

8th Meeting of Harbourfront Commission
held at 2:30 pm on 13 December 2011 at the Conference Room
on Upper Ground Floor, Hong Kong Heritage Discovery Centre,
Kowloon Park, Haiphong Road, Tsim Sha Tsui, Kowloon, 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 Paul Ho	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Dr Peter Cookson Smith	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Mr Shuki Leung	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Winston Chu	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour (SPH)
Mr Chan Hok-fung	
Ms Dilys Chau	
Mr Eric Fok	
Mr Vincent Ng	
Mr Philip Yung	Commissioner for Tourism
Mr To Kam-biu	Assistant Commissioner/Urban, Transport Department
Mr Hon Chi-keung	Director of Civil Engineering and Development
Mrs Betty Fung	Director of Leisure and Cultural Services
Mr Francis Liu	Director of Marine
Mr Ling Kar-kan	Deputy Director of Planning/Territorial
Mrs Winnie Kang	Secretary

In Attendance

Ms Gracie Foo	Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands) ¹
Mr Chris Fung	Assistant Secretary (Harbour) ¹ , Development Bureau

	(DEVB)
Mr Ronald Leung	Assistant Secretary (Harbour)2, DEVB
Ms Jacinta Woo	Chief Town Planner/Studies & Research, Planning Department (PlanD)
Mr Lam Cheuk-yum	Co-opted Member of Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island
<u>For Agenda Item 7</u>	
Mr Jimmy Chan	Principal Assistant Secretary (Works) 3, DEVB
Mrs Sorais Lee	Deputy Project Manager (Kowloon), Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Ms Jacinta Woo	Chief Town Planner/Studies and Research, PlanD
<u>For Agenda Item 8</u>	
Mrs Margaret Brooke	Chair of Best Practice Committee, Harbour Business Forum (HBF)
Mr Tom Callahan	Senior Consultant, GHK(Hong Kong) Limited
Mr Andrew Amerasekera	Senior Consultant, GHK(Hong Kong) Limited
<u>Absent with Apologies</u>	
Dr Frederick Lee	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Leslie Chen	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Ir Peter Wong	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Benjamin Cha	
Ms Lily Chow	
Mr Clement Kwok	
Ms Ann So	

Action

Welcoming Message

The Chair welcomed all to the 8th meeting of the Harbourfront Commission (the Commission), in particular, Mr Francis Liu who had taken over the post of Director of Marine from Mr Roger Tupper with effect from 2 November 2011. He

suggested and Members agreed to record a vote of thanks for Mr Tupper for his contribution to the Commission.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 7th Meeting

1.1 **The Chair** said that the Secretariat circulated the draft minutes of the 7th meeting to Members and the Hong Kong Cycling Alliance (HKCALL) on 24 October 2011 and received proposed amendments from Messrs Clement Kwok and Paul Zimmerman, and HKCALL. After incorporating the proposed amendments, the revised draft minutes were circulated to Members on 30 November 2011. As no further amendment was proposed at the meeting, the revised minutes were confirmed.

Item 2 Matters Arising

A. *The Commission's Annual Report (Paragraph 2.3 of the minutes of the 7th meeting)*

2.1 **The Chair** said that the draft annual report was circulated to Members on 8 November 2011. After incorporating Members' comments, a finalised report was circulated to Members on 9 December 2011. Further comments were received on 11 December 2011 from Mr Paul Zimmerman who opined that the report did not accurately reflect the Commission's position on the proposed Lei Yue Mun Waterfront Enhancement Project (LYMWEP).

2.2 **Prof Becky Loo** clarified that at the subject Task Force meeting, all Members agreed that sewerage problem did exist in the area; and supported an upgrading to the area. While a few Members insisted that the LYMWEP should only proceed after the sewerage problem had been resolved, other Members opined that the LYMWEP should go ahead for early enjoyment by both local and overseas visitors on the understanding that a medium-to-long term plan to alleviate the sewerage problem had

already been included in the LYMWEP and such plan was consistent with the overall upgrading plan of the area. The divergence of views had been recorded in the minutes of the subject Task Force meeting. The annual report reflected the majority view of Members.

2.3 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** said that Members had heated debate on the issue and in his opinion, the LYMWEP could hardly improve the facilities in the area.

2.4 **The Chair** concluded that Members agreed on the wording of the annual report, subject to accurate reflection of the minutes. He and all Task Force Chairs would ensure that issues were considered in the light of the Commission's objectives.

the Secretariat

B. *TD's Note on the Latest Development of Hung Hom (South) Ferry Pier (Paragraph 3.5 of the minutes of the 7th meeting)*

2.5 **The Chair** said that TD's note on the latest development of Hung Hom (South) Ferry Pier was circulated to Members for information on 9 December 2011.

C. *The Administration's Comments on the HKCAll's Proposal to plan a Continuous Cycle Route along the Harbourfront (Paragraphs 6.3 and 6.13 of the minutes of the 7th meeting)*

2.6 **The Chair** said that the relevant government bureaux and departments had examined the HKCAll's proposal and provided comments in an information note which was circulated to Members on 9 December 2011. The note would be sent to HKCAll after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: The Secretariat sent the information note to HKCAll on 14 December 2011.)

D. *Review of Technical Circular No. 1/04 in the light of*

SPH's proposed Proportionality Principle (Paragraphs 7.7 and 7.16 of the minutes of the 7th meeting)

2.7 **Ms Gracie Foo** said that Members had useful and constructive discussion on SPH's proposed proportionality principle at the last Commission meeting. She reiterated that the Government would not shy away from reclamation projects, especially those with enormous public benefits; and enumerated that the Environmental Friendly Linkage System (EFLS) under the "Energizing Kowloon East" Initiative, and the proposed piers and floating pontoon in the West Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD) were being explored. She updated Members that DEVB had already taken the initiative to ask CEDD to conduct topical studies to explore the technical feasibility and the implications under the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance for the proposed boardwalk under the Island Eastern Corridor, which received widespread support during public consultation on the Hong Kong Island East Harbour-front Study. Subject to the outcome of the topical studies, CEDD would conduct a formal engineering study covering the proposed boardwalk and the possible refurbishments to North Point Ferry Piers. She reiterated that the Government would ensure that water-land interface issues and opportunities would not be affected or compromised in the pursuit of those proposals.

2.8 **Ms Foo** supplemented that initial discussion had been made with the concerned departments regarding Technical Circular No. 1/04, which was found still valid, relevant and useful when implementing individual projects. The circular had been distributed to Members for reference after the last meeting.

2.9 **Mr Winston Chu** said that the proportionality principle was written in good faith to assist the Government, the Commission and the general public to understand SPH's position and legal viewpoint regarding harbour reclamation. However, although SPH had presented the paper formally to the Commission and also written to the Secretary for Justice, it had not been provided with an official response. He was of the view

that the Government might need to update the circular so that it would be able to consider the legal impact of the proportionality principle.

2.10 **Ms Foo** said that Secretary for Development, Mrs Carrie Lam, had already made a thorough response to SPH at the last Commission meeting. If SPH preferred a response in writing, DEVB would follow up after the meeting. **Mr Chu** said that he would issue a letter to the Government, with a copy to Members. He hoped that the Government would formally respond.

DEVB

(Post-meeting note: DEVB issued a reply to SPH on its paper on “Proposed proportionality principle on reclamation of Victoria Harbour” on 14 February 2012.)

Item 3 Progress Report from Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island (Paper No. HC/21/2011)

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

3.2 Members noted the contents of the progress report.

Item 4 Progress Report from Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development (Paper No. HC/22/2011)

4.1 **Mr Vincent Ng** briefed Members on the progress report.

4.2 Members noted the contents of the progress report.

Item 5 Progress Report from Task Force on Harbourfront Developments in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing (Paper No. HC/23/2011)

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

5.2 Members noted the contents of the progress report.

Item 6 Progress Report from Task Force on Water-land Interface (Paper No. HC/24/2011)

6.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the first meeting of the Task Force on Water-land Interface was held on 24 November 2011 and Mr Leung Kong-yui was elected the Chair of the Task Force. As Mr Leung could not attend the meeting, **the Chair** presented the progress report on his behalf.

6.2 Members noted the contents of the progress report.

Item 7 Energizing Kowloon East and the Environmentally Friendly Linkage System (Paper No. HC/25/2011)

7.1 **The Chair** welcomed Mr Jimmy Chan, Principal Assistant Secretary (Works) 3 of DEVB, Mrs Sorais Lee, Deputy Project Manager (Kowloon) of CEDD, and Ms Jacinta Woo, Chief Town Planner/Studies and Research of PlanD.

7.2 Mr Chan, Ms Woo and Mrs Lee presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.

7.3 **The Chair** questioned whether the commissioning date of 2023 for the whole EFLS could be advanced. **Mr Eric Fok** also asked about the phasing of development of the EFLS.

7.4 While supporting the EFLS in principle, **Mr Tam Po-yiu** considered that it was more important to develop external transportation network in order to promote economic and commercial development of Kowloon East (KE) as another “Central Business District” (CBD). For example, it should be

well connected to the WKCD – the future terminus of the Hong Kong Section of the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link.

7.5 **Mr Andy Leung** opined that as Kowloon Bay and Kwun Tong used to be industrial areas with much private and fragmented land ownership, there should be a concrete redevelopment plan to facilitate their transformation to business, commercial and office uses. To trigger the formation of a CBD, the Government should provide a cluster or focal point in the development and plan Kai Tak proactively.

7.6 **Mr Winston Chu** opined that large corporations would not be attracted to move from Central to the scattered development in KE where industrial buildings were converted to commercial uses. He said that there should be a focused development planning, like the Canary Wharf in London, to provide a critical mass of new and prestigious commercial buildings supported by commercial facilities, restaurants, hotels, etc. This might be achieved by increasing the Gross Floor Area (GFA) around the MTR stations right next to the cluster of government offices, and the area should be well served by convenient transportation.

7.7 **Mr Francis Liu** said that the proposed 21m vertical clearance under the Kwun Tong Transportation Link of the EFLS would affect some 80% of the vessels currently using the Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter. He requested that the relevant trade associations be consulted during the public engagement exercise.

7.8 **Mr Jimmy Chan** and **Mrs Sorais Lee** made the following response -

- (a) since the announcement of the Energizing KE Initiative, the Government had received comments from various stakeholders. Connectivity was one of the most commonly raised issues that would be well addressed when working out the details of the Initiative;

- (b) the Government's objective was to transform KE into a prestigious business district by providing sufficient infrastructure facilities to attract business corporations to move into the area. Action Area 1 in the Kowloon East conceptual master plan was a piece of government land located at the centre of the area, which had a high potential to become a focal point for kick starting the development. With the improved connectivity, branding of the area, well planned urban design and introduction of diversity into the area, it was expected that more business corporations would be attracted to the area to create the critical mass required for the transformation;
- (c) the commissioning date of the EFLS was affected by the interface with other projects within Kai Tak, including the Shatin to Central Link (SCL) which would only be completed by the end of 2018. The timing would also be affected by the relocation of existing facilities in Action Area 1 where the proposed EFLS depot would be located;
- (d) while the Government would phase the development, the EFLS would only be able to operate after the completion of the whole section;
- (e) a series of measures to improve the connectivity in KE would be considered, including improvement of the existing walkway system and pedestrian environment; improvement of the intra-district transport by provision of other road-based public transport prior to the commissioning of the proposed EFLS; improvement of the external transport linkage by connecting the EFLS with the existing MTR line and the planned SCL; and
- (f) a monorail system had a lighter structure and more flexibility in design and outlook as compared with other

systems. The proposed line network of the EFLS was simple and suitable for the adoption of monorail system.

7.9 **Prof Becky Loo** said that Energizing KE was a good initiative but she was not very supportive of a monorail system because it was not a new technology and could hardly become a tourism attraction; it was visually intrusive and noisy thus requiring high clearance and station design with nearby developments; and was expensive and inflexible in future system upgrade. The Government should consider these issues in the public engagement exercise.

7.10 **Mr Vincent Ng** welcomed the Initiative. To accomplish this visionary Initiative, he opined that it was important to provide more supporting facilities and better environment for the people going to work in KE as the area would be transformed from industrial to a business district. While in favour of setting up a Kowloon East Development Office (KEDO) for overall coordination, he asked for more information about its jurisdictions and division of work with the existing Kai Tak Office (KTO).

7.11 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** opined that KE should be termed a secondary commercial centre instead of “CBD2” because it was not in Central and was quite dispersed in terms of the distribution of business development. He was supportive of the proposed EFLS as it would help link up and consolidate the dispersed areas, and suggested making the EFLS a loop system.

7.12 **Mr Shuki Leung** said that the proposed EFLS would connect Kai Tak, which would become a high quality working, living, leisure and entertainment district, with the adjoining old communities like Kwun Tong which was undergoing urban renewal. If the Cruise Terminal was successful in promoting the status of Kai Tak, plenty of new job and business opportunities would arise in Kwun Tong and Kowloon Bay to energize and convert the old industrial areas into vibrant business districts. To enhance the status of KE as an important CBD in support of

the existing Central CBD, the Government should not only focus on the two proposed Action Areas, but also explore ways to advance the monorail project and make it attractive, iconic, inspirational and well integrated with local communities in order to create a vision for the private sector to join hands with the Government to invest in the development of KE.

7.13 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** said that connectivity with the wider system was essential and should be in place in the area earlier in order to make the Initiative a success. However, she also concurred that monorail was visually intrusive and would spilt Kai Tak in the middle from the waterfront.

7.14 In response to Members' comments, **Mr Jimmy Chan** said that -

- (a) the Government had plan to build a total of 11km of promenade in the whole KE area. Kwun Tong Promenade Stage 1 was opened to the public in 2010 and, subject to the approval of the Legislative Council (LegCo)'s Finance Committee, the construction of Kwun Tong Promenade Stage 2 would commence in end 2012 for completion in 2014. Many enhancement measures had been proposed in the conceptual master plan to improve the access to the promenades, e.g. a number of improved pedestrian linkage system with the existing railway network, improved streetscape and footbridge networks;
- (b) as most of the land in Kwun Tong and Kowloon Bay was privately owned, the proposed KEDO would be a multi-disciplinary office to steer, coordinate, and engage land owners and developers in taking forward the transformation. On the other hand, land in the Kai Tak Development was government land and with an overall plan for its development. Thus, KTO was mainly tasked to deliver the planned infrastructure projects in Kai Tak according to the development plan;

- (c) it was considered not cost effective to make a loop alignment along Kwun Tong waterfront for the EFLS as the area could be well served by the existing Ngau Tau Kok MTR Station. The public would be consulted on the details of the EFLS during the public consultation commencing in early 2012; and
- (d) the Government was not just focusing on the two Action Areas but would look at the development of the whole KE.

7.15 **The Chair** said that the issue of monorail aside, the proposed EFLS would clearly enhance the connectivity of the waterfront and the runway tip with the surrounding districts.

7.16 **Mrs Carrie Lam** made the following remarks -

- (a) since the announcement of the Energizing KE Initiative by the Chief Executive (CE) in his final Policy Address on 12 October 2011, there had been positive public reception to the plan, both in terms of its substance as well as the Government's vision and commitment. That said, the Government would not be complacent about the initial reception as there were a lot of hurdles and difficult areas to tackle;
- (b) the alignment reserve for the EFLS had been included in the Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan (OZP), which was the result of an extensive public engagement exercise and had been looked at by the former Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC) and ultimately approved by the CE in Council in November 2007. To meet the public aspiration for an EFLS, the Government would undertake a detailed study on the alignment, feasibility and modes of transport. As the originally proposed alignment of the EFLS could only provide connectivity within Kai Tak and the adjacent

harbourfront area, the Government had proposed to expand its network.

- (c) Because of the surging office rental in Central, the urge for more supply of quality offices particularly from the overseas business community, the initial encouraging result of the revitalisation of industrial buildings in Kowloon Bay and Kwun Tong; and leveraging on the opportunity offered by the Kai Tak development and the enhanced connectivity brought about by the EFLS, the Government had conceived this Initiative in order to provide some measures to sustain Hong Kong's economic competitiveness. Connectivity was considered as the most important issue to be tackled because Kowloon Bay, Kwun Tong and Kai Tak were now poorly connected and one of the crucial linkages was to connect Kwun Tong to the tourism node at the runway tip of Kai Tak;
- (d) the Government had looked at many other systems around the world and there was actually no better alternative than a monorail system. The initial response was positive, particularly from the district community and local people. Some people were in favour of having an iconic type of transport in the area as Hong Kong had no elevated monorail system before. That said, as the EFLS was preliminarily estimated to cost about \$12 billion, the Government would be very cautious and would provide adequate information on the project to the public during the consultation. The Government would also keep an open mind and engage stakeholders, including the transport sector, before committing on this elevated monorail system. Due to the possible noise impact of the system, the Government had rejected the idea to extend the monorail system further into residential areas like To Kwa Wan and Wong Tai Sin;

- (e) the KTO's mission was to deliver the infrastructure in Kai Tak. At the moment, DEVB was still considering the setup of the proposed KEDO but it would not replace the KTO. The KEDO would replicate the successful model of DEVB's Development Opportunities Office and provide one-stop advisory services and support in various statutory procedures to private developers and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) on how they could better take forward their respective land development proposals in Kowloon Bay and Kwun Tong. Despite such division of work, both KTO and KEDO would ensure that a coherent urban design would be achieved in the whole area;
- (f) while the Commission and the Kai Tak Task Force needed not be re-configured to cover KE, the Commission could provide advice on the use of the water body along the Kai Tak Approach Channel and Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter, which would have a great role to play in injecting energy into the old areas. Members could further deliberate on whether the issue would be taken forward in the Kai Tak Task Force or the Task Force on Water-land Interface; and
- (g) the Government was also keen to advance and accelerate the EFLS project but was constrained by the spilt land ownership in the area, particularly in Kwun Tong; and the interface with other major transport infrastructure. As private sector initiative was another factor affecting the timing, the Government welcomed private land owners and developers to come forward with good proposals. CEDD would come back to further brief the Kai Tak Task Force on the EFLS in the first quarter of 2012.

CEDD

7.17 In closing the discussion, **the Chair** said that the Government should be commended for this Initiative, which had much foresight and responded to some of the economic

challenges faced by Hong Kong. He suggested that the Kai Tak Task Force and the Task Force on Water-land Interface could jointly look at the use of the water body along the Kai Tak Approach Channel.

Item 8 Harbour Authority Information Paper by Harbour Business Forum (HBF) (Paper No. HC/26/2011)

8.1 **The Chair** recapped that when discussing the proposed establishment of a harbourfront authority at the 5th Commission meeting held in May 2011, Members saw the need to conduct a research on local and overseas authorities with a view to identifying key parameters for further discussion. Subsequently, HBF offered to conduct a background research for the Commission, which was now completed. He thanked HBF for the efforts in preparing the paper and welcomed Mrs Margaret Brooke, Chair of Best Practice Committee of HBF, and Messrs Tom Callahan and Andrew Amerasekera, Senior Consultants of GHK (Hong Kong) Limited.

8.2 **Mrs Brooke** presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.

8.3 **Mr Winston Chu** suggested that the harbourfront authority should also look after the Central reclamation site despite that the legislative process for its establishment might be long.

8.4 **Mrs Carrie Lam** appreciated HBF's effort in preparing the paper for Members' reference. Reiterating her response at the LegCo's debate on Hon Prof Patrick Lau's motion on "*Perfecting Harbourfront Planning and Management in all Districts of Hong Kong*" in July 2011, she said that the Commission might look at an authority type of institution this time, and that she remained committed to providing a proposal before the end of this term of Government for consideration by the Government of the new term. While it would not be

possible to address all the specifics or to come up with the draft legislation required for constituting an authority, the framework for the proposed authority would be set out in the proposal. To enable Members to have sufficient time to go through the issues for establishing an authority, she suggested organising a retreat on a Saturday in early 2012 so that Members could put their collective wisdom together. The Secretariat would under her personal steer and based on HBF's paper, come up with a checklist of the topics for Members to go through, notably covering the proposed authority's role, remit, function, land ownership, planning, financing and staffing aspects, etc. Some relevant government officers could also be invited as resources persons to support the discussion and advise Members on Hong Kong's experience and the practicability of various options. For example, the proposed authority should not have overriding planning power as the Town Planning Board should be Hong Kong's only independent statutory town planning body. While it might not be possible for the proposed authority to be given the right to sell land, it might, like the Hospital Authority, be vested with land that could be subleased and sublet for various types of activities but the land ownership should remain with the Government. Land could be vested in the authority by phases, as in the case of the Hospital Authority.

the Secretariat

8.5 Regarding Mr Winston Chu's question on how to deal with the new Central harbourfront in the interim, **Mrs Lam** said that the Commission should better move fast on the proposed authority and see whether it could provide solution to some of the Central harbourfront sites.

8.6 On the name of the proposed authority, **Mrs Lam** had reservation on calling it "Harbour Authority". She was inclined to stick with "harbourfront" and might also add "Victoria" before it. To call it "Harbour Authority" might confuse the future authority as one assigned with port management functions such as those Hong Kong was obliged to carry out as a result of international conventions related to port operation. In line with the practices of other overseas harbourfront authorities, the

proposed authority should be held accountable to the Administration which would have the power to appoint members. To engage the public and stakeholders, the authority might consider setting up “friends of the authority” or co-opting members to sub-committees. She welcomed Members’ suggestions and ideas, which could be channelled to the Secretariat for working out a comprehensive checklist for Members to go through at the retreat.

8.7 **Mr Chu** pointed out that “Victoria Harbour” had a clear legal definition but it would be difficult to define “harbourfront”.

8.8 **Prof Becky Loo** opined that in considering the way forward, Members should make a stronger case on how the people of Hong Kong would benefit from the setting up of an authority, and how the authority could better fulfil the Harbour Planning Principles (HPPs).

8.9 In closing the discussion, **the Chair** said that he looked forward to the retreat which was targeted to be held in February 2012. He would assist Mrs Lam in coming up with the checklist to facilitate the brainstorming at the retreat.

(Post-meeting note: The retreat was held on 25 February 2012.)

Item 9 Any Other Business

9.1 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:45 pm.

**Secretariat
Harbourfront Commission
March 2012**