

5th Meeting of Harbourfront Commission
held at 2:30 pm on 17 May 2011 at the Conference Room
on 15/F, North Point Government Offices, 333 Java Road, Hong Kong

Minutes of Meeting

Present

Mr Nicholas Brooke	Chair
Mrs Carrie Lam	Vice-Chair
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 Andy Leung	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Tam Po-yiu	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Dr Peter Cookson Smith	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Ir Dr Chan Fuk-cheung	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Winston Chu	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Ms Dilys Chau	
Ms Lily Chow	
Mr Vincent Ng	
Mr Philip Yung	Commissioner for Tourism
Mr Joseph Lai	Commissioner for Transport
Mr Stephen Tang	Head/Kai Tak Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Mr Bobby Cheng	Deputy Director of Leisure and Cultural Services (Leisure Services)
Mr Roger Tupper	Director of Marine
Mr Jimmy Leung	Director of Planning
Mr Chris Fung	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)
Mrs Jessie Ting	Deputy Secretary (Works)1, DEVB
Mr Terence Yu	Press Secretary to Secretary for Development
Mr Ronald Leung	Assistant Secretary (Harbour)2, DEVB

Mr Peter Mok
Mr Raymond Wong

Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB
Assistant Director/Territorial, Planning Department
(PlanD)

For Agenda Item 3

Mr Sin Tak-cheung

Assistant Director/Planning and Services, Marine
Department (MD)

For Agenda Item 4

Mr Paul Cheung

Assistant Director (Leisure Services)1, Leisure and
Cultural Services Department (LCSD)

Ms Connie Lam

Executive Director, Hong Kong Arts Centre
(HKAC)

Ms Kelley Ho

Assistant Programme Manager, HKAC

Ms Kathy Ng

Programme Officer, HKAC

Mr Daniel Hui

Artist

Mr Douglas Ho

Artist

For Agenda Item 5

Mr Tom Callahan

Senior Consultant, GHK (Hong Kong) Limited

For Agenda Item 9

Miss Katharine Choi

Principal Assistant Secretary (Energy),
Environment Bureau (ENB)

Mr Lo Kam-cheung

Senior Engineer/Energy Efficiency A1, Electrical
and Mechanical Services Department (EMSD)

Absent with Apologies

Prof Carlos Lo

Mr Leslie Chen

Dr Paul Ho

Mr Louis Loong

Mr Benjamin Cha

Mr Chan Hok-fung

Mr Eric Fok

Mr Clement Kwok

Representing Friends of the Earth

Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape
Architects

Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors

Representing Real Estate Developers Association
of Hong Kong

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 4th Meeting

1.1 **The Chair** said that after circulating the draft minutes of the 4th meeting to Members on 21 April 2011, the Secretariat had received proposed amendments from Mr Paul Zimmerman and Tourism Commission (TC). The revised draft minutes were circulated to Members on 9 May 2011.

1.2 **The Chair** informed Members that the Society for Protection of the Harbour (SPH) had tabled a note relating to the proposed amendment to paragraph 5.4 of the revised draft minutes of the 4th meeting. **Mr Winston Chu** said that the question was raised by Mr Paul Zimmerman to seek clarification on the position of the Harbourfront Commission (the Commission) on the proposed Lei Yue Mun Waterfront Enhancement Project (LYMWEF) and on whether the Executive Council (ExCo) would be alerted to the views of the members of the Commission when considering the proposed project in due course. **The Chair** said that the amendment was to record what he said at the 4th meeting and reflected the views of his and a number of other members that the project should be examined on a comprehensive and integrated basis. The project should include a programme to address the sewerage and other issues as part of a comprehensive plan for Lei Yue Mun Waterfront. In response to the Chair's question, **Mr Philip Yung** said that TC would relay HC's views in this respect to the ExCo accordingly.

1.3 As no further amendment was proposed, the revised draft minutes were confirmed.

Item 2 Matters Arising

- A. *Overview of Commercial Port Operations and Facilities in Victoria Harbour (Paragraph 7.11 of the minutes of the 4th meeting)*

2.1 **The Chair** said that MD would make a presentation on the subject under agenda item no. 3 of this meeting.

B. *Short Term Tenancy Parking Sites at the Harbourfront (Paragraph 8.3 of the minutes of the 4th meeting)*

2.2 **The Chair** said that Transport Department (TD) had sent a supplementary note on the subject to Members on 11 May 2011. Subsequently, the Secretariat had received further comments from a Member and had forwarded them to TD.

C. *Society for Protection of the Harbour's Letter on Central Harbourfront Development Authority*

2.3 **The Chair** drew Members' attention to a letter of 14 May 2011 tabled by SPH, which suggested the establishment of a Central Harbourfront Development Authority. **Mr Winston Chu** said that paragraph 3.6 of the Recommendation Report of the Task Group on Management Model for the Harbourfront (TGMMH) of the former Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC), which was also tabled at the meeting, covered the management of harbourfront areas overseas. The Marina Bay Development Agency in Singapore and the West Kowloon Cultural District Authority (WKCDA) were clear and successful precedents. The Government should consider setting up a similar authority for the Central harbourfront.

2.4 **Mrs Carrie Lam** referred Members to paragraph 4.25 of the Recommendation Report and said that she agreed that it had summed up the views and aspiration of many for a statutory harbourfront authority. She shared Members' vision and passion for creating a world-class and vibrant harbourfront for public enjoyment and was personally convinced that a statutory and independent authority with its own finances and executive powers would provide better assurances and capacity to deliver that vision by overcoming difficulties associated with the division of work within the Administration. She said that, with the formation of a new harbourfront in Central and Wan Chai, Hong Kong would

soon be entering a period of great opportunities. To grasp and realise them, it might be opportune to revisit the idea of a statutory harbourfront authority such that a concrete recommendation could be put forward for consideration by the Government of the next term. In this regard, she would like to involve all Members in the coming months to compile a report setting out the key parameters for setting up such an authority.

2.5 **Mrs Carrie Lam** said that Members could discuss whether the authority should cover the Central harbourfront only or the whole harbourfront area. Issues such as vesting of land, the interface between the harbourfront and the water, composition of the authority, mode of financing, etc. would also need to be discussed. She cautioned that Members should not draw a direct reference from local and overseas authorities whose waterfront areas still offered considerable room for commercial and residential development, whereas our new harbourfront was predominantly for public use. For instance, the Marina Bay Development Agency of Singapore assumed a land disposal agency for the 700 hectares of land reclaimed in the project.

2.6 **The Chair** said that he agreed with Mrs Lam's views. Having had the experience of the former HEC and now sitting on the Commission, he opined that the establishment of a harbourfront authority would be a natural progression and the ultimate objective. Members would need to discuss the issues concerned thoroughly and get a good understanding of the relevance of the various models for devising a tailor-made model that would work for Hong Kong's harbourfront.

2.7 **Mr Winston Chu** said that SPH appreciated deeply Mrs Carrie Lam's courage and vision in bringing the idea forward. However, he envisaged that it would take a long time to complete the legislative process while the Central Reclamation Phase III project was nearing completion meanwhile. Therefore, there was an urgent need to establish the authority to ensure a holistic development.

2.8 **Mrs Carrie Lam** said that the legislative process might not take long. However, she would not underestimate the difficulty in drawing up the framework for the authority and in taking the proposal through the Administration. The financing aspect might be one difficult issue to deal with.

2.9 **The Chair** said that the Commission and the Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island (HK Task Force) were conscious of the challenges that the Central harbourfront development presented. Members of the Commission should work towards setting up an authority as their ultimate target. This would be an on-going agenda item for the Commission.

Item 3 An Overview of Commercial Port Operations and Facilities in Victoria Harbour (Paper No. HC/06/2011)

3.1 **Mr Roger Tupper** said that land-water interface was an important subject and that therefore MD welcomed the opportunity to better understand how the commercial port activities could better integrate with the opening up of the harbourfront to the community which was the goal of the Commission. The eastern side of the harbour was being gradually opened up for more community sport and recreational water events. For instance, the two PCWAs at Kwun Tong and Cha Kwo Ling would be closed later in the year and the former would be developed into a waterfront promenade for public enjoyment. There was also rationalisation of commercial port activities at the western side of the harbour. While MD's presentation would be on the commercial port operations and their economic contributions, MD was mindful that the activities should align with the Commission's vision of a vibrant port and waterfront for people of Hong Kong.

3.2 Mr Sin Tak-cheung, Assistant Director/Planning and Services of MD, then introduced the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation.

3.3 **The Chair** said that it was a useful presentation giving an overview of the existing marine-related facilities, including typhoon shelters, private moorings areas, marine refuse collection points, etc., which were part and parcel of the harbourfront. In opening up more of the harbourfront to the public for recreational activities, the value of the working harbour would also need to be taken into account.

3.4 **The Chair** asked whether more PCWAs could be closed other than the two at Kwun Tong and Cha Kwo Ling. **Mr Tupper** said that MD monitored closely the demand for PCWAs and would continue to explore opportunities for further closures. At the present moment, the PCWAs were just able to meet the demand. Moreover, there was also the need to meet the demand from the increasing river trade traffic.

3.5 In response to the Chair's view that all the piers should better integrate for the benefit of the public, **Mr Tupper** said that the passenger ferry piers were under the management of franchised ferry companies while the public piers were under TD's management as far as the land side was concerned. As regards the water side, MD was responsible for managing the berthing and un-berthing activities to ensure that these facilities were reasonably utilised.

3.6 In response to Prof Becky Loo's question on MD's role in promoting cultural and leisure activities in the harbour, **Mr Tupper** said that MD's primary role was related to shipping safety and the environmental impact caused by vessels. MD also worked with organisers of various activities taking place in the harbour from the water safety perspective.

3.7 **Mr Winston Chu** asked what MD had done to ensure that enough berthing facilities were provided, and whether MD had conducted any study on the future demand for berthing facilities for cruise liners.

3.8 **Mr Tupper** said that terminals for cruise liners should be under the policy purview of TC. MD's role was in the safety aspect such as approach channels and MD worked closely with TC on that. **Mr Philip Yung** supplemented that TC had been working very closely with MD in developing the new Cruise Terminal at Kai Tak and in devising its operation plan.

3.9 **Mrs Carrie Lam** said that MD operated some private mooring areas for pleasure vessels in Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter (CWBTs). She asked whether that was a legacy or policy and whether MD had a role to play in marina development. She said that some boat makers and repairers had expressed the view that there was a strong demand for moorings for private vessel repairing but the business was at present handicapped by insufficiency of mooring facilities.

3.10 **Mr Tupper** explained that the private mooring areas for pleasure vessels were mostly historically associated with certain yacht clubs in Hong Kong such as those in CBTS and had been under MD's purview partly due to historical reasons. MD was responsible for the safety of design and equipment of pleasure crafts and for registering personnel engaged in operating the vessels. Whilst responsible for private mooring activities for commercial craft, MD were only responsible for allocation of space for buoy moorings for pleasure craft in certain sheltered areas of the New Territories and the historic yacht club areas spoken of earlier. However, the development of marinas was similar to the development of any other commercial facilities. All marinas were developed and owned by private companies and there was no public marina. Some yacht clubs had been developing their own mooring system and had actually given up the space for buoy moorings after obtaining seabed rights to berth more vessels in the area by using a pontoon mooring system.

3.11 In response to the Chair's question on which department should be approached for marina development, **Mr Tupper** said that as the developers or yacht clubs needed to put in place some form of mooring system, they would need to apply for seabed

right from Lands Department.

3.12 In response to Mr Lam Kin-lai's question about the future demand for container port facilities, **Mr Tupper** said that according to the port cargo forecast undertaken by the Port Development Council, the annual growth rate of cargo throughput was between 2% and 5%. For this year, it was probably around 3.2%. Based on the port cargo forecast in 2013, the Administration would determine whether or not to build Container Terminal 10, and the site being examined was on west Tsing Yi.

3.13 **The Chair** said that the Commission would probably need to set up the 4th Task Force to look at the interface between commercial and recreational activities on the waterfront in a holistic manner. **Mr Tupper** said that while MD supported the setting up the 4th Task Force, it would be very much a decision for Members as to how that should be arranged.

3.14 **Mr Winston Chu** asked whether the marina to be built on Yau Tong Bay would be a private one such that members of the public could not use it. He said that it might not be lawful to construct a breakwater, which involved reclamation, for a private marina.

3.15 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** suggested that where an existing private pier was no longer required because of the change of use of the land side, MD could consider taking it back for use by the public.

3.16 In response, **Mr Tupper** said that certain activities on the land side required marine access right. The operation of the shipyards at Tsing Yi was an example. Should there be a change of use such that the marine access right was no longer required, careful consideration should still be given before the piers were demolished as they could serve other users.

3.17 **Mr Vincent Ng** said that he agreed with the setting up of another Task Force to further deliberate on the issue of land-water interface. However, it would be difficult to avoid its work

overlapping with that of the other three Task Forces which could not just take care of the land side and ignore the water side.

3.18 **The Chair** concluded by suggesting that a paper on the establishment of the 4th Task Force including the proposed terms of reference be prepared for discussion by the Commission. **the Secretariat**

Item 4 The Leisure and Cultural Services Department – “Park Deco” Project (Paper No. HC/07/2011)

4.1 **The Chair** welcomed Mr Paul Cheung, Assistant Director (Leisure Services)¹ of LCSD, Ms Connie Lam, Chief Executive Officer, Ms Kelly Ho, Assistant Programme Manager, Ms Kathy Ng, Programme Officer of Hong Kong Arts Centre (HKAC), Mr Daniel Hui and Mr Douglas Ho, Artists.

4.2 **Mr Cheung, Ms Lam, Mr Hui and Mr Ho** introduced the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation.

4.3 In response to the Chair’s question, **Mr Cheung** said that an opinion survey about the project was being carried out on Chief Executive’s Office Facebook under the page of “Upper Albert Road” from 12 to 31 May 2011 and another would be conducted in July 2011 by HKAC. By then, LCSD hoped to be able to get sufficient feedback from users on the design of new park furniture and signage for the future.

4.4 **The Chair** asked whether it was a one-off initiative or the opinion collected would be applied to large parks and waterfront in future. He also asked how the project compared with the traditional design on cost. **Mr Cheung** said that the project at Quarry Bay Park (QBP) was basically a pilot project and LCSD was now working very closely with Hong Kong Design Centre (HKDC) on another medium-term project at Cornwall Street Park (CSP) and that was expected to be completed by August 2012. Upon completion of these two projects, LCSD would assess public feedback and see whether the

design parameters could be applied to existing as well as new parks. Turning to cost, he said that the QBP project cost around \$3 million. The new park furniture and signage were comparatively more expensive than the traditional ones which were of prototype design in term of unit cost. Understanding that price was a major concern, LCSD would try to keep the prices of the new park furniture and signage at a reasonable level.

4.5 **Mr Vincent Ng** commented that it would be unfair to compare an artwork with factory-made furniture. He said that having joined the opening ceremony of the QBP project on 12 May 2011, he would like to congratulate LCSD on this very encouraging, refreshing and enlightening initiative. On park management, he said that if members of the public were allowed walking or lying on the grass, LCSD should ensure that such policy was communicated to and observed by their frontline staff.

4.6 **Prof Becky Loo** said that the project was a good initiative but she was concerned about whether LCSD had the necessary resources and expertise for future maintenance of the new park furniture. **Ir Dr Chan Fuk-cheung** shared the same view. **Mr Tam Po-yiu** suggested that LCSD could consider using recycled materials for the artwork furniture in future.

4.7 **Ms Dilys Chau** asked whether LCSD had considered the cost for regularly renewing the artwork furniture.

4.8 In response, **Mr Cheung** said that to ensure that all their staff were aware of the policy on opening up the multi-purpose lawn for public use, he had briefed all the managers and supervisory staff of LCSD and had asked them to convey the message to all frontline staff including security guards and cleaners. He added that the new park furniture were not only artistic pieces but would also be frequently used by the public. Therefore, a considerable period of time had been spent on developing the design and choosing common, durable and functional materials that would not give rise to frequent maintenance needs. LCSD had also obtained feedback from

members of the public who had actually tried the mock-up furniture. LCSD did not see any maintenance or management problem with these new park furniture and signage. **Ms Lam** supplemented that when the team started this project, they were already aware that the artwork furniture should be functional and durable. To enhance the green element of the project, solar panel system for lighting and recycled materials (i.e. ESDM) had already been used.

4.9 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** supported collaboration with the art sector in promoting contemporary art at the waterfront. As people might get tired of the design after a while, he opined that the new furniture should be more of a temporary nature. He also suggested cutting down the number of signage because some of them obscured the vegetations; and extending the new design to kiosks and other facilities in the parks.

4.10 **Mr Cheung** said that those were park furniture with artistic flavour and that the intention was to place them in the park for a longer period. Under the pilot project, LCSD tried out putting different new park furniture in the park, instead of using the prototype design. For the CSP project, LCSD would collaborate with the HKDC which had architects and engineers to provide expertise advice on design and material selection. On signage, he said that LCSD had tried to cut down the number but some were unavoidable so as to advise to the public on relevant regulations. That said, LCSD would try to adopt a softer tone for signs advising visitors not to do certain things.

4.11 **The Chair** concluded the discussion by saying that the project was a successful initiative and a great step forward, and that the Commission was very supportive of it. He asked LCSD to brief the Commission on the public feedback on the new park furniture design in due course after the completion of the two projects.

LCSD

(Note: As the representatives from ENB and EMSD needed to

leave by 5:00 pm for another meeting, the Chair proposed and the Meeting agreed to advance the discussion of agenda item 9 on “External lighting in Hong Kong”.)

(Note: Mrs Carrie Lam left the meeting at this juncture)

Item 9 External Lighting in Hong Kong (Paper No. HC/11/2011)

9.1 **The Chair** welcomed Miss Katharine Choi, Principal Assistant Secretary (Energy) of ENB, and Mr Lo Kam-cheung, Senior Engineer/Energy Efficiency A1 of EMSD.

9.2 **Miss Choi** introduced the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation.

9.3 **The Chair** asked whether there was any plan to consider if external lighting at the harbourfront should be regulated in a different way. In response, **Miss Choi** said that ENB had not come across any views that lighting at the harbourfront should be dealt with differently but that the tourism sector might have some views because the night view at the harbourfront was a tourist attraction. In future, when the proposed external lighting task force was established, it would assess whether and how any regulatory measures should be put in place to strike a balance between reducing light nuisance to residents and maintaining that tourist attraction of Hong Kong.

9.4 **Mr Vincent Ng** said that it was a very useful presentation. In fact, the Commission and the former HEC had to consider from time to time whether certain buildings along the harbourfront should be allowed to have neon advertisement signs. There were commercial values, but also concerns about light pollution. He opined that the Commission might need to work out some principles or guidelines. **The Chair** said that the Commission would draw up such.

9.5 **Mr Lam Kin-lai** supported setting up a task force to deal with the issue because there were many different stakeholders with different views. He said that when Shun Tak Centre proposed to put up rooftop advertisement signs, a lot of complaints were received from neighbouring residents. At the end, Shun Tak Centre only put up the sign facing the harbour to minimise the nuisance. The task force could consider such an approach. The task force should also be very careful about occulting lighting which had attracted a lot of complaints in the past.

9.6 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** considered it rather difficult to get wide consensus on the issue because the intensity of lighting varied with distance. While an external lighting might be a nuisance to people nearby, it could be an enjoyment to those at a distance. Subjective judgements were involved.

9.7 **Ir Dr Chan Fuk-cheung** said that external lighting was a difficult and complicated issue in terms of intensity measurement. Unlike sound, there was no standard on ambient lighting. Measurement of external lighting would also be affected by a lot of factors. Encouraging more lighting to attract tourists and minimising lighting that did not benefit the wider public at the harbourfront would be a controversial matter.

9.8 **Prof Becky Loo** suggested that as external lighting was a central issue on the harbourfront, it would be helpful if a representative from the Commission could be invited to join the external lighting task force.

9.9 **Miss Choi** said that whether certain lighting was pleasing or a nuisance was a subjective judgement. There were divergent views among different stakeholders on how the balance should be struck. The overseas reference standard or guidelines could not be directly applied to Hong Kong because, as pointed out by Ir Dr Chan, the ambient lighting level in Hong Kong was very different from those of other cities or countries which had mandatory control on external lighting. The Government had to

draw up Hong Kong's own standards and technical parameters in addressing the issue in the unique urban environment of Hong Kong. ENB also paid attention to public concerns over occulting lighting which was a major source of complaints and those mainly involved video walls or neon signboards. For the former, the problem could be addressed from the noise nuisance front. For the latter, the Government usually had to get in touch with the operators and there were some successful cases where the operators either agreed to switch off the occulting lighting at a particular point of time everyday or to reduce the flickering intervals. With all these divergent views, it was very important for the task force to try to forge a consensus among different stakeholders and to balance their interests. On the composition of the external lighting task force, she welcomed the suggestion of sending a representative from the Commission and would consider that in the appointment exercise.

ENB

9.10 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** opined that it would not be necessary to set up more regulatory standards and committee on external lighting. Some situations like occulting lighting on video walls could be tackled by existing regulations. The guidelines on external lighting installation should also be as simple as possible.

9.11 **Mr Andy Leung** said that there was a trend that unnecessary decorative or even occulting lighting was put up in residential neighbourhoods. He opined that measures should be implemented to control such lighting to minimise the nuisance to residents, e.g. by putting in control terms in the land lease or environmental building standards, e.g. BEAM Plus. He, however, understood that it would be difficult to set a prescriptive standard.

9.12 In response, **Miss Choi** said that Members' views echoed some of the views that the Government had received but that there were also views from green groups appealing for tight regulatory control. The Government was mindful of the importance of striking a balance. The most difficult part was to tackle lighting

in commercial cum residential districts which were a unique urban setting not commonly found elsewhere.

9.13 **The Chair** said that the HK Task Force would consider a few applications involving advertisements and signboards at its next meeting on 25 May 2011. He asked Miss Choi for advice on the useful reference from which the HK Task Force could draw. **Miss Choi** suggested that the Task Force could draw reference from the draft guidelines on industry best practices on external lighting installations at Annex 1 of ENB's paper, which provided some technical standards and guidelines quite commonly adopted in other countries. **The Chair** agreed that the proposed guidelines could be a very good reference. In closing the discussion, he requested ENB to revert to the Commission when the external lighting task force had come up with some concrete proposals on control of external lighting.

ENB

Item 5 Study on Water-land Interface (Part II) by Harbour Business Forum (HBF)

5.1 **The Chair** welcomed Mrs Margaret Brooke of HBF and Mr Tom Callahan, senior consultant of GHK (Hong Kong) Limited.

5.2 **Mrs Brooke** and **Mr Callahan** presented the findings and recommendations of the study with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation.

5.3 **The Chair** said that the Commission should put on record its appreciation for HBF for carrying out the study that had identified a number of challenges which the Commission could further look into.

5.4 **Mr Winston Chu** congratulated HBF on pursuing the useful study. He said that the problem was that too many parties would like to make use of the harbour. He opined that a strategic plan should be prepared on the basis that the harbour should only

be altered as a last resort. He had drafted a paper on reclamation and would submit it to the Commission for discussion at a later meeting.

5.5 In response to Prof Becky Loo's question, **Mrs Brooke** said that the PowerPoint presentation could be put on the Commission's website while the new website for the "Google Earth" map database would be launched in about a month's time after further testing and addition of instructional video for users. **Prof Loo** further suggested that it would be good if information on Gross Floor Area, building height and building layout could be included in the database. **Mrs Brooke** said that much of the data was not available publicly. She would be pleased to include the data in the database if HBF was permitted access to them and had identified ways to keep the data reliable and up-to-date.

5.6 In summing up, **the Chair** said that the study was a very important and useful piece of work. He thanked HBF again for the good work.

Item 6 Progress Report from Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island (Paper No. HC/08/2011)

6.1 **The Chair**, in his capacity as the Chair of the HK Task Force, presented the progress report.

6.2 On the Market Sounding Exercise (MSE) for Sites 4 and 7 Development, **Ms Gracie Foo** thanked Members for their very valuable suggestions on how the questionnaire in the MSE document could be simplified. Those suggestions had been taken into account in finalising the document. She said that in addition to the MSE document, the gist of the discussion of the brainstorming session held in March 2011 and the HK Task Force Progress Report had also been uploaded to the Commission's website. The MSE would be launched on 19 May 2011. She welcomed Members' assistance in publicising the MSE in their

respective sectors. The Administration would welcome submissions from all sectors. Thus far, two newspapers had reported on the MSE. DEVB had also received requests for interview from the media. Mr Vincent Ng, who convened the brainstorming session, had kindly agreed to join DEVB in explaining the proposal to the media. She appealed for Members' support in publicising and explaining the MSE.

6.3 **Prof Becky Loo** opined that the first paragraph on Appendix II of the MSE document already implied that an increase in the commercial or shopping area would increase the vibrancy and financial viability of the project. She hoped that the public benefit and social gain could be reflected in the questionnaire as well. She also asked if the Government would lower the requirements for various public provisions or increase the commercial floor area if no private sector indicated interest in this project. She said that since public gain and social benefit were considered to be more or less of equal importance, there should not be further concession. She also asked whether there was any bottom line for the MSE.

6.4 In response, **Ms Foo** said that while it was important to ensure that the project was attractive enough in commercial terms, the Administration had already set out clearly in the MSE document the social objectives that the project must seek to achieve. As discussed at the Task Force and elaborated at the brainstorming session, this project was not about optimising revenue. On the issue of bottom line, **Ms Foo** said that it was important to have meaningful responses from the PPC partners. If the response was really lukewarm, the Administration might need to reconsider the PPC approach as proposed for Sites 4 and 7.

Item 7 Progress Report from Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development (Paper No. HC/09/2011)

7.1 **Mr Vincent Ng** took members through the progress

report.

7.2 The meeting noted the contents of the progress report.

Item 8 Progress Report from Task Force on Harbourfront Developments in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing (Paper No. HC/10/2011)

8.1 **Prof Becky Loo** presented the progress report.

8.2 In relation to the item on the proposed district revitalization in the “comprehensive development area” zoning at Yau Tong Bay, **Prof Loo** asked about the Commission’s general practice in handling applications to the Town Planning Board (TPB) that concerned the harbourfront, in particular whether only the web links would be circulated to Members or whether all such applications would be discussed at the Commission’s meeting. **The Chair** said that general planning applications involving the harbourfront would be dealt with by circulation. As for planning applications that could have important implications for the harbourfront, they could be discussed at the Task Forces on a need basis. **Mr Chris Fung** supplemented that under the current practice, the Secretariat would post the web links of the TPB applications onto the Commission’s website and would alert Members to them. If upon the request of the project proponents or departments/bureaux concerned, or the applications had important implications for the harbourfront, the Secretariat would consult the relevant Task Force Chair to see if those applications should be discussed at the Task Force meeting.

8.3 **Prof Loo** asked whether the Task Force would convey the views of its members to the TPB. **Mr Chris Fung** said that according to the usual practice, the Secretariat would extract the relevant part of the minutes and send it to the TPB. Speaking from experience, **Mr Vincent Ng** supplemented that there was usually a time issue because planning applications had to be considered by the TPB within 2 months whilst sometimes the

confirmed minutes of the Task Force meeting might not be ready then. In such circumstances, the Secretariat would prepare a gist of the discussion of the Task Force in relation to the application and send it to the TPB after obtaining the Task Force Chair's agreement. This approach had been working well so far in resolving the timing issue.

8.4 **Mr Winston Chu** said that he had seen the plan submitted by the developer of Yau Tong Bay. He asked whether the project involved reclamation. **Prof Loo** replied that at the Task Force meeting, the presentation team advised that no reclamation would be involved.

Item 10 Any Other Business

10.1 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:55 pm.

10.2 **The Chair** informed the meeting that the next meeting was scheduled for 18 July 2011.

**Harbourfront Commission Secretariat
July 2011**