 in the New Central Harbourfront". **Ms Gracie Foo** replied that the issue had been substantively discussed at the last Task Force meeting with the presence of the consultant. The study covered Sites 4 and 7, but the scope would be too large if Site 8 or any other specific sites were to be added to the brief after the appointment of the consultant. That notwithstanding, the consultant had noted the Task Force's views and would keep an open mind on the issue. If any potential or opportunity was identified during the study or the market sounding exercise, the consultant would flag it up for the Task Force's consideration.

3.3 **Dr Smith** said that follow-up action would be required if any potential or opportunity for development of Site 8 was flagged up. **Ms Foo** reminded Members that the study was on business viability, which was recognized among Members as one of the key parameters which needed to be established for the public-private collaboration (PPC) model. There were commercial spaces at Site 4 but not Site 8. It was the

Administration's wish to seize the opportunity to achieve a holistic design for the new Central harbourfront if it was commercially viable to extend the PPC to Site 7. However, it was not certain at the present stage whether the PPC would cover the whole or part of Site 7 and, if so, what the options there would be.

3.4 **Mr Clement Kwok** asked whether the PPC would involve unconstrained commercial usage of the sites or some planning parameters and requirements had already been incorporated into the consultancy brief. He opined that if the Commission adopted a top-down approach for the development of the sites, the consultant should be guided accordingly.

3.5 **The Chairman** responded by saying that there were certain physical constraints and planning parameters applicable to the sites but there was no restriction on creative uses of the sites. It was up to the consultant to come up with viable commercial solutions. Members could provide steer and innovative ideas in the course of the study as the consultant would brief the Task Force on a regular basis.

3.6 **Mrs Carrie Lam** supplemented that unlike the usual consultancy arrangements under which the relevant government bureau/department would steer the consultancies, the Administration would like the consultant for this study to work to the Task Force so that Members would be able to suggest ideas directly to the consultant. She hoped that Members could help steer and guide the consultancy at every stage of its work; and she invited the Secretariat to put in place an arrangement for the consultant to seek the Task Force's steer.

the Secretariat

3.7 In response to Mr Clement Kwok's comments, **Mrs Lam** said that she hoped that the selected PPC model could have as little constraint as possible. However, given the statutory planning regime and the fact that the sites covered by the Study were valuable harbourfront sites, certain development parameters such as usable gross floor area (GFA), maximum building height,

etc. had been pre-determined. Members already noted in earlier discussions that the designs and configurations of the sites had been formulated as part and parcel of the “Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront” (UDS). Nevertheless, there could be a certain degree of flexibility in relation to those aspects. For example, instead of a centralised approach of putting all the GFA in two or three buildings, a more scattered-out approach could be considered if that would strengthen the business case. However, there would not be the flexibility to the extent of defying the planning parameters because this would inevitably result in re-opening up a lot of work previously done for the sites.

3.8 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** commented that certain parts of the progress report relating to the public engagement (PE) programme for the construction of additional floors above Central Piers Numbers 4 to 6 were not clear. In response, **the Chairman** said that the progress report was intended to be summaries of the Task Force’s discussions and therefore not all the details were included in the report. He further explained that the Central Piers project aimed to improve the business viability of the ferry services, and to turn the piers into more attractive harbourfront venues for the community. While the PE programme would start in late February 2011 and CEDD would revert to the Task Force on the detailed design of the additional floors in mid 2011, CEDD would hold informal discussion sessions with Task Force Members during the interim period to collect Members’ ideas.

3.9 **Mr Winston Chu** opined that the project should have made reference to the Town Planning Board (TPB)’s vision statement for Victoria Harbour, the former Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC)’s Harbour Planning Principles (HPPs) and Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines. As the piers were located at a prominent harbourfront site, careful consideration should be given to the visual impact of the additional floors on the harbour.

3.10 In response, **the Chairman** said that CEDD’s paper on the project discussed at the last Task Force meeting referred

exclusively to the PE programme. CEDD would revert to the Task Force on the detailed design and layouts of the additional floors later on. **Mr C K Hon** supplemented that CEDD was at the stage of engaging the public and seeking their views on the possible design options. Detailed design of the additional floors had yet to be worked out. As mentioned in CEDD's paper, the HPPs were among the guidelines laid down for the design of the project.

3.11 **Mr Chu** said that he was concerned about the concept of adding storeys to the piers but not the design. Nothing could be cured by the design if the original concept was wrong. In response, **Mrs Lam** said that she did not recall any opposition to the project which had been extensively discussed in the public domain when the UDS was conducted. Apart from increasing the business viability of the ferry services which served many residents on the outlying islands, the project would also contribute to increasing the vitality and vibrancy of the harbourfront. Having regard to those principles mentioned by Mr Chu, the former HEC had given its support to the project. Accordingly, DEVB had also extended support to the Transport and Housing Bureau (THB) which looked after the provision of the ferry services and this project. The project would also integrate well with the landscaped deck at Sites 1 and 2 in the future. Therefore, Members should not be confused that the Administration had made a decision which violated all those principles and then forced this Commission to accept it. Actually, the Administration was now in the course of implementing the proposal which had been discussed and agreed previously; and CEDD would revert to consult the Task Force on the detailed design. TPB would control the uses of the additional floors in terms of zoning, while THB would give guidance on how to bring in operators for the additional floors in order to increase the viability of the ferry services.

3.12 **The Chairman** pointed out that open space would be provided at the roof of the piers upon completion of the project, thus increasing the community's involvement. **Dr Smith** opined

that the ultimate intention of the project was to generate more non-box fare revenue for the ferry operators. That said, the Commission would need to look at the management of the additional floors.

3.13 **Mr Chu** said that he was grateful for Mrs Lam's remarks at the 2nd meeting of the Commission that the outline zoning plans (OZPs) covering both the pier area and the on-going Central Reclamation Phase III were living documents which could be subject to review from time to time. He considered that perhaps it was now the right time to review the OZPs which pre-dated the Court of Final Appeal (CFA)'s judgement on reclamation, instead of accepting them blindly and proceeding on a wrong legal basis.

3.14 In response, **Mrs Lam** said that there was no legal point in the issue and that she still abided by her remarks at the meeting that the OZPs were living documents. It was an on-going process and at some stage, the OZPs would need to be revisited. However, she did not agree that the construction of additional floors above Central Piers Numbers 4 to 6 was a wrong decision, and that the Commission was pressurized into accepting a wrong decision made in the past. It was only the minority's view that it was a wrong decision to put some additional spaces on top of the piers which were rather unattractive at present. Apart from generating more non-fare box revenue for the ferry operators, the project also achieved the objective of making the harbourfront more lively and attractive, instead of just providing the public with a visual access to the harbour.

3.15 **Mr Chu** said that he would like to clarify his thoughts which were that the Commission should not be tied by decisions made before the CFA's judgement on reclamation. To take a positive way forward, the Commission should review previous decisions and should not be completely bound by them. In this regard, the two OZPs should be regarded as merely a guide. While Members supported that the Project should be proceeded with at full speed ahead, the decisions made in the past should not be followed blindly as they were made under circumstances

different from now.

3.16 In concluding the discussion on this item, **the Chairman** said that the OZPs were living documents and the Commission could and would revisit them at a later stage.

Item 4 Progress Report from Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development (Paper No. HC/02/2011)

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

4.2 Regarding the public cargo working area (PCWA) at Kwun Tong (KT), **Mrs Carrie Lam** said that its recent development was much driven by the Kai Tak Development. As suggested by the former HEC and with the support from the concerned District Council, KT was then identified as a priority area for relocation of operators from PCWAs so that the waterfront now used as PCWAs could be opened up for public enjoyment. Before the last renewal of tenancy for the KT PCWA in 2008, the Administration had intensive discussion and achieved a pragmatic compromise under which a promenade would be developed there by two phases. Through relocating the operators, the Administration had opened up 200 metres of the PCWA which had been turned into a very attractive promenade in the first phase. The second phase would be another 600 metres of promenade fronting the runway. The tenancy for the KT PCWA was due to expire this summer and MD together with THB had been working hard on vacating the said 600 metres for public enjoyment. MD and THB had briefed the Legislative Council's Panel on Economic Development on the arrangements for relocation of berths in PCWA, and the Panel had made further suggestions on how the Administration could come up with a better solution to address some of the concerns raised by the KT PCWA operators (including the waste paper recyclers). While the relocation of the KT PCWA was not a matter for this Commission, Mrs Lam appealed for the Commission's support to the relevant government bureaux and departments for their efforts

made in pursuing the issue. Deepest appreciation and support should also be given to Mr Roger Tupper, Director of Marine, who was handling the issue, as the whole community would appreciate a continuous 800-metre promenade. To complement MD's effort and to avoid leaving the land idle, CEDD would be requested to look into ways to carry out some advance works for the promenade so that the public could enjoy the area vacated as early as possible once the PCWA had been relocated.

4.3 **Mr Roger Tupper** thanked Mrs Lam's vote of appreciation. He explained that as MD was also closing the Cha Kwo Ling PCWA for highways development, it was quite difficult to get all the affected operators to agree on the relocation arrangements. MD would revert to the Legislative Council's Panel on Economic Development at the end of the month and he would reflect the Commission's support to all colleagues involved in this matter. MD would also continue to work hard to ensure that the additional 600 metres at the PCWA could be vacated later this year.

4.4 **Mr Ng** thanked Mrs Lam and Mr Tupper for bringing this issue to Members' attention. The issue had not been discussed at the Task Force. As Chairman of the Task Force, he reiterated his support for improving the promenade as this was very much in line with the aspiration of the Commission and the former HEC. He noted that some newspapers attributed the loss of jobs by people working at the KT PCWA to the promenade development. He disagreed with such reports as the Commission's proposal for enhancing the harbourfront was not intended to make people jobless. He hoped that the waste paper recyclers could keep their jobs after relocation of the KT PCWA.

Item 5 Progress Report from Task Force on Harbourfront Developments in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing (Paper No. HC/03/2011)

5.1 **Prof Becky Loo** took Members through the progress

report.

5.2 In response to Mr Paul Zimmerman's written comments on the progress report which had been tabled at the meeting, **Prof Loo** said that she remembered that Mr Zimmerman had raised the point that priority should be given to marine supporting uses of land along the sheltered water. However, she did not recall other members having raised the same point regarding the open space at ex-Tai Kok Tsui Bus Terminus. In general, Members welcomed provision of open space to the public in Kowloon West. She opined that while in general marine-related uses should be supported as Victoria Harbour was still a working harbour, not every piece of harbourfront land should be designated for marine-supporting uses.

5.3 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** noted that the port and working sea frontage had moved to the western side of the Harbour. On the Lei Yue Mun Waterfront Enhancement Project (LYMWEP), he was of the view that the support for the project was not overwhelming and some of the Members would like to explore in detail a comprehensive approach for the project.

5.4 **Prof Loo** responded by saying that Members supported unanimously the view that the Lei Yue Mun area needed enhancement and that the LYMWEP should be integrated with the entire upgrading of the area. There had been quite a strong view that EPD should deal with the sewerage problem in the long term but the Task Force was not provided with adequately detailed information at the last meeting. The Task Force would revisit the issue when more details were provided at a later stage. **The Chairman** considered that LYMWEP could proceed as a first phase but should only do so as part of a committed integrated plan which also addressed the sewerage issue.

Item 6 Overview of Land Use Framework for Victoria Harbourfront (Paper No. HC/04/2011)

6.1 **The Chairman** welcomed Ms Jacinta Woo, Chief Town Planner/Studies and Research of PlanD.

6.2 **Ms Woo** presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.

6.3 **The Chairman** opined that when considering individual waterfront proposals, Members would need an overall plan for the harbourfront. The former HEC and PlanD had done a lot of work towards this plan but there was still work to be done noting that the Commission's role was moving from minimizing adverse impacts to adding values to the harbourfront.

6.4 **Mr Vincent Ng** said that the presentation was useful and could give Members an overall view of the harbourfront. He added that harbourfront planning was a complicated process. When people looked at the details, they would ask why they could not see the overall plan; but when they looked at the overall plan, they would ask why they could not see the details. The Commission definitely needed an overall plan but Members should focus their efforts on overcoming the hurdles in order to deliver the projects.

6.5 **Prof Becky Loo** said that the presentation was very informative and helpful in providing Members with the overall picture of the harbourfront at a macro level. She opined that the long term strategies and overall vision could better be dealt with at the Commission level while individual projects should be discussed at Task Force level. Regarding the Hung Hom District Study completed in 2008, she asked whether the study had taken account of the Shatin-Central Link (SCL) project which would have impact on certain parts of Hung Hom area.

6.6 **Mr Clement Kwok** shared Mr Ng and Prof Loo's view that the briefing was useful and was impressed by the amount of work that had been done. On the transition from harbourfront planning to realisation of proposals, he opined that the Commission could take two approaches. The first was a

bottom-up approach which was essentially the present approach the Commission was adopting. The other one was a top-down conceptualising approach which he hoped that the Administration and the Commission could try.

6.7 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** pointed out that PlanD was currently carrying out the “Study on Action Plan for the Bay Area of the Pearl River Estuary” and Hong Kong had its major role in contributing to the overall business circle in the Bay Area. If the Commission concentrated too much on the harbour’s leisure uses, the status of Hong Kong as a central business district might be adversely affected in the future. The Commission should consider whether there would be more interaction between Hong Kong and the nearby cities in the Bay Area. The overall plan should also take note of Victoria Harbour’s working harbour functions.

6.8 **Mr Winston Chu** said that Victoria Harbour was a large harbour with a lot of constraints. There were numerous conflicting uses for the harbourfront and so it was indeed a matter of priority. Without binding the Society for Protection of the Harbour (SPH), he suggested four points for Members’ consideration:

- (i) the planning approach should enhance the value of the harbour and Hong Kong as an international metropolis;
- (ii) the enjoyment of the harbour should be enhanced as a harbour;
- (iii) priority should be given to uses that had to be on the harbourfront; and
- (iv) projects should not be planned in ways which would necessarily require future reclamation.

6.9 **Mr Eric Fok** opined that when looking at individual harbourfront sites and projects, the important guiding principles of attractiveness, vibrancy and accessibility should not be neglected. He agreed that priority should be given to marine-related uses. He also hoped that the Commission could deliver certain projects

by the end of this term.

6.10 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** commented that the Commission needed to work towards a strategic framework to achieve the overall goal of enhancing the harbourfront. As such, Members needed information including the existing zoning of land uses. Members also needed to look at opportunity areas, constraints that could not be changed and land-water interface especially those associated with a working harbour. The master plan should be sufficiently flexible to cater for ongoing changes. The Commission also needed to inject creative thinking when implementing individual projects.

6.11 In response to Members' comments, **Ms Woo** made the following remarks:

- (i) during the course of the Hung Hom District Study, PlanD had realised that the SCL project would have impact on part of the area. For this reason, the proposed development of the harbourfront area around the MTR Freightyard and International Mail Centre was considered as a long-term proposal in the study;
- (ii) regarding the strategic land use framework for the harbourfront area, the HPPs and Harbour Planning Guidelines (HPGs) served as useful reference at the strategic level so far; and
- (iii) the district studies conducted had almost covered all the areas considered to have opportunities for harbourfront enhancement, and PlanD would review the OZPs from time to time to take forward the planning proposals recommended in these studies to form the basis for planning control and implementation of individual projects. It would be a pragmatic approach for the Commission to focus on the action areas proposals and to see through the implementation of these individual projects.

6.12 **Mrs Carrie Lam** thanked Members for their valuable views and considered that PlanD's presentation was a very comprehensive one, putting together all the things that had been done. Members could see from the presentation that the Administration had plans to increase the length of waterfront promenade at both sides of Victoria Harbour. On the question of what facilities had to be on the waterfront, she said that the fact that Victoria Harbour was still very much a working, functional harbour, apart from being a harbour for public enjoyment, should not be overlooked. To be fair to the departments which needed part of the harbourfront to operate, the Commission should not just be directing them to relocate their existing facilities away from the harbourfront. The Commission should also review and, if necessary, make the continued presence of these facilities as compatible as possible with their surroundings.

6.13 As regards Mr Kwok's points, **Mrs Lam** said that she expected the Commission to focus within its current term more attention on realisation of vision. She agreed with Mr Kwok that there were two approaches that the Commission could adopt in realising the vision. While she might be more used to the bottom-up (i.e. the more conventional government) approach, she was very attracted by the idea of a top-down and innovative approach. She would welcome Members' advice on this front. She assured Members that she was willing to try new ideas as much as possible but those ideas had to be tested against the current climate in which a lot of importance was attached to transparency, accountability, level playing field, etc.

6.14 In closing, **the Chairman** concluded that Members could focus on the overall plan at the Commission level, and the details at Task Force level. He was confident that the Commission had the ability and capability to come up with interesting and innovative ideas for the harbourfront.

Item 7 Study on Water-land Interface by Harbour Business Forum

7.1 Before the presentation, **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** declared that he was a member of Harbour Business Forum (HBF)'s Best Practice Committee.

7.2 **The Chairman** welcomed Mrs Margaret Brooke and Mr Stephen Bradley of HBF.

7.3 **Mrs Brooke** presented the initial findings of the study with the aid of a PowerPoint.

7.4 In response to the Chairman's enquiry, **Mrs Brooke** said that HBF would finish the study in March 2011 and publish the report in April 2011.

7.5 **Prof Becky Loo** commented that water-dependent and water-related uses should be accorded priority but it should be careful not to define these uses too narrowly, especially if a "harbour use audit" would be carried out under the study. In response, **Mrs Brooke** said that the Study Team (the Team) had a long debate on where to draw the line for the definition. Apart from public enjoyment, the Team had to balance the essential water-dependent uses that had to be located on the harbourfront.

7.6 In response to the enquiries of Messrs. Tam Po-yiu and Winston Chu, **Mrs Brooke** said that the comprehensive database of the existing assets and uses on and around the harbour under the study would also include data on land ownership at the harbourfront; and that the study would include proposals for provision of ferry services. The Team considered that it was a good idea to promote more flexible uses of ferries around the harbour subject to safety and other considerations.

7.7 **Ms Dilys Chau** appreciated the idea of land-water relationship and she also liked the idea of making the harbourfront accessible and attractive to visitors. She hoped that the Commission could come up with an overall vision for the harbourfront, based on which individual focused projects could be

developed. She asked whether HBF had conducted surveys on other world-class harbours, and whether Hong Kong could replicate some of those concepts.

7.8 In response to Ms Dilys Chau's enquiry, **Mrs Brooke** said that HBF had conducted a survey on some overseas harbourfronts and harbours as part of a study two years ago. Nevertheless, the study focused more on management and operating models rather than regulatory models, design and attraction on the waterfront.

7.9 **Mrs Carrie Lam** thanked HBF for its work and would like the Team could extend its work by doing some extra research and coming up with ideas on how to construct business cases in the following three areas:

- (i) to attract people from business sector, both local and overseas, to develop marinas in Hong Kong;
- (ii) to create additional ferry services which could be sustainable; and
- (iii) to identify potentials for social enterprises to participate in some of the PPC projects. As discussed by the former HEC, PPC could involve collaboration between the government and social enterprises.

7.10 In response, **Mrs Brooke** assured Mrs Lam that the Team would explore the possibility to include the above into the scope of the Study.

(Post-meeting note: Mrs Brooke advised on 16 March 2011 that HBF was unable to assist with the additional work due to the need to engage a qualified consultant.)

7.11 **Mr Roger Tupper** said that MD would give a presentation on an overview of commercial port operations and facilities, including PCWAs and typhoon shelters at the next Commission meeting. The presentation would primarily look at mid-stream cargo handling operations. There was a long-term

strategy to focus such mid-stream operations on the western side of the harbour, leaving the eastern side for other marine activities.

7.12 **Mr Eric Fok** pointed out a few issues which might be relevant to study:

- (i) the Guangdong Province had recently announced its plan to build a cruise terminal in the province. Although the location of the terminal had not been identified, Hong Kong should keep in view closely its impact on the Kai Tak Cruise Terminal;
- (ii) domestic air restriction in Guangzhou had been relaxed recently, which might have an impact on Hong Kong's plan for helipad in the future; and
- (iii) the Mainland and Hong Kong were moving towards a direction of cooperating together in developing marinas under the programmes for the Pearl River Delta.

7.13 In conclusion, **the Chairman** said that he looked forward to the release of the report on the study in April 2011, and HBF's further briefing on the study findings.

Item 8 Short Term Tenancy Parking Sites at the Harbourfront (Paper No. HC/05/2011)

8.1 **The Chairman** informed the meeting that this agenda item was raised by Mr Paul Zimmerman.

8.2 **Mr Joseph Lai** presented the paper and drawn Members' special attention to the following two points:

- (i) there was a real practical need on traffic and transport management ground to provide adequate parking spaces particularly for goods vehicles and coaches. A significant number, about 28%, of all the parking spaces for goods vehicles and coaches were provided by

short-term tenancy (STT) sites throughout Hong Kong; and

- (ii) from the transport point of view, there was no particular need for the parking sites to be located at the harbourfront. It was a matter of site availability as some of the sites which could be identified for short-term parking uses happened to be at the harbourfront. TD was conscious that these STT parking sites would need to be relocated to make way for other developments at some point of time. TD would identify replacement sites or other solutions when the termination of STT parking sites would lead to acute shortage of parking spaces for particularly goods vehicles and coaches. Nevertheless, the fact that there was a genuine need for parking spaces, which had to be reasonably spread throughout the territory, should not be neglected. TD would continue to work with relevant departments to this end.

8.3 **The Chairman** said that Mr Zimmerman had raised a few comments on TD's discussion paper. He suggested TD respond to those comments after the meeting. He enquired whether TD would make use of sites which were provided to MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) as works area on a temporary basis after completion of the projects. If sites were no longer required for STT car parks, consideration could be given to turn them into open space for public enjoyment.

TD

**The
Administration**

8.4 In response, **Mr Lai** said that TD usually would have identified an alternative site before giving up an STT parking site to facilitate permanent developments. TD would work with Lands Department on this.

8.5 **Mr Lam Kin-lai** said that shortage of parking spaces was a long standing problem. The Administration could not rely on STT sites to solve the problem but should formulate a long

term strategy to handle it. If there was such a need, the Government should build some permanent parking spaces; otherwise drivers would have no alternatives but to park their lorries on roads at night, posing danger to road users.

8.6 **Mr Vincent Ng** opined that the situation could be improved by way of better planning. In other words, adequate parking spaces should be planned and provided in the hinterland other than harbourfront areas. He suggested that the Administration could consider building underground car parks with open space on top of them.

8.7 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** agreed that a strategy was needed to solve the problem. The Administration should find suitable locations for parking of heavy vehicles and those needed not be close to where the drivers lived or worked.

8.8 **Prof Becky Loo** asked whether it was possible to build some multi-storey or underground car parks for lorries and coaches, like those logistics centres in the Mainland.

8.9 In response to Ms Dilys Chau's enquiry, **Mr K B To** replied that the duration of STTs was usually one year and thereafter be extended with one-month's advance notice required for terminating the tenancy.

8.10 In response to Members' comments, **Mr Lai** made the following remarks:

- (i) TD had never refused and would never refuse to give up a site in support of the Government's land sale programme or long-term development. However, it was important to find a replacement site before giving up an existing STT site in area with acute parking problem; and
- (ii) TD would look into some long-term strategies and alternatives, including the feasibility to build underground or multi-storey car parks as suggested by Members. Problems such as high construction

and maintenance costs and the visual impact of such huge buildings, etc. have to be resolved. TD would give due consideration to those possibilities together with the written comments made by Mr Paul Zimmerman.

8.11 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** opined that the Government should devote resources to solve the problem. Other cities, like London, had built such permanent facilities with very good landscaping.

8.12 In response to the Chairman's enquiry, **Mr Lai** said that the demand of parking spaces for goods vehicles and coaches remained fairly stable in the past few years.

8.13 In response to Ms Chau's enquiry, **Mr Lai** said that of the 2,600 parking spaces at the 14 harbourfront sites, about 1,000 were for goods vehicles and coaches. In coming up with a longer term solution, it was important that the replacement sites be provided evenly across the territory. The 2,600 parking spaces were operated by a good mix of both large and small operators, which further added challenge to TD in identifying replacement sites.

8.14 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** commented that inadequacy of parking spaces was not a problem concerning just the harbourfront area, but a territory-wide issue. The Government should compare the actual demand and supply with the planning standards to find out whether there was a surplus or shortfall of parking spaces.

8.15 In concluding the discussion, **the Chairman** said that the shortfall of parking spaces was a challenge shared by all and he asked TD to take note of Members' comments in formulating a long-term strategy.

TD

Item 9 Any Other Business

(A) Co-opted Members of the Task Forces

9.1 **The Chairman** informed the meeting that he, in consultation with the Vice-chairlady and Task Force Chairmen, had invited ten individuals to join the three Task Forces. They had discussed thoroughly and taken account of planned projects under respective Task Force in considering the co-option list. The newly co-opted members came from different fields which were relevant to the work of the Task Forces. He suggested that the Secretariat circulate a list of the co-opted members to Members for information after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: The Secretariat circulated a list of the co-opted members to Members on 25 February 2011)

(B) Organisation of World-Class Events in Victoria Harbour

9.2 **Mr Franklin Yu** asked if the Administration had any plans to facilitate organisation of world-class events in Victoria Harbour.

9.3 In response to Mr Yu's question, **Mrs Carrie Lam** said that the Administration had the experience of working with a group to bring in a mega event in the harbour - the Louis Vuitton Regatta. It was unfortunate that the group called off the event at the very last moment because of a clash of schedule with another large-scale competition. She assured Members that the Administration would watch out for those types of international events that could promote Hong Kong's harbourfront, and had established a mechanism with the Royal Hong Kong Yacht Club whereby they would approach the Government if they needed facilitation from various departments to organise similar events.

(C) Reclamations within the Harbour

9.4 **Mr Franklin Yu** said that reclamation within Victoria Harbour was forbidden unless there was an overriding public need. He was of the view that this could limit the planning of new facilities. Reclamation should be justified if it was for good purposes. He opined that the issue might worth the

Commission's discussion in the future.

9.5 **Mr Winston Chu** remarked that SPH wished to see **Mr Winston Chu** Victoria Harbour preserved against the huge demand for land for development. Therefore, the law had to be very strong and firm. **The Chairman** suggested that Mr Chu prepare a paper on reclamation for discussion by the Commission. In response, **Mr Chu** said that he was willing to do that, on the condition that it was without prejudice to SPH's position. He informed Members that SPH was working on the idea of proportionality which meant that the loss and damage to the harbour had to be balanced against the need and benefit to the community. He said that he might need more time to prepare the paper, and might invite his legal advisor and Ms Christine Loh to the discussion if held.

9.6 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:35 pm.

Harbourfront Commission Secretariat
May 2011