

20th Meeting of Harbourfront Commission
held at 2:30 pm on 15 June 2015 at the Conference Room
on 15/F, North Point Government Offices, 333 Java Road, Hong Kong

Minutes of Meeting

Present

Mr Nicholas BROOKE	Chair
Mr Paul CHAN	Secretary for Development, Vice-Chair
Mrs Margaret BROOKE	Representing Business Environment Council
Mr LEUNG Kong-yui	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Mr LAM Kin-lai	Representing Conservancy Association
Mrs Karen BARRETTO	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Andy LEUNG	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Evans IU	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Dr Peter Cookson SMITH	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Mr LAU Chun-kong	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr Ivan HO	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Ir Peter WONG	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Shuki LEUNG	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Mr CHAN Hok-fung	
Mr CHAN Ka-kui	
Mr Walter CHAN	
Mr Eric FOK	
Mrs Ayesha Macpherson LAU	
Mr Brian David LI	
Mr Raj Sital MOTWANI	
Mr TAM Po-yiu	Member, Task Force on Water-land Interface (for Agenda Item 8 only)
Mr Thomas CHOW	Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)
Mr Daniel CHUNG	Director of Civil Engineering and Development
Ms Emily MO	Assistant Commissioner (Tourism) 2, Tourism

Mr TANG Wai-leung	Commission (TC) Assistant Commissioner/Urban, Transport Department (TD)
Mrs Doris FOK	Assistant Director (Leisure Services) 1 (Atg.), Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Mr CHEUK Fan-lun	Assistant Director/Planning & Services (Atg.), Marine Department (MD)
Ms Amy CHEUNG	Assistant Director/Territorial, Planning Department (PlanD)
Miss Christine AU	Secretary

In Attendance

Mr Eric MA	Under Secretary for Development
Mr Thomas CHAN	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Miss Fannie KONG	Press Secretary to Secretary for Development
Mr Frederick YU	Assistant Secretary (Harbour) Special Duties, DEVB
Miss Ingrid TJENDRO	Assistant Secretary (Harbour) 2, DEVB
Mr Peter MOK	Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Kenneth WONG	Assistant Secretary (Harbour) 1 (Atg.), DEVB

Absent with Apologies

Ms Lily CHOW	
Mr Vincent NG	
Prof Becky LOO	Chair, Task Force on Harbourfront Developments in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing

For Agenda Item 7

Mr Mark TAYLOR	Director, Mark Taylor Asia Ltd
----------------	--------------------------------

For Agenda Item 8

Miss Christine AU	Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
Ms Amy CHEUNG	Assistant Director/Territorial, PlanD
Ms April KUN	Chief Town Planner/Studies and Research, PlanD
Mr Mann CHOW	Senior Town Planner/Studies and Research 3, PlanD
Mr CHEUK Fan-lun	Assistant Director/Planning & Services (Atg.), MD

Welcoming Message

The Chair welcomed all to the meeting. He said that it was the last meeting of the current term of the Commission and thanked all Members for their dedicated service to the Commission in the past two years. He introduced Mr Daniel CHUNG, Director of Civil Engineering and Development, who had taken over the post from Mr HON Chi-keung with effect from 11 May 2015, and thanked Mr HON for his contributions to the work of the Commission. He also informed Members that Ms Emily MO, Assistant Commissioner (Tourism) 2 of TC, was attending on behalf of Ms Cathy CHU; Mr TANG Wai-leung, Assistant Commissioner/Urban of TD, was attending on behalf of Mrs Ingrid YEUNG; Mrs Doris FOK, Assistant Director (Leisure Services) 1 (Atg.) of LCSD, was attending on behalf of Ms Michelle LI; Mr CHEUK Fan-lun, Assistant Director/Planning & Services (Atg.) of MD, was attending on behalf of Mr Michael WONG; and Ms Amy CHEUNG, Assistant Director/Territorial of PlanD, was attending on behalf of Mr LING Kar-kan.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 19th Meeting

1.1 **The Chair** said that the Secretariat had circulated the draft minutes of the 19th meeting to Members on 8 June 2015, and did not receive any comments. The draft minutes were confirmed at the meeting.

Item 2 Matters Arising

- A. *Planning for Victoria Harbourfront - Revisiting the Harbour and Waterfront Plan (Paragraph 2.2 of the minutes of the 19th meeting)*

2.1 **The Chair** said that PlanD, MD and the Harbour Unit would present the result of their review of the plan of functional zones underpinned in the Harbour Plan Study 2003 under Agenda Item 8 of the meeting.

B. *Coach and Goods Vehicle Parking at the Harbourfront (Paragraph 3.15 of the minutes of the 19th meeting)*

2.2 **The Chair** said that as agreed at the last meeting, the Secretariat would invite the Transport and Housing Bureau (THB) and TD to report to the Commission on the latest situation of coach and goods vehicle parking at the harbourfront in a year's time.

THB & TD

2.3 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** reiterated his objection to the granting of the proposed car parks at Wa Shun Street and Bailey Street under short term tenancy on grounds that the sites were zoned for public open space and the relevant Task Forces had discussed the design of the open spaces in detail. Instead of increasing on-street parking spaces for coaches near tourist hotspots as suggested in the paper prepared by THB and TD, he opined that it would be better to provide permanent parking spaces off-street so that more street space could be made available for harbourfront enhancement-related uses. **The Chair** asked Mr Zimmerman to forward his views to the Harbour Unit for proper recording and follow-up actions with relevant parties.

C. *Progress Update of the Proposed Establishment of a Harbourfront Authority in Hong Kong (Paragraphs 4.21 and 4.29 of the minutes of the 19th meeting)*

2.4 **The Chair** said that the Secretariat would report on the progress of the proposed establishment of Harbourfront Authority under Agenda Item 9 of the meeting. As regards the Harbour Business Forum's information paper on land allocation, Lands Department was preparing a formal response which would be circulated to Members when available.

D. *Research on Victoria Harbourfront Dining by Students of Worcester Polytechnic Institute (Paragraphs 9.3, 9.4 and 9.16 of the minutes of the 19th meeting)*

2.5 **The Chair** reported to the Meeting that the Secretariat was conducting an initial stock-taking exercise on potential harbourfront dining locations as presented by the Study conducted by Harbour Business Forum and Designing Hong Kong. Under the exercise, different works departments would look into various variables that were relevant to developing outdoor dining. When the preliminary findings were available, the Secretariat would report to the respective geographical Task Forces which then could decide on the way forward.

Item 3 Progress Report from Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island (Paper No. HC/07/2015)

3.1 **The Chair**, in his capacity as the Chair of the Task Force, briefed Members on the progress report.

3.2 On the land use review on the western part of Kennedy Town, **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that at the last Task Force meeting, Members did not agree with PlanD's revised proposal and requested PlanD not to submit it to the Town Planning Board (TPB) until the resolution of the identified issues, which included the proposed concepts and development parameters for the key waterfront and pier sites, details of the public space and the new access road which would segregate the residential development from the waterfront, etc.

3.3 **Ms Amy CHEUNG** responded that at the present stage, PlanD was still processing all the comments received and conducting internal assessment on the issues in parallel. PlanD would proceed with the outline zoning plan (OZP) amendments after the completion of the internal exercise. PlanD was also

PlanD

mindful of the need to hold an informal working session with HC Members in the process.

Item 4 Progress Report from Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development (Paper No. HC/08/2015)

4.1 As Mr Vincent NG, the Chair of the Task Force, was unable to attend the meeting, **the Chair** presented the progress report on his behalf.

4.2 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** expressed disappointment that the proposed installation of onshore power system (OPS) at Kai Tak Cruise Terminal was not taken forward despite the Government's commitment to adopt a green development approach for Kai Tak.

4.3 **Miss Christine AU** responded that the issue of OPS was discussed at the last Kai Tak Task Force meeting. If Members had further comments on the topic of OPS, the Secretariat could convey them to the Environmental Protection Department for follow-up and response.

the Secretariat

Item 5 Progress Report from Task Force on Harbourfront Developments in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing (Paper No. HC/09/2015)

5.1 As Prof Becky LOO, the Chair of the Task Force, was unable to attend the meeting, **the Chair** presented the progress report on her behalf. **Members** noted the contents of the report.

Item 6 Progress Report from Task Force on Water-land Interface (Paper No. HC/10/2015)

6.1 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui**, in his capacity as the Chair of the Task Force, briefed Members on the progress report.

6.2 **Mr CHAN Ka-kui** declared that he was a director of the Hong Kong Water Sports Council.

6.3 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that there were many active users of the water who were not represented in the Council. The Commission should explore ways to connect with them and help defend their interests.

Item 7 Event Management at the Waterfront

7.1 **The Chair** welcomed Mr Mark TAYLOR of Mark Taylor Asia Ltd to the meeting. He informed Members that earlier last March, he participated in a waterfront development conference in which Mr Mark TAYLOR made a presentation about waterfront event management issues. He found the presentation to be insightful and hence invited Mr Taylor to share with Members' his understanding of the practical aspects and challenges in event management and design. **Mr Mark TAYLOR** did so with the aid of a PowerPoint.

7.2 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** raised the following questions:-

- (a) whether there was an event master layout plan and whether the provision of permanent supporting facilities including power supply, etc. was adequate for the Tsim Sha Tsui waterfront which would undergo a major facelift; and
- (b) whether it was possible to standardise the provision of necessary facilities at the waterfront whilst maintaining flexibility with the hosting of different events with different requirements.

7.3 **Mr Mark TAYLOR** responded that:-

- (a) as he recalled, while there was power supply in the piazza area of the Hong Kong Cultural Centre, there was no specific provision for other outdoor areas along the promenade and additional power might be needed for some events to be held indoors. For some outdoor events, the organisers might need to bring in electricity generators but that should be avoided as far as possible because of the noise and environmental pollution entailed. Water points and data connection points might also be needed, especially for trade events; and
- (b) the facilities to be provided at different sites varied, and much would also depend on the nature and scale of the events to be held. If there was no provision, the event organiser might have to bring in electricity generators and water tankers. Setting up for events took varying lengths of time and required right accesses to the site. For some events, there might be very specific engineering requirements and the need for specialists to come in from overseas.

7.4 In response to Mr CHAN Ka-kui's enquiry about the necessary conditions (except hardware) for events to be successful, **Mr Mark TAYLOR** opined that it would be much more preferable if the organisers could provide sufficient food and beverage (F&B) facilities for public enjoyment and consumption. The new Central harbourfront and Tsim Sha Tsui waterfront could work on that aspect by introducing more F&B options.

7.5 In response to the Chair's enquiry about striking a balance between the scale and safety of events, **Mr Mark TAYLOR** said that all events (big or small) required temporary place of public entertainment licences and part of the review process was to establish that sufficient toilets and security staff would be provided. For ticketed or licenced events, there should be proper crowd management measures in place as well as sufficient storage areas.

7.6 **The Chair** thanked Mr Mark TAYLOR for attending the meeting. **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** suggested evaluating the 73km-long Victoria harbourfront for their suitability of event management and the different types of events to be held.

Item 8 Planning for Victoria Harbourfront – Revisiting the Harbour and Waterfront Plan (Paper No. HC/11/2015)

8.1 **The Chair** welcomed the presentation team to the meeting.

8.2 **Ms Christine AU** recapped that the subject of the planning for Victoria Harbourfront had been discussed at various Commission and Task Force meetings since 2012. On 3 November 2014, DEVB, PlanD and MD were invited to brief Members on “Planning for Victoria Harbour: Approach and Process” at the 18th Commission meeting. It was agreed at the meeting that DEVB would collaborate with PlanD and MD to review and update the functional zones underpinned in the Harbour Study Plan and assess its applicability under current circumstances. **Mr Mann CHOW** presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.

8.3 **The Chair** thanked the team for the update and invited Members to give comments and suggestions. With regard to the demarcation of the Recreational Use zone in Kai Tak as shown on Slide 17 of the PowerPoint, he asked why it only included the North Apron of Kai Tak but was not extended to the runway as well.

8.4 **Ms Amy CHEUNG** replied that the area shaded green on the slide indicated the original Recreational Use zone in Kai Tak on the old plan prepared in 2003. She said that the North Apron area together with the Kai Tak Approach Channel and the rest of the Kai Tak Development were all included for a holistic

review under the updated plan and suggested to be re-categorised as a Mixed Use zone.

8.5 **The Chair** asked PlanD to clarify whether the new Mixed Use zone at Kai Tak was equivalent to the area described as “tourism and recreation-gear development” on Slide 17 of the PowerPoint.

8.6 **Ms Amy CHEUNG** explained that the new Mixed Use zone at Kai Tak would combine the original Recreational Use zone at the North Apron, the Residential Use zone in the mid-section of the runway and the Tourism Node at the runway tip.

8.7 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that the updated plan of functional zones was a good start, but raised the following questions:-

- (a) whether stakeholders and marine users were consulted in the course of drawing up the updated plan, and whether the Government would develop and work further on refining the plan through workshops;
- (b) how the Government assessed the adequacy of water-dependent supporting facilities along the harbourfront; and
- (c) how vantage points were selected and determined on the plan.

8.8 **The Chair** opined that the presentation at the meeting should be regarded as part of the Government’s stakeholder engagement process. He invited PlanD to respond to Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN’s questions.

8.9 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** commented that the purpose of the paper was to inform Members about the changes of functional zones that had been made but Members were not

given the chance to provide input.

8.10 **Ms Amy CHEUNG** explained that the aim of the review was to update the plan of functional zones developed ten years ago. PlanD was aware of Members' concerns that some of the information on the original plan might already be obsolete in the light of past developments. The updated plan had therefore incorporated new study proposals, such as those related to Kai Tak, Hung Hom and East Kowloon, as well as the recently promulgated initiative of a water-friendly culture. The general intention of the updating exercise was to produce a plan showing the overall direction of harbourfront development, which would be followed up and supported by district-based studies such as the on-going Urban Design Study for the Wan Chai North and North Point Harbourfront Areas.

8.11 **Ms April KUN** supplemented that the intention of the exercise was to compile the most up-to-date information and provide a framework for Members' further deliberation on harbourfront planning. PlanD had not made any new suggestions or new proposals in the updating exercise. Examination of detailed proposals would be conducted under district-based studies. The ten vantage points on the updated plan were some of the commonly selected locations and PlanD welcomed Members' suggestions on additional vantage points.

8.12 **Mr CHEUK Fan-lun** said that MD's contribution in the review exercise was to provide a plan showing the pattern of vessel traffic within the Victoria Harbour, which would help in the identification of potential areas for water sports events. MD would ensure the safe access of public landing steps and had no comment on waterfront supporting facilities.

8.13 **Miss Christine AU** reiterated that the Government adopted a two-pronged approach for harbourfront planning. At the district level, extensive public engagement exercise was conducted to consult stakeholders in each individual study such as the Urban Design Study for New Central Harbourfront and the

upcoming one for Wan Chai North and North Point Harbourfront Areas. The updated plan presented was an aggregation of feedbacks and views received from public consultations done for harbourfront-related district studies. In that sense, community needs at the district level would already have been reflected in the plan. She further elaborated that the revised plan consisted of multiple layers of information, which could be extracted, selected and overlaid interactively to serve different purposes and functions. The plan should be regarded as a tool for identifying suitable locations for different land uses and/or marine activities.

8.14 **The Chair** made reference to paragraph 26 of the paper that “there appears to be no lack of waterfront supporting facilities along the Victoria Harbour”. He queried how the assumption was made.

8.15 **Miss Christine AU** replied that, according to the previous stocktaking exercise on water-dependent land uses and facilities, on average, public landings were available every 1.5 km along the shoreline. She pointed out that there were indeed no standard guidelines or measurements on the adequacy of waterfront supporting facilities. However, district studies and projects provided the channel for assessing the demand for public landing facilities at the local level, and it was generally believed that the number and the average distance between these landing facilities should have been able to facilitate different uses for public enjoyment. Future discussion on the issue would be welcomed if necessary.

8.16 **Ms Amy CHEUNG** added that PlanD and other relevant departments would always grasp the opportunities to improve the provision of waterfront supporting facilities to enhance water-land interface and support water-based functions along the shoreline at the detailed planning stage.

8.17 **The Chair** enquired about the difference between the functional zones suggested in the paper and the statutory land use

zonings as stipulated in OZPs.

8.18 **Miss Christine AU** explained that the Harbour Plan Study completed in 2003 was a joint effort of PlanD and the Hong Kong Tourism Board. The concept of “functional zones” was proposed in the Harbour Plan Study, which was not statutory and thus different from the land use zonings in OZPs. The updating exercise made use of the concept of functional zones as proposed in 2003 as a basis for review. She clarified that the functional zones would cover more areas than statutory land use zonings, and were another way of classifying different land uses broadly. In the review exercise, it was suggested that Mixed Use zones would replace the original Tourism Use zones to better show the development potential of opportunity areas in the updated plan.

8.19 **The Chair** said that a lot of efforts had been put into the exercise. He invited Members to comment and support them as appropriate.

8.20 **Mr Ivan HO** shared the Chair’s view that the presentation showed the collaboration and hard work of various departments, but he commented that the concept of functional zones was confined to a two- dimensional level. He would prefer having “functional zoning plans” which could be three or four-dimensional consisting even of the element of time. To step out of the two-dimensional framework, he suggested that the Government and the Commission could consider how the idea of event organisation brought up in the previous agenda item of Event Management at the Waterfront and how potential harbourfront activities could be realised in the updated plan, having regard to the most suitable time and season for such happenings. He further proposed adopting a Smart City approach when developing the Victoria Harbour and the harbourfront for a more effective water-land interface management. Specifically, he enquired why the zone marked as “Mix 2” at Kai Tak did not include the southern part of the Approach Channel.

8.21 **Mr Shuki LEUNG** endorsed the approach of the review exercise and said that the updating had provided a lot of useful information. He considered that the exercise could be treated as a tool and a baseline for engaging and explaining to stakeholders and the local community about water-land activities. He also appreciated that it was the first time in Hong Kong that considerations were given to the possible integration of land and water activities at the planning stage. The plan offered a possibility for scenario building to guide different departments to promote the sustainable use of water and land resources.

8.22 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** endorsed the approach of the review and agreed that the updating exercise was a very useful baseline to be built upon at a later stage. He opined that it might not be appropriate to get into detailed considerations at the meeting but suggested that Members could submit their comments to the Secretariat so that specific discussions could be held later.

8.23 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** said that the exercise served as a good reference for subsequent discussion and further work to be done on harbourfront planning. With regard to specific local issues, while Yau Ma Tei waterfront was currently a working area with a typhoon shelter, she wondered why the opportunity of linking up the promenade along Yau Ma Tei waterfront was not shown in the updated plan.

8.24 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** welcomed the attempt of having a periodic review to identify action areas for more in-depth discussions in the future.

8.25 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** proposed arranging a separate workshop for Members and relevant departments to further discuss the plan at the site-specific level. He shared the view that water sports activities, such as sailing events, made use of the entire eastern part of the Harbour, and thus those areas should be clearly defined. He suggested that MD should make more

specific indications for parts of the water body where public access was prohibited or where passage of pleasure crafts would be unsafe (e.g. the Rambler Channel). He would like to know the design horizon of the updated plan. Noting that the relevant meeting materials would be available for public access on the Commission's website, he opined that it should be indicated on the website that the relevant materials would be subject to further refinements.

8.26 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** had no objection to the updated plan of functional zones tabled at the meeting, but had the following advice/questions:-

- (a) the term “zoning” usually had a negative connotation for defining boundaries and imposing limitations. A dynamic and proactive plan would require the mentality to break through the compartmentalisation of bureaucracy, laws and limitations. Subsequent to the update of the plan of functional zones, the Government should devise an action plan to address the present shortcomings and seek necessary policy changes;
- (b) the term “Mixed Use zones” was rather vague and might not be able to help the Government focus on issues that it should address;
- (c) the turning area taken up by the cruises and vessels of the Kai Tak Cruise Terminal should also be indicated on the plan;
- (d) why was the water area in front of Hung Hom not also earmarked as one of the potential locations for hosting water sports events, whereas some less suitable water areas close to residential areas and along the principal fairways (e.g. Island East) were suggested as potential spots for water events; and
- (e) with regard to the scope of the review, the updated plan

of functional zones should also take into account the water body beyond the harbour limit, such as Tseung Kwan O and Lantau, so that harbour planning efforts could also take into account marine-related uses being planned there in the longer run and consider how they would interact with the activities in the harbour.

8.27 **The Chair** summarised that the review exercise was a useful scenario building and testing tool, and provided a baseline for judging and choosing appropriate water-related uses. Members had also provided positive feedback to the approach. He advised Members to submit written comments, if any, on the updated plan to the Harbour Unit for consolidation by end of June 2015. He invited PlanD to give an initial response to the timeline of the plan of functional zones.

8.28 **Ms Amy CHEUNG** thanked Members for endorsing the approach in preparing the updated plan. Concerning the timeline of the plan, she agreed with Mr Shuki LEUNG that planning was an on-going process and said that PlanD welcomed Members' comments on the revised plan for further improvement by the end of June. PlanD would not set a rigid timeline for taking forward the plan but saw merits in taking into account other on-going studies conducted by MD, PlanD and other departments, such as the reviews on public cargo working areas and typhoon shelters, and the study on the potential link to the East Lantau Metropolis.

8.29 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired whether event planning exercise would be included in future discussions, and whether a separate workshop would be arranged. **The Chair** advised him to submit his requests and comments on the subject in writing to the Harbour Unit.

8.30 **The Chair** concluded that Members supported the suggested approach for updating the plan of functional zones in general. He thanked PlanD, MD and DEVB for the presentation and Members for their comments.

Item 9 Any Other Business

A. The Large Metal Object found during Works of Wan Chai Development Phase II (WDII)

9.1 Mr Nicholas BROOKE had to leave the meeting earlier. Mr LEUNG Kong-yui was invited to help preside the discussion of the item.

(Note: As Mr LEUNG Kong-yui presided the discussion of this item, “the Chair” to which the remaining paragraphs referred in this item should be understood as Mr LEUNG Kong-yui, rather than Mr Nicholas BROOKE.)

9.2 On the Chair’s invitation, **Mr Daniel CHUNG** reported that CEDD’s contractor working on Wan Chai’s reclamation works found a large metal object at about 6 metres beneath the seabed when they were carrying out the dredging work near the old Wan Chai Ferry Pier to prepare for the reclamation of WDII and tunnel works of the Central-Wan Chai Bypass (CWB). Since then, they had gathered more information about the object which was approximately 40 metres in length, 2 metres to 11 metres in width and 2 metre in height. According to the preliminary assessment by marine archaeologists, the object might be part of a ship sunk in the Victoria Harbour during World War II and could be the remains of HMS Tamar. However, the identity of the object had not yet been confirmed because neither the ship bell, name plate nor any other distinctive features had been found. CEDD was now removing the sediments inside and surrounding the object and other substances covering it. Only until the whole object was fully exposed could CEDD compare it with the relevant information for drawing a more solid conclusion of the identity of the object and its conservation value. CEDD had to be very careful in protecting and avoiding damaging the object and had to minimise the impacts on the related infrastructural projects, including

WDII, CWB and Shatin to Central Link (SCL). After discussion with the Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO), it was considered that the relocation of the object under water to a nearby area outside the reclamation area for further surveying would be the most appropriate plan. It was expected that the relocation work could be completed by the end of June 2015. After that, further surveying could be conducted, and the reclamation works and relevant projects could be resumed.

9.3 As regards the impact on the infrastructure projects, **Mr Daniel CHUNG** said that the reclamation and associated works at the area had been suspended. As the completion date of that section of the CWB tunnel structure had been affected, the Highways Department (HyD) anticipated that the commissioning of the CWB by 2017 as originally planned would be at risk. As the reclamation area concerned would also be handed over to the SCL project by end of December 2016 for works relating to the Exhibition Station, HyD indicated that any delay in the handing-over might cause impact on the SCL Exhibition Station works. When the metal object was successfully relocated outside the reclamation area, CEDD would conduct an in-depth assessment on the impact on the progress of the relevant projects. At the moment, CEDD would continue to liaise with HyD and take all feasible measures in a timely manner to minimise the impact on the CWB and SCL.

9.4 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** questioned what other items had been found which were potentially associated with HMS Tamar, such as brass name labels associated with crew members of the ship; whether the large metal object was found at the location prior to the construction of the original Wan Chai Ferry Pier; whether there would be risk of damaging the integrity of the metal object and evidence in the vicinity when relocating it outside the reclamation area.

9.5 In response, **Mr Daniel CHUNG** said that so far, CEDD had not found anything at the site which could help identify the object beyond doubt. Also, the object was covered

by various matters like silt and sediments. To enable a more in-depth investigation, CEDD concluded that it would be most prudent to relocate the object to an area outside the reclamation area. It was hoped that when all the sediments were removed, the whole object could be exposed so that it could be checked against the relevant information for verifying its identity. On the timing of such relocation, CEDD would do it as soon as possible when all sediments covering the object were removed. The programme at the moment was to complete the whole process by the end of June 2015.

9.6 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** believed that some items associated with HMS Tamar had been found at the location of the original Wan Chai Ferry Pier where the vessel had sunk. He asked the CEDD to confirm whether such items had been found; whether it was safe for the object to be relocated outside the reclamation area; and whether CEDD would continue to search for associated with HMS Tamar in the location. To clear any suspicion, he urged CEDD to share all the information with the community.

9.7 **Mr Daniel CHUNG** responded that CEDD had found some items but those items alone were not enough to draw any conclusion about the identity of the object. The relocation would take quite some time and that had to be done very carefully in order to protect the object itself. The plan was to remove the sediments first so that the whole object could be exposed and CEDD would carefully relocate the object under water, avoid taking it out of the water and exposing it to air as that would risk damaging the object. CEDD was trying their best to preserve the object as well as to identify its identity.

9.8 In response to the Chair's enquiry, **Mr Daniel CHUNG** said that because the object was not totally exposed, CEDD could not have an overall assessment of the object itself at the moment. While CEDD could see the condition of the exposed part, CEDD needed to get it totally exposed so that a thorough inspection and survey for its overall condition could be made.

The approach and method of relocating the object would be decided when it had been totally exposed and when the engineers had a better assessment.

9.9 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** questioned when CEDD would show to the public the items that had been found so far and why CEDD was hiding its findings from the public.

9.10 Drawing Members' attention to the Terms of Reference of the Commission, **Mr Thomas CHOW** said that Members should look at the issue in the context of harbourfront enhancement. It was not a meeting for questioning or challenging the work undertaken by CEDD that had little, if anything, to do with harbourfront enhancement. Members should also avoid putting the cart before the horse.

9.11 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that it was an issue of direct concern to the Commission as it might potentially necessitate some changes to the waterfront development. He opined that the public should be made aware of the matter and their participation in the discussion was crucial.

9.12 **Mr Thomas CHOW** responded that as pointed out by CEDD, the identity of the object could not be confirmed with the discovery and observation made so far. If the identity of the object was confirmed in the future, and perhaps with the advice of the Antiquities Advisory Board, the Commission would then have a role to play and to involve the public in advising the Government on possible harbourfront enhancement actions if the object was to be preserved. If CEDD was able to find more information about the metal object, they would come back to the Commission and seek its advice if it was related to harbourfront enhancement. **Mr Daniel CHUNG** said that when CEDD had relocated the object, it would work with experts to verify the identity of the object and assess the preservation method, if necessary. By that time, CEDD would suitably come back to consult the Commission.

9.13 **The Chair** agreed that the Commission and the relevant government departments had the duty and responsibility to reveal information that was of public importance, but the Commission should not step in or interfere with the work of relevant departments' at the stage when whether it was a matter of harbourfront enhancement was still uncertain.

B. Impact of Climate Change on Sea Level

9.14 **Mrs Karen BARRETTO** asked whether it was possible to have a presentation in the future on the impact of climate change on the sea level of the Victoria Harbour and the contingency plan to cope with the sea level rise and storm surges. **The Chair** said that the issue could be discussed at the next term of the Commission.

C. Vote of Thanks

9.15 **Mr Ivan HO** proposed and **Members** unanimously agreed to record a vote of thank for Mr Nicholas BROOKE for his abled leadership in the Commission in the past years.

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

**Secretariat
Harbourfront Commission
September 2015**