

13th Meeting of Harbourfront Commission
held at 3:00 pm on 2 May 2013 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
Mr Paul Chan	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 the Conservancy Association
Mr Andy Leung	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Tam Po-yiu	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Ir Dr Chan Fuk-cheung	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Louis Loong	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Paul Zimmerman	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Ms Dilys Chau	
Ms Lily Chow	
Mr Vincent Ng	
Ms Ann So	
Mr Jeffrey Chim	Assistant Commissioner 2 (Acting), Tourism Commission (TC)
Mr Albert Lee	Assistant Commissioner/Urban, Transport Department (TD)
Mr Hon Chi-keung	Director of Civil Engineering and Development
Miss Margrit Li	Assistant Director (Leisure Services)1, Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Mr Fung Kwok-ming	Assistant Director/Planning and Services, Marine Department (MD)
Mr Ling Kar-kan	Director of Planning
Mrs Winnie Kang	Secretary

In Attendance

Mr Thomas Chow	Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)
Mr Thomas Chan	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Henry Ho	Political Assistant to Secretary for Development
Miss Fannie Kong	Press Secretary to Secretary for Development
Mr Larry Chu	Assistant Secretary (Harbour) 1, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Frederick Yu	Assistant Secretary (Harbour) Special Duty, DEVB
Miss Venus Tsoi	Assistant Secretary (Harbour) 2, DEVB
Mr Peter Mok	Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Leung Kong-yui	Chair, Task Force on Water-land Interface

Absent with Apologies

Prof Carlos Lo	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Leslie Chen	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Dr Paul Ho	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Dr Peter Cookson Smith	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Mr Benjamin Cha	
Mr Chan Hok-fung	
Mr Eric Fok	
Mr Clement Kwok	

For Agenda Item 7

Mr Raymond Cheng	Chief Engineer/Railway Development 1-2, Railway Development Office, Highways Department (HyD)
Mr Chan Chung-hin	Senior Engineer/ Shatin to Central Link (6), HyD
Mr Philco Wong	General Manager – Shatin to Central Link (SCL), MTRCL
Mr Clement Ngai	Chief Design Manager – SCL, MTRCL
Ms Maggie So	Deputy General Manager – Projects and Property Communications, MTRCL
Mr Kelvin Wu	Senior Liaison Engineer, MTRCL
Ms Joanne Yiu	Public Relations Officer – Projects and Property, MTRCL

Welcoming Message

The Chair welcomed all to the 13th meeting of the Harbourfront Commission (the Commission).

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 12th Meeting

1.1 **The Chair** said that the Secretariat circulated the draft minutes of the 12th meeting to Members on 8 April 2013. After incorporating the proposed amendments received, the Secretariat circulated the draft minutes to Members on 23 April 2013. The revised draft minutes were confirmed at the meeting.

Item 2 Matters Arising

A. *Design of Lung Wo Road (Paragraph 3.3 of the minutes of the 12th meeting)*

2.1 **The Chair** said that the design of Lung Wo Road was discussed at the 12th meeting of the Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island (Hong Kong Task Force) on 21 February 2013. The Hong Kong Task Force would continue to follow up the matter.

B. *Coach Parking Facilities in Tsim Sha Tsui (Paragraph 5.8 of the minutes of the 12th meeting)*

2.2 **The Chair** informed Members that TD had implemented various measures on coach parking in Tsim Sha Tsui and would report to the Task Force on Harbourfront Developments in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing (Kowloon Task Force) on the progress in due course. The Kowloon Task Force would continue to follow up the matter.

C. Central Kowloon Route – Phase 2 Public Engagement Exercise (Paragraph 7.12 of the minutes of the 12th meeting)

2.3 **The Chair** informed Members that HyD would consult the Kowloon Task Force and the Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development (Kai Tak Task Force) later in May 2013 on the details of the Central Kowloon Route project-related infrastructure works at the Yau Ma Tei and Kai Tak harbourfront areas.

D. Water Quality of Victoria Harbour and its Typhoon Shelters (Paragraph 8.7 of the minutes of the 12th meeting)

2.4 **The Chair** said that the Environmental Protection Department (EPD)'s written response on the measuring of odour density, weekly odour patrol and comparison of the bacteriological water quality objectives (WQOs) between Hong Kong and overseas countries was circulated to Members on 8 April 2013.

2.5 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that EPD should advise the Commission on the cost implications for achieving secondary contact WQOs at Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter (KTTS) and Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter (CBTS). He remarked that the relocation proposal for the Shatin Sewage Treatment Works (SSTW) to caverns should pay due regard to the objective of achieving secondary contact WQOs at KTTS for holding water sport events.

2.6 In response, **Mrs Winnie Kang** said that the Secretariat would relay the comments to EPD and ask them to report back to the respective geographical task forces in due course. She informed Members that the treated effluent from SSTW could comply with secondary contact WQOs.

the Secretariat

Item 3 Progress Report from Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island (Paper No. HC/08/2013)

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

3.2 On the amendments to the draft Central District (Extension) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H24/7, **Mr Paul Chan** said that the amendments were basically technical in nature. All the public views expressed on the amendments would be duly considered by the Town Planning Board (TPB), and the Government had no further point to make at this stage.

3.3 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** did not agree that the proposed amendments were technical in nature and made the following comments –

- (a) the community was not objecting to the berthing of People's Liberation Army (PLA) vessels at the new Central harbourfront, but to the proposed change of zoning of the military dock from “open space” to “military use”;
- (b) the rezoning proposal was not in line with the Garrison's previous commitment on opening the site for public access when it was not in military use. If the site was rezoned to “military use”, there would be no height restriction on buildings to be built thereon and the public access to the site would be subject to the Garrison's discretion;
- (c) the rezoning proposal was immature at the moment since management issues related to the military dock had not been sorted out;
- (d) the Government did not mention the proposed OZP amendments to the Legislative Council (LegCo) when

seeking funding approval for the construction of the military dock, and to the community during the public engagement exercise of the “Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront” (UDS); and

- (e) the site was not included in the 1994 Sino-British Defence Land Agreement, and was zoned as “open space” from the beginning. The rezoning proposal was unexpected to the community and not conducive to building harmony and consensus.

3.4 **Mr Thomas Chan** made the following responses –

- (a) the 1994 Sino-British Defence Land Agreement had already set out the provision of a military dock at the new Central harbourfront. When the OZP was first approved in 2000, the location of the military dock had already been demarcated, albeit its detailed design and boundary were not decided at the time. As the design and boundary of the military dock had been finalized, it was timely to reflect its final delineation and land use on the OZP;
- (b) when applying to the LegCo Public Works Subcommittee for funding of the Central Reclamation Phase III project in 2002, the Government had already made it clear that a 150m military berth would be constructed as part of the project;
- (c) the Government had reiterated on various occasions the Garrison’s commitment that the dock would be opened to the public as part of the waterfront promenade when it was not in military use; and
- (d) the Government had presented the design of the military dock and the proposed structures thereon to the Hong Kong Task Force and the Central and Western District Council in 2010. During the public engagement

exercise of UDS, the issue had also been discussed in detail by the public and UDS's final report had clearly set out that a military dock including the structures thereon would be built at its current location. Members of Hong Kong Task Force had paid a site visit to the military dock to see the design and structures thereon in 2012. The public, the Commission and the relevant stakeholders had all along been consulted on the design and construction of the military dock.

3.5 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** agreed that Members were aware of the military dock for a long time, but not the rezoning proposal. She considered the rezoning unnecessary and might give rise to the concern that bulky buildings could be built at the site in future.

3.6 **Mr Ling Kar-kan** reiterated that the proposed amendments were technical in nature as explained in the government statement issued on the matter. It was important to note that the Government had proposed and the Garrison had agreed that the military dock would be opened to the public when it was not in military use. The Government would deal with other technical issues mentioned by Members such as management and maintenance arrangement of the military dock separately.

3.7 In closing, **the Chair** said that this was a planning issue which should be dealt with by the TPB under its established procedures.

Item 4 Progress Report from Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development (Paper No. HC/09/2013)

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

4.2 In response to the Chair's enquiry on the location of the heliport and Kai Tak Fantasy, **Mr Hon Chi-keung** said that the

heliport would be at the tip of the runway while the Kai Tak Fantasy would be on the other side facing KTTS.

4.3 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** commented that there was no public pier near the Cruise Terminal for tourists' interchange with local water transportation means.

4.4 **Mr Jeffrey Chim** responded that TC would look into the issue with TD having regard to factors like the service demand. **Mr Thomas Chow** added that TC should also study whether there was an overriding public need in the context of the requirement under the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance as clarified by the Court if any new pier was proposed to be built within the Victoria Harbour.

**Tourism
Commission**

Item 5 Progress Report from Task Force on Harbourfront Developments in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing (Paper No. HC/10/2013)

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

5.2 On Tsim Sha Tsui Ferry Pier, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** pointed out that various parties such as TD, LCSD, the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department and the ferry operator were involved. He enquired whether funding would be available for DEVB to take forward the enhancement of the area under an integrated approach.

5.3 On Tsim Sha Tsui East, **Mr Lam Kin-lai** said that there were numerous complaints that coaches illegally parked along the waterfront had blocked the seaward views of visitors from the nearby alfresco dining area and caused a lot of traffic problems. He urged TD to address the problem as soon as possible.

5.4 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** echoed the view and said that the part of Salisbury Road at Tsim Sha Tsui East was constantly blocked by coaches. He suggested that TC deploy traffic

wardens to manage the traffic flow of coaches at the nearby tourist spots.

5.5 In response, **Prof Becky Loo** remarked that the coach parking problem in Tsim Sha Tsui was a complicated issue as it was a developed area with many constraints. Although a number of coach parking spaces had been built under the land lease in new developments within the area, the developers were not obliged to open these spaces for public use. Therefore, an effective solution to tackle the problem had to be worked out with the collaboration of different departments. The Kowloon Task Force would continue to look into the issue.

Item 6 Progress Report from Task Force on Water-land Interface (Paper No. HC/11/2013)

6.1 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** presented the progress report.

6.2 On marina development, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that there was insufficient safe mooring space for local pleasure vessels in some typhoon shelters within Victoria Harbour. The mooring spaces available were often occupied by vessels owned by dockyard companies which should not be moored there. **The Chair** suggested that the issue be further discussed at the Task Force on Water-land Interface.

Item 7 Update on the Shatin to Central Link (Paper No. HC/12/2013)

7.1 **The Chair** welcomed the project team to the meeting. **Mr Kelvin Wu**, Senior Liaison Engineer of MTRCL, presented the paper, with the aid of a PowerPoint.

A. Hung Hom Area

7.2 **The Chair** enquired about the height of the proposed Hung Hom Station ventilation shaft and the north ventilation

building (NVB). **Mr Kelvin Wu** elaborated that these buildings would be lower than the podium of the Hong Kong Coliseum and the nearby flyover of Hung Hom Bypass. The exterior of these buildings would be vertically landscaped to minimize the visual impact.

7.3 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that he was concerned about the planning of the entire waterfront area after SCL works, such as the amount of gross floor area available, provision of public facilities like cycling track for public enjoyment, etc. The SCL project should further enhance the pedestrian connectivity between Hung Hom and Tsim Sha Tsui East waterfront.

7.4 **Mr Lam Kin-lai** said that a holistic planning of the area should be presented by MTRCL. He considered that the current linkage between Hung Hom and Tsim Sha Tsui East by footbridge was not the best arrangement. He suggested enhancing the at-grade linkage by opening up the waterfront area near the emergency vehicular access (EVA) of NVB. He also commented that the current barging point would be the better location for the future heliport, as it was closer to the hotel areas in Tsim Sha Tsui. Echoing Mr Lam's view, **Mrs Margaret Brooke** said that an integrated plan for the waterfront area should be presented for Members to advise further on the SCL project.

7.5 **Mr Ling Kar-kan** said that there was clear planning intention for the area, including enhancing the linkage of the waterfronts between Hung Hom and Tsim Sha Tsui East. As the concerned area was largely used for railway development, MTRCL had submitted some conceptual ideas to PlanD for discussion in the past year. The discussion would continue with a view to drawing up a plan to make the best use of the waterfront asset in the area.

7.6 **Mr Philco Wong** responded that the current design of tunnel and ventilation facilities aimed to reduce the footprint so as to leave the potential for future development in the area. MTRCL had been keeping a dialogue with relevant parties but

had yet to come up with an overall plan for the area.

7.7 **Ms Maggie So** supplemented that the construction works for the SCL would take a few years to complete. MTRCL had minimised the area occupied by the EVA so that the area could be used for other planned purposes like open space in future. MTRCL was focusing on the railway scheme for the time being but it would coordinate with other departments regarding future developments in the area.

7.8 **Mr Lam Kin-lai** said that MTRCL should consult Members on the overall plan of the area before the structures were built.

7.9 **Prof Becky Loo** remarked that MTRCL should also adopt a more people-oriented approach in making the station and the nearby area in Hung Hom more accessible for public enjoyment.

B. Wan Chai North Area

7.10 **Mr Lam Kin-lai** said that the proposed location of the south ventilation building (SVB) should be close to the Cross Harbour Tunnel (CHT) instead of Gloucester Road and enquired whether SVB and the re-provisioned Police Officers' Club (POC) could be integrated into one building.

7.11 **Mr Kelvin Wu** explained that MTRCL had to re-provision the POC and build the SVB within the original footprint of the POC site. Given the building height restriction on the OZP, some facilities would be placed underground in order to minimize the scale and visual impact of the buildings. The proposed layout was the optimal arrangement which would also allow the construction of an EVA to serve both buildings.

7.12 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested that the pedestrian connectivity to the area could be improved by setting back the boundary of the POC site and widening the footpath there.

7.13 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** commented that if SVB was used to exhaust air from the railway tunnel in case of fire, it should not be built next to CHT.

7.14 **Mr Andy Leung** suggested improving the pedestrian connectivity between the western and eastern sides of the CHT tunnel portal, and across Gloucester Road.

7.15 **Mr Kelvin Wu** responded that the SCL alignment had already been finalised. Changing SVB to another location would affect the arrangement of underground air duct and other associated facilities and might result in an increase in the facilities' building height that exceeded existing restriction on the OZP. The current proposal was a balanced solution integrating the underground structures within the footprint of the site so as to minimize the visual impact of the building. No polluted air would be exhausted from the SVB under normal circumstances as trains were powered by electricity.

7.16 **Mr Ling Kar-kan** said that the position of SVB had been marked on the Wan Chai North OZP after a long engagement process with input from relevant stakeholders. He added that while any proposal to change the zoning on the OZP could be presented to the TPB for consideration, there was no strong justification to change the proposed location for SVB for the time being. Ideas to facilitate pedestrian connectivity in the area would be worked out before finalising the overall planning of the area.

7.17 **The Chair** said that MTRCL should fine tune the design of SVB and POC having regard to Members' comments particularly on the pedestrian connectivity, and report further to the Hong Kong Task Force.

MTRCL

7.18 To improve the water quality at CBTS, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested that the MTRCL's contractor could pump fresh seawater from the harbour into CBTS in order to

flush out the stagnant water there. He further commented that while the broad land use of the area was set out in the Wan Chai North OZP, the zonings should be flexible for changes to tie in with the detailed planning of the area for development after the completion of the Wan Chai Development Phase II project.

7.19 In response to the Chair's enquiry, **Mr Ling Kar-kan** said that the Government was looking into the possibility of making better use of the land on top of the Exhibition Station, and would consult the Commission in due course.

(Post-meeting note: On 7 June 2013, PlanD briefed the HC's Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island about the proposed amendments to the Approved Wan Chai North OZP No. S/H25/2, which mainly involved the proposed Exhibition Station topside development primarily for convention and meeting facilities, with pedestrian links connecting to the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre Extension, the existing elevated walkway system in Wan Chai North and the proposed landscaped elevated walkway under the WDII project leading to the waterfront.)

7.20 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** said that an overall plan of the development at the Exhibition Station, including how the ventilation buildings could fit into the area, should be clearly presented to Members.

7.21 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** enquired about the pedestrian connectivity at the junction of Fleming Road and Convention Avenue and whether all the facilities of Harbour Road Sports Centre would be re-provisioned in its new building for community use.

7.22 **Mr Lam Kin-lai** suggested reviewing whether the bus terminus should be re-provisioned at the site, in view of the streamlining of bus routes. He added that with the opening of the Exhibition Station, the number of bus routes operating in the area should be reduced to improve traffic conditions.

7.23 **Mr Andy Leung** said that the Exhibition Station could become a focal point for activities if a good design was adopted, and asked for more information on the station design to explore possible enhancement.

7.24 **Ir Dr Chan Fuk-cheung** remarked there were many technical constraints such as alignment, ventilation and safety requirements for railway development and it would be difficult to accommodate substantial changes once the engineering works started. For the case of SCL, since its initial design had started more than ten years ago and already entered the implementation and construction stages, MTRCL might only incorporate certain improvements having regard to the technical constraints. He was of the view that the community needs should be taken into account at the initial planning stage, and a more people-oriented approach should be adopted for a holistic planning of the area.

7.25 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** said that while the zoning of the new Wan Chai waterfront had been finalised, the urban design for the area had yet to commence. As SCL project would affect some existing buildings and infrastructures, he suggested that MTRCL should provide further information for Members to consider how its facilities would impact on the urban design of the new Wan Chai waterfront.

7.26 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that an overall plan showing the traffic flow and interface of the station with other road users such as pedestrians, buses and coaches and private cars should be presented by MTRCL.

7.27 **The Chair** asked MTRCL to brief Members on any idea of optimizing the use of the Exhibition Station site. The Commission should also be briefed on an integrated planning for the area in due course.

**MTRCL &
PlanD**

C. *Kai Tak Area*

7.28 **Mr Andy Leung** suggested and **Mr Vincent Ng** agreed **the Secretariat**

that the development of the Kai Tak Station area should be elaborated at the future Kai Tak Task Force meeting.

7.29 **Mr Philco Wong** responded that MTRCL would consider Members' suggestions and work with the Commission's Task Forces to further enhance the detailed design of the project.

MTRCL

Item 8 Any Other Business

A. Budget and Resources for Harbour Unit

8.1 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** opined that the Harbour Unit did not have sufficient resources given the amount of harbourfront issues it had to handle, including HA. More resources should be provided to the Unit for taking forward harbourfront enhancement projects.

B. Chapter No. 4 of the Director of Audit's Report No. 60 on Development and Management of Parks and Gardens

8.2 Referring to Chapter No. 4 of the Director of Audit's Report No. 60 on development and management of parks and gardens, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** commented that it was opportune to discuss on the categorisation of public open space before the departments concerned would submit their responses to the Audit Commission.

8.3 In response, **Mr Thomas Chan** said that the Government would look into the recommendations and respond to the audit report. Among other things, the existing provision of open space and the land planned for developing new open space would be updated, and the relevant department(s) could present the updated information to Members if needed. He said that as far as the planning of open space was concerned, the basis would be the "Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines" which set out a number of considerations relevant to waterfront promenade.

8.4 **Mr Vincent Ng** expressed concerns on planning through a computational approach and considered that an ideal harbourfront for public enjoyment could not be achieved that way. To provide a quality harbourfront, a higher than the minimum standard of open space provision would be required.

C. Resources for Marine Department

8.5 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that during a visit to a MD facility in Yau Ma Tei, he found that the office was understaffed. He asked the Transport and Housing Bureau (THB) to give sufficient support to MD by providing resources, land and facilities on the waterfront to enable the department to discharge its duties properly.

THB

D. Vote of Thanks

8.6 **The Chair** said that this was the last meeting of the Commission in the current term. He thanked all Members for their contributions to the work of the Commission in the past three years.

8.7 There being no other business, the meeting ended at 5:45 pm.

**Secretariat
Harbourfront Commission
September 2013**