

21st Meeting of Harbourfront Commission
held at 3:00 pm on 29 September 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
Prof Becky LOO	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Dr NG Cho-nam	Representing Conservancy Association
Mrs Karen BARRETTO	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Franklin YU	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Evans IU	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Prof TANG Bo-sin	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Sr Emily LI	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr Ivan HO	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Ir Prof CHOY Kin-kuen	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
Mr CHAN Hok-fung	
Mr CHAN Ka-kui	
Mr Walter CHAN	
Ms Lily CHOW	
Ms Vivian LEE	
Mr Vincent NG	
Mr Michael WONG	Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)
Mr Daniel CHUNG	Director of Civil Engineering and Development
Mr Edward LEUNG	Senior Manager (Tourism) 2, Tourism Commission (TC)
Mr TANG Wai-leung	Assistant Commissioner/Urban, Transport Department (TD)

Ms Elaine YEUNG	Assistant Director (Performing Arts), Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Mr CHEUK Fan-lun	Assistant Director/Planning & Services (Atg.), Marine Department (MD)
Mr LING Kar-kan	Director of Planning
Miss Christine AU	Secretary

In Attendance

Mr Allen FUNG	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 Duties, DEVB
Miss Ingrid TJENDRO	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

Mr Eric FOK
Mr Hans Joachim ISLER
Mr KAN Chak-fun

Welcoming Message

The Chair welcomed all to the 21st meeting of the Harbourfront Commission, which was the first meeting of the Commission in its new term starting from 1 July 2015. He introduced new Members who were present at the meeting, including Dr NG Cho-nam, representing Conservancy Association; Prof TANG Bo-sin, representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners; Sr Emily LI, representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors; and Ms Vivian LEE. He informed Members that Mr Michael WONG, Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands) (PS(PL)) had taken over the post from Mr Thomas CHOW with effect from 31 August 2015; and Ms Maisie CHENG had taken over from Mr Michael WONG as Director of Marine with effect from 15 September

2015. He welcomed Mr WONG for attending the meeting as PS(PL), and thanked Mr CHOW for his contribution to the work of the Commission. He also informed Members that Mr Edward LEUNG, Senior Manager (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; Ms Elaine YEUNG, Assistant Director (Performing Arts) of LCSD, was attending on behalf of Ms Michelle LI; and Mr CHEUK Fan-lun, Assistant Director/Planning & Services (Atg.) of MD, was attending on behalf of Ms Maisie CHENG.

Item 1 Acknowledgement of Minutes of the 20th Meeting

1.1 **The Chair** said that the Secretariat had circulated the draft minutes of the 20th meeting to members of the last term on 27 August 2015. After incorporating the proposed amendments received, the revised draft minutes were circulated on 22 September 2015. There being no further amendment, **Members** acknowledged and agreed for the minutes to be uploaded onto the Commission's website for public information.

Item 2 Matters Arising

A. *Coach and Goods Vehicle Parking at the Harbourfront (Paragraph 2.2 of the minutes of the 20th meeting)*

2.1 **The Chair** said that the Transport and Housing Bureau (THB) and TD briefed Members on coach and goods vehicle parking at the harbourfront on 23 March 2015. The Secretariat would invite THB and TD to update Members in March 2016.

B. *Land Use Review on the Western Part of Kennedy Town (Paragraph 3.3 of the minutes of the 20th meeting)*

2.2 **The Chair** said that a working session was arranged on

24 August 2015 for Members to provide further input on the land use review. The Planning Department (PlanD) would consult the Task Force on the conceptual design of the waterfront areas after taking into account Members' comments.

PlanD

C. *Onshore Power System at Kai Tak Cruise Terminal (Paragraph 4.3 of the minutes of the 20th meeting)*

2.3 **The Chair** said that the Secretariat had not received any further comment on the matter from Members after the last meeting. If there would be any, in accordance with the usual practice, the Secretariat would relay Members' comments on specific projects to the relevant government departments for consideration.

Item 3 Progress Report from Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island (Paper No. HC/12/2015)

3.1 **The Chair**, in his capacity as the Chair of the Task Force, briefed Members on the progress report. On future development of the new Central harbourfront, he suggested organising a working session in due course for Members to discuss with relevant government departments.

the Secretariat

3.2 **Mr Franklin YU** enquired if any workshop would be organised for the Urban Design Study for the Wan Chai North and North Point Harbourfront Areas (UDS). **Miss Christine AU** replied that a working group was established under the Hong Kong Task Force in the last term to provide a platform for Members to be engaged during the study process. The next meeting of the working group would be scheduled before the next Hong Kong Task Force meeting. Same as Stage 1 Public Engagement (PE) which was concluded in August 2015, the study team would organise workshops and focus group meetings to engage the community during Stage 2 PE, which was expected to be launched in 2016. Members were welcomed to join the

working group and attend PE activities in future.

(Post-meeting note: The Secretariat invited Members of the new term to join the working group on 12 October 2015 and the 3rd meeting of the working group was held on 2 November 2015.)

3.3 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that the current water quality objective (WQO) stipulated for the Victoria Harbour water control zone was primarily for navigation and port-related marine activities. He asked whether the Commission would identify and designate areas for water sports, so that the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) could set corresponding WQOs for these areas. On the temporary coach parking site at Hoi Yu Street in Quarry Bay, he opined that coaches parking illegally at Java Road would not use the site. A monitoring mechanism should be put in place to evaluate the effectiveness of the measure in six months' time. On the nearby temporary car park, he observed that the site was mainly used by local residents as a cheaply-priced car park instead of by promenade users. He opined that such situation should be rectified or else current users would ask for reprovisioning when the site was to be released for future development.

3.4 **The Chair** responded that the Police and the Eastern District Office undertook to monitor the situation closely including the conduct of inspections to ensure that the coach parking area would only be used by coaches. They would report back to the Task Force in six months' time. **Miss Christine AU** supplemented that Members could consider the evaluation conducted by the proponent after six months and decide whether the temporary measure should be continued. On the UDS, she said that the updated harbour plan was presented to Members at the last Commission meeting held on 15 June 2015. A few areas were identified in the plan as possible locations for water related events, including Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter (KTTS), Kai Tak Approach Channel (KTAC), waters to the west of Kai Tak runway, Wan Chai North, Shau Kei Wan, Cha Kwo Ling, Yau Tong Bay, Tsim Sha Tsui East,

Lei Yue Mun and Quarry Bay, etc. These locations matched with those identified by the Home Affairs Bureau under their earlier presentation on “Water-friendly Culture and Activities”. It was a concerted effort among multiple bureaux/departments to identify suitable locations and bring possible water related events to these areas. EPD was aware of these proposed locations and was embarking on Stage 2A of the Harbour Area Treatment Scheme and other measures to further enhance quality of coastal waters of Victoria Harbour.

3.5 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** asked the Secretariat to circulate the updated harbour plan highlighting the areas proposed for water sports for Members’ reference. On the temporary coach parking site at Hoi Yu Street, he opined that the proponent should verify whether the site was used by cross-boundary coaches, but not other coaches and requested for a written confirmation from the proponent. **The Chair** said that the Secretariat would convey the comments to the proponent department for consideration. **the Secretariat**

(Post-meeting note: Taking into account the feedback received from Members, the harbour plan was further refined and circulated on 1 December 2015. Four areas were proposed to have potential for water-related activities.)

Item 4 Progress Report from Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development (Paper No. HC/13/2015)

4.1 **Mr Vincent NG**, the Chair of the Task Force, presented the progress report.

4.2 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** raised that as he recalled, there was no agreement reached at the Task Force meeting for CEDD to proceed with the proposed interception and pumping scheme (the IP Scheme) to replace the originally proposed 600m opening at the former runway, as Members were not given any confirmation that the IP Scheme could achieve water quality

standard suitable for water sports activities at KTTS and KTAC, in addition to mitigation of odour.

4.3 **Mr Vincent NG** responded that Members had a lengthy discussion about the potential of KTAC as a venue for water sports activities and were given to understand that even the original proposal of 600m opening was targeted for reduction of odour and pollutants of the water body. In view that neither the 600m opening nor the IP scheme could actually achieve water quality suitable for water sports at KTTS and KTAC, and that both options would give equivalent performance in meeting the objectives as set out in the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report, the Task Force concluded that the IP Scheme could be adopted as an alternative to the 600m opening. CEDD was also reminded of the need to carry out further measures to improve water quality at Kai Tak with the view to facilitating the hosting of water-related recreational uses thereat.

4.4 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** agreed with Mr Vincent NG's recollection of Members' discussion on the topic at the Task Force meeting. Members were given to understand at the meeting that the 600m opening could only reduce odour but not transforming KTTS and KTAC into an area for water sports activities. Members accepted that the 600m opening and the IP Scheme were functionally equivalent but also stressed the need for the Government to carry out further works to improve the water quality at the waterbody in Kai Tak to enable the establishment of a water sports centre.

4.5 **Mr CHAN Ka-kui** echoed Mr Vincent NG with his recollection. He proposed that the Government should provide a timetable and an action plan on the improvement of water quality at KTTS and KTAC to a standard suitable for water sports.

4.6 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that Members made it clear that the Government had to report back and demonstrate that water quality at KTTS and KTAC could be improved to the

overall standard required for water sports. Therefore, it should not be assumed that Members had agreed with adopting the IP Scheme as an alternative to the 600m opening.

4.7 **Miss Christine AU** clarified that there were two separate discussions at the meeting. Firstly, CEDD confirmed that the objective of the 600m opening was to tackle the problems of odour, and it was not a solution for improving water quality at Kai Tak. Secondly, Members noted that there were different sections of the waterbody around Kai Tak with potential for water sports development. It was acknowledged that KTTS could achieve water quality standard suitable for water sports much faster than in KTAC. In the end, Members concluded at the meeting to proceed with the IP Scheme in lieu of the 600m opening, noting that the two schemes could achieve the same performance while the IP Scheme would be more cost-effective. That said, department representatives also agreed to look into further enhancement of the water quality at Kai Tak to facilitate water sports activities in the area.

4.8 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** expressed his objection and said that he would listen to the audio recording of the meeting as his recollection was different.

4.9 **Mr Vincent NG** clarified once again that with CEDD's explanation at the meeting that not even the 600m opening could ensure a safe level of water quality at KTAC for carrying out water sports, the Task Force agreed and concluded that the IP Scheme could be accepted as an alternative to the 600m opening to tackle the problem of odour. The Task Force also agreed that the Government should look into longer-term measures for further improving the water quality at Kai Tak. It was a clear understanding established that the Government was requested to consider implementing two phases of improvement works: the first to accept the IP Scheme as an alternative to the 600m opening for mitigating odour, and the second to carry out further works with the goal for hosting water sports activities in the future. He agreed with Mr CHAN Ka-kui that the Government

EPD/CEDD

should be requested to provide a timetable and an action plan on water quality improvement measures for KTAC and KTTS and the issue would be followed up at the next Task Force meeting.

(Post-meeting note: At the 19th Kai Tak Task Force meeting held on 18 November 2015, CEDD informed Members that they had already embarked upon another study to identify further feasible measures to improve the water quality at KTAC/KTTS for other possible beneficial uses including water sports activities. It is expected that preliminary findings would be available in mid-2016 and CEDD would report to the Task Force on the recommendations of the study.)

4.10 Concurring with Mr Vincent NG, **Dr NG Cho-nam** said that at the stage of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the Kai Tak area, the whole purpose was to minimize the impact of odour (and other parameters) to meet the required Water Quality Objective (WQO), but it would not go beyond achieving that particular standard. Based on the EIA Report for Kai Tak development, the creation of a 600m opening at the runway was proposed to meet the WQO as stipulated for the area, which included the alleviation of odour. However, if the objective and requirements should be tightened now in the hope of facilitating secondary contact recreational uses, the initial recommendations in the EIA Report might no longer be applicable. The WQO set for this particular area would also have to be adjusted. However, this would be a complicated matter with wide implications to the overall framework as the existing water quality control zones would need to be subdivided into smaller zones each with their own set of WQOs. He opined that both the IP Scheme and the 600m opening could achieve the same environmental objectives but the former would be more cost effective.

4.11 Switching on to discuss the promenade fronting the Hong Kong Children's Hospital, **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that the current design had precluded shared use by pedestrians,

marine users, cyclists and pet owners on the promenade. While LCSD responded earlier that these issues could be handled in the future, he opined that these uses should be incorporated in the current design.

4.12 **Miss Christine AU** responded that Mr ZIMMERMAN's earlier comments had been conveyed to LCSD and a written response was circulated to Task Force Members. She recapped the following for other Members' information –

- (a) the current design scheme had already included a reserve area for the future cycle track alignment. Constructing a relatively short cycle track on the subject promenade before other parts along the waterfront might not be a desirable option. On this, the Kai Tak Office of CEDD would conduct a feasibility study on the provision of a cycle track network in Kai Tak including the promenade fronting the Hong Kong Children's Hospital;
- (b) on issues related to water-land interface, there was no existing landing step or anchor point along the subject promenade available or accessible by the public. In their upcoming studies on Kai Tak Fantasy, the Energising Kowloon East Office would look into the water body of KTTS and look into the best possible locations for landing facilities or anchor points to be placed. The study might provide insights into the enhancement for water-land interfaces around the Kai Tak area; and
- (c) as regards pet garden, LCSD was mindful that the promenade in question was relatively small and close to the hospital. Therefore, it might not be a suitable location for provision of pet gardens. If Members had further views, the Secretariat would convey them to the project proponent again.

4.13 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** reiterated that the issue of shared uses of the promenade should be addressed in the currently proposed design in order to avoid abortive costs in the future. He clarified that he was not asking for a pet garden, but would like to make sure that pet owners could walk through the entire waterfront with their pets. If possible, a pet route should be designated. **The Chair** suggested Mr ZIMMERMAN to submit his views in writing to the Secretariat and the Chairs of the Kai Tak Task Force and the Task Force on Water-land Interface for follow up.

Item 5 Progress Report from Task Force on Harbourfront Developments in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing (Paper No. HC/14/2015)

5.1 **Prof Becky LOO**, the Chair of the Task Force, took Members through the progress report.

5.2 On refurbishing the promenade at West Rail Tsuen Wan West Station, **Mr Franklin YU** said that he was given to understand that the co-use of cycle track and emergency vehicular access (EVA) was not feasible because the cycle track could not be too wide while the EVA should be at least 6m wide. He would like to know the rationale behind. On the proposed revitalisation of Tsim Sha Tsui waterfront, he said that the Phase 1 PE on the design of the project would be completed by November 2015. As the next Task Force meeting was scheduled for early November 2015, he queried whether the design could be revised taking into account public comments received and presented to the Task Force in time.

5.3 **Prof Becky LOO** said that Phase 1 PE would be conducted from September to November 2015. The next Task Force meeting was scheduled for early November 2015 for the proponent to update Members on the feedback of the general public. Phase 2 PE would then be conducted from January to June 2016. **Mr Franklin YU** said that as the Phase 2 PE would

focus on the operation of the revitalised waterfront, he was concerned that the schedule would be tight for the proponent to revise the design taking into account the comments received from Phase 1 PE.

5.4 **Ms Elaine YEUNG** responded that LCSD would work to its best in carrying out Phase 1 PE despite under a tight schedule. The first focus group meeting with stakeholders would be held on 30 September 2015 and the rest would follow. A website would be set up in early October to provide information on the project. By the end of October 2015, a series of roving exhibitions would be held at Hong Kong Cultural Centre, the City Hall, the Tsim Sha Tsui waterfront and Shatin Town Hall. Visitors would be invited to express their views through a questionnaire. Member of the public could also provide comments through an enquiry telephone number and email address. The views and comments received would be consolidated and summarised within November 2015 the earliest. The proponent would report the progress of Phase 1 PE at the next Task Force meeting scheduled for early November 2015, and present the revised design to the Commission later.

5.5 **The Chair** asked whether to defer the next Task Force meeting for a couple of weeks with a view to allowing the proponent to prepare more information about the Phase 1 PE. **Prof Becky LOO** said that deferring the meeting might leave the proponent shorter time to revise the design. Members might pass their initial comments to the proponent so that Members could comment on the revised design before it was finalised. Members could express their views and she would work with the Secretariat on the finalised meeting schedule.

5.6 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** asked whether the dates and details of the focus group meetings had been made public. On repair and improvement works of the bridge structure, he said that while Members were given to understand that there would be no further action until early 2016, it was a surprise to learn from LCSD's press release on 2 September 2015 that the Avenue

of Stars (AoS) would be closed for repair and improvement works from 8 October 2015. He queried the reason of entrusting the repair and improvement works to the New World Development (NWD), and whether the works would involve removing the existing railing. The PE plan provided did not address the concern on the entrustment arrangement on the management of AoS. He asked how the management arrangement would be decided, and whether the public would be consulted. On the co-use of cycle track and EVA at the promenade near West Rail Tsuen Wan West Station, he suggested putting markings of cycle track on the EVA. The proponent should also provide further information on outdoor seating and alfresco dining areas.

5.7 **Ms Elaine YEUNG** said that the proponent had already presented photos showing the deteriorated condition of the bridge structure and it was the appropriate timing to carry out repair works due to public safety. As there were still nine years remaining before the expiry of the current management deed, NWD should be responsible for repairing the bridge structure. The repair works would not involve the railings at the Tsim Sha Tsui East waterfront. Members were informed of the closure in writing. On entrustment of future management, LCSD was still deliberating on the way forward, and the Commission would be informed of LCSD's decision. She asked for Members' understanding that the revitalisation of the Tsim Sha Tsui waterfront was a complicated project. Instead of partnering only with NWD, LCSD was taking it forward in collaboration with many government departments and other parties.

5.8 **The Chair** remarked that he considered the AoS matter to be put back on track and it was encouraging that the proponent was engaging the community on the project. He appreciated that Members were keen to know the outcome of the PE exercise and review the design so that it would reflect public views. The next Task Force meeting would be updated on the progress of Phase 1 PE and the Commission could further review the revised design and proposed way forward. On future management,

Members should note that LCSD was still considering the issue.

5.9 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that he would encourage investment by a third party in revitalising the area concerned. He opined that the area was dilapidated and he did not mind if NWD was willing to enhance the Tsim Sha Tsui waterfront. However, the community should be involved in the formulation of design and decision making process for the future management arrangement. The entrustment arrangement should be thoroughly discussed by the community.

5.10 **Mr Ivan HO** said that he did not agree with the suggestion of starting the project all over again. The PE exercise should be transparent and the future design should be the focus. On the closure of AoS, he said that the deterioration of the bridge structure seemed not sufficiently serious that required immediate closure of AoS. He suggested that the Government should provide adequate technical support to LCSD as it was not a works department.

Item 6 Progress Report from Task Force on Water-land Interface (Paper No. HC/15/2015)

6.1 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui**, the Chair of the Task Force, presented the progress report.

6.2 **Mr Franklin YU** recalled from the presentation made by the Hong Kong Observatory that the impact of climate change on Victoria Harbour was alarming and in several decades' time, coastal areas in Hong Kong would be affected by serious flooding every year. The current planning approach and framework for the harbourfront would need to cater for this inevitable challenge arising in the future. **The Chair** said that the Government had devoted much effort in waterfront planning and the Commission would keep a watch on the situation with respect to climate change.

6.3 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that Members requested for a map showing flood-prone areas so that Members could focus their discussion on the more vulnerable locations. Members also had a discussion on stocktaking unlicensed vessels within the harbour and sports clubs, and the management of seawalls and other marine infrastructures such as bollards along promenades. **The Chair** responded that the Task Force would follow up on these issues.

the Secretariat

Item 7 Co-option of Members in Task Forces (Paper No. HC/16/2015)

7.1 **The Chair** said that in the past two terms, the Commission had co-opted a total of 29 members with various expertise to support the work of the Task Forces. He invited Members to nominate potential candidates with the required expertise for his consideration. **Miss Christine AU** supplemented that in the last term, it was useful to have members from District Councils (DCs) relevant to the harbourfront areas to join the Task Forces and reflect the local community's views. Subject to Members' view, the Secretariat would continue inviting the relevant DCs to nominate their members to the Commission for co-option.

7.2 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** commented that as the Task Forces had a widely represented membership and co-option should be on a need basis, it would not be necessary to co-opt members up to the maximum numbers allowed. In response, **Miss Christine AU** said that there was no intent to co-opt members up to the maximum numbers. Co-option would be merit-based and a list of candidates would be collated for the Chair's prioritisation and consideration.

(Post-meeting note: The Secretariat invited Members' nomination on 2 October 2015.)

Item 8 Any Other Business

8.1 **The Chair** said that during the discussion of the last Kowloon Task Force meeting, it was considered sensible to include specific reference to the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines (HPPs and HPGs) in the terms of references (ToRs) of the four Task Forces. The Secretariat had circulated a set of the revised ToRs which was also tabled. There being no further views from Members, the revised ToRs were confirmed.

8.2 On the Commission's ToR, **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** suggested including reference to HPPs and HPGs, and specifying that PE was a guiding principle and the Commission could conduct PE exercise on its own for major harbourfront enhancement projects. **The Chair** asked him to submit a formal proposal for circulation to Members.

(Post-meeting note: The written proposal from Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN was received on 30 September 2015.)

8.3 There being no other business, the meeting ended at 6:00 pm.

**Secretariat
Harbourfront Commission
December 2015**