

**30<sup>th</sup> Meeting of Harbourfront Commission**  
**held at 3:00 pm on 5 March 2018 at the Conference Room**  
**on 15<sup>th</sup> Floor, North Point Government Offices, 333 Java Road, Hong Kong**

**Minutes of Meeting**

**Present**

Mr Nicholas BROOKE	Chair
Mr Michael WONG	Secretary for Development, Vice Chair
Mr Andy LEWIS	Representing Business Environment Council
Prof Becky LOO	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Mrs Karen BARRETTO	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Freddie HAI	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Evans IU	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Dr Eunice MAK	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Mr Ivan HO	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Ir Raymond CHAN Kin-sek	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Mr Walter CHAN	
Ms Kelly CHAN	
Mr Karl KWOK	
Ms Vivian LEE	
Mr Vincent NG	
Mr Frankie NGAN	
Ms Bernadette LINN	Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands), Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Simpson LO	Assistant Commissioner for Tourism 2, Tourism Commission (TC)
Mr Peter WONG	Assistant Commissioner/Urban, Transport Department (TD)
Mr Ringo MOK	Deputy Project Manager (South), Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Mrs Doris FOK	Assistant Director (Leisure Services) <sup>1</sup> , Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Mr CHEUK Fan-lun	Assistant Director/Planning & Services, Marine Department (MD)
Mr Raymond LEE	Director of Planning

Miss Rosalind CHEUNG Secretary

**In Attendance**

Mr LIU Chun-san	Under Secretary for Development
Ms Doris HO	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, DEVB
Mr Allen FUNG	Political Assistant to Secretary for Development, DEVB
Miss Teresa SAIR	Press Secretary to Secretary for Development
Mr LEUNG Kong-yui	Chair, Task Force on Water-land Interface
Mr Larry CHU	Assistant Secretary (Harbour)1, DEVB
Ms Jenny WONG	Assistant Secretary (Harbour) Special Duties, DEVB
Mr Ian CHENG	Assistant Secretary (Harbour) 2, DEVB
Mr Peter MOK	Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB

**Absent with Apologies**

Sr Francis LAM	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr Terence LEE	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong

Dr NG Cho-nam	Representing The Conservancy Association
Mr CHAN Ka-kui	
Mr Hans Joachim ISLER	
Mr Alan LO	
Mr Tony TSE	

**Agenda Item 3**

Ms Vivian HO	Assistant Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport) 4A, Transport and Housing Bureau (THB)
Ms Stella LEE	Assistant Commissioner / Management and Paratransit, TD
Ms Anna YEUNG	Chief Transport Officer/Planning/Ferry, TD

**Agenda Item 4**

Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN	CEO, Designing Hong Kong
Mr Marco Andrew INTERLANDI	Student, Worcester Polytechnic Institute

Action

**Welcoming Message**

**The Chair** welcomed all to the meeting. In light of the announcement of the 2018-19 Budget, he expressed his disappointment that no funding was earmarked for harbourfront enhancement in the 2018-19 Budget. He opined that high-level leadership and their commitment for supporting the work of the Harbourfront Commission (HC) would be imperative for HC to put forward the territory-wide harbourfront initiatives.

**Ms Doris HO** responded that \$500 million dedicated funding had been earmarked in last year's Budget for harbourfront enhancement and the HC had already deliberated and agreed on its deployment for six projects. The Government was actively implementing these initiatives, which included two large scale projects, namely the urban park in front of Hung Hom Ferry Piers and the open space at Eastern Street North in Sai Ying Pun; two other quick-win projects, namely enhancement of the Tsuen Wan waterfront and creation of the advance promenade from New Central Harbourfront to Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre, which the Government had been working closely with relevant parties on their design; as well as two consultancy studies on policy or design matters crucial to future harbourfront development.

**Mr Michael WONG** made the following responses -

- (a) he expressed his gratitude for HC's commitment and contribution to harbourfront enhancement;
- (b) he added that the Government would take forward the harbourfront enhancement projects to be funded by the dedicated funding as agreed by HC as soon as possible. Apart from the dedicated funding, efforts would also be made to mobilise other resources for harbourfront enhancement. He believed that with good ideas on

**Action**

enhancing the harbourfront, the necessary resources would follow; and

- (c) in the meantime, the Government would continue to explore and put on trial different project implementation and management models.

**Mr Ivan HO** shared the disappointment of the Chair and hoped that the message could be conveyed to the Administration.

**Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that without the establishment of a Harbourfront Authority (HFA), the harbourfront could only be enhanced through the traditional means which involved time-consuming funding application process for each single project. The Government lacked a holistic plan on the harbourfront. With some harbourfront sites left vacant and some used for car parking, people could only enjoy the harbourfront with limits. He requested a table setting out land availability, existing uses and timing of implementation for ongoing and planned projects for all sites so as to keep track of the progress of planning, implementation and activation of the entire harbourfront.

**The Chair** informed Members that Mr Joe WONG had taken over the post of Commissioner for Tourism from Miss Cathy CHU, and Mr Simpson LO, Assistant Commissioner for Tourism, was attending on Mr WONG's behalf; Mr Peter WONG, Assistant Commissioner of TD, was attending on behalf of Ms Mable CHAN; Mr Ringo MOK, Deputy Project Manager of CEDD was attending on behalf of Mr LAM Sai-hung; Mrs Doris FOK, Assistant Director of LCSD, was attending on behalf of Ms Michelle LI; and Mr CHEUK Fan-lun, Assistant Director of MD, was attending on behalf of Ms Maisie CHENG.

- 1.1 **The Chair** said that the Secretariat circulated the draft minutes of the 29<sup>th</sup> meeting to Members on 1 March 2018 and no comment was received from Members. There being no proposed amendment, the minutes were confirmed at the meeting.

## **Item 2 Matters Arising**

### *A. Terms of Reference of the Commission*

- 2.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the Secretariat had circulated the revised Terms of Reference (ToR) with initial amendments proposed by himself and Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN to Members for comments in December 2017. The further revised ToR with further proposed amendments incorporated was tabled for discussion (**Annex**).

- 2.2 **The Chair** invited and **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** took Members through the further revised ToR. On top of the amendments proposed by the Chair and Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN, some further amendments were proposed by the Harbour Unit as follows -

- (a) to delete the word “financing” in (a) of the ToR, as the financing of private projects would be subject to private sector’s initiative, while that for public projects would be subject to the public works procedures as stipulated by the Government. It would be difficult for HC to play a role in the financing of harbourfront projects;
- (b) to insert “within the harbour limit” after “their adjacent waters” in (a) of the ToR so as to tally with the wording used in the General Circular No. 3/2010 “Harbourfront Enhancement” and specify more clearly the boundary of adjacent waters which was relevant to the work of HC ;
- (c) to make textual amendments to (b) of the ToR;

Action

- (d) to keep “through a wide range of contractual entrustment” in (c) so as to retain the original flexibility in allowing private participation in harbourfront initiatives;
- (e) to delete the specific reference to “Town Planning Board” (TPB) in the new term (d) of the ToR. It was considered that as part of the established practice, HC’s advice on harbourfront matters had all along been provided to bodies such as the TPB and the West Kowloon Cultural District. TPB would have been covered under the category of “others”; and
- (f) to amend the new term (e) of the ToR. Studies to be commissioned by the Harbour Office on behalf of HC would generally take the form of tender exercises, which would be subject to stringent Government Stores and Procurement Regulations. The proposed amendments aimed to suggest having the Harbour Office as HC’s executive arm so as to ensure compliance with the relevant rules and regulations.

2.3 After receiving no comments from Members, **the Chair** concluded that the Commission agreed to the proposed amendments and confirmed the ToR.

B. *Coach and Goods Vehicle Parking at the Harbourfront (Para 3.15 of 19th Meeting)*

2.4 **The Chair** said that at the last Hong Kong Task Force meeting on 23 January 2018, TD was invited to give an update to Members on the latest progress of addressing car parking problem and phasing out of short-term car parks with the harbourfront areas. He invited Mr Peter WONG to give a brief update of the latest status and the timeframe of the relevant territory-wide consultancy study.

2.5 **Mr Peter WONG** reported that TD had commissioned a consultancy study on parking for commercial vehicles in December 2017. The study aimed to review the parking

**Action**

demand and supply situations of commercial vehicles, and to come up with appropriate medium to long-term measures to address the parking need for commercial vehicles. The study was expected to last for two years until end 2019. HC would be updated when more concrete proposals or recommendations had emerged.

2.6 **The Chair** asked TD to provide an interim report on the study and update Members on the study progress regularly.

2.7 **Mr Peter WONG** responded that TD would review the study schedule and work out the appropriate time for providing updates to the Commission.

2.8 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired about the details of the study scope, in particular whether the study would focus on car parking issues at specific harbourfront locations. Noting that it would need two years to complete the study, he asked TD to address the car parking problem at the harbourfront as soon as possible.

2.9 **Mr Peter WONG** responded that the study was conducted on a territory-wide basis covering the harbourfront areas.

2.10 **The Chair** asked and **Mr Peter WONG** agreed to provide the scope of study for Members' information.

**TD**

2.11 **Ir Raymond CHAN** asked whether underground parking space would be included in the study. He also enquired about whether the policy on car parking aimed to meet or curb demand on parking spaces.

2.12 **Mr Peter WONG** replied that underground car parking space would be one of the measures to be examined for meeting car parking demands. The Government's prevailing policy in the provision of parking spaces is to accord priority to considering and meeting the parking demand of commercial vehicles. Developers were encouraged to provide parking spaces at the higher end of the range under the Hong Kong Planning

Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG).

- 2.13 **Mr Ivan HO** opined that it would not be desirable for TD to review its parking policy based on the outdated HKPSG which should be reviewed. A strategic review should be carried out instead. He requested TD to brief members on the study details in particular on what was expected from the consultant at the next meeting.
- 2.14 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** echoed with Members' views and requested TD to provide the study brief for Members' information.
- 2.15 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** asked TD to provide HC with a specific report focusing on the temporary car parking sites falling within harbourfront areas, and identifying alternative parking sites so that the harbourfront sites could be returned for public enjoyment. He reiterated that the issue had been discussed at the Commission for many years and TD should address Members' concern as soon as possible rather than having to wait for another two years.
- 2.16 **Ir Raymond CHAN** said that he had all along been advocating that if temporary car park had to be located at harbourfront area inevitably, a narrow strip of land should at least be reserved for people to go to the waterfront.
- 2.17 **The Chair** requested TD to circulate the study brief of the consultancy study for Members' information, and present study details to Members at the future meetings. **TD**

### **Item 3 The "Star" Ferry Services and Enhancement of Relevant Piers**

- 3.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives from the Transport and Housing Bureau (THB) and the Transport Department (TD) to attend the meeting.



Action

- 3.2 **Ms Stella LEE** briefed Members on the proposed new franchise for The “Star” Ferry Company, Limited (SF) and the enhancement of relevant piers with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 3.3 **The Chair** commented that SF might have little incentive to proactively enhance pier facilities under the imminent renewal of franchise for 15 years, if granted. Noting that TD’s presentation had not covered much on pier enhancement, in particular enhancement to Tsim Sha Tsui SF Pier, he enquired whether there would be any enhancement works for the piers.
- 3.4 **Mr Andy LEWIS** said that the SF’s ferry services were well-known iconic water journeys of Hong Kong. The SF piers, which were frequented by both tourists and local residents, should be better designed and revitalised to enhance public enjoyment and promote tourism. The Government should motivate SF in pier improvement.
- 3.5 **Mr Ivan HO** concurred with Mr Andy LEWIS’s view and made the following comments-
- (a) the design of the Central and Tsim Sha Tsui SF Piers was dated and failed to make the SF piers attractive icons of Hong Kong. The design, accessibility and utilization of SF piers should be enhanced;
  - (b) the renewal of franchise provided an opportunity for the Government to request SF to improve the SF piers; and
  - (c) the Government should examine the pier enhancement issue from urban planning perspective in a holistic way, such as conducting a comprehensive urban design study.
- 3.6 **Prof Becky LOO** opined that the presentation should focus more on how the new franchise could benefit the harbour from the harbour planning perspective. The renewal of franchise would be a great opportunity for pier enhancement, in particular, to integrate the Tsim Sha Tsui SF Pier with the nearby area and improve its dilapidated condition. Given the

Action

pier was a key icon in terms of its heritage and historical value, and that it represented the collective memories for many Hong Kong people, she saw an urgent need to revitalise the pier.

- 3.7 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** shared Members' views and saw the need to revitalise the pier and its adjacent area for public enjoyment. He also noted the ageing problem faced by the ferry industry and considered that SF should review the management and operation of the ferry services in a holistic approach so as to sustain its development.
- 3.8 **Ms Kelly CHAN** opined that the Government should conduct a holistic water transport review, which included, inter alia, the ferry route between North Point and Hung Hom.
- 3.9 **Mr Vincent NG** acknowledged that SF's ferry services were iconic features of the Victoria Harbour which were worth preserving. However, the problem faced by SF was how to be financially sustainable without increasing considerably the ferry fare. He considered that it might be an opportunity to let the ferry operator to manage part of the harbourfront areas so as to enhance vibrancy of harbourfront and financial sustainability through public private partnership. While the current condition of the SF piers and the management of surrounding open space were far from satisfactory, THB/TD failed to project a visionary image of how to revitalise the SF piers, improve accessibility and add vibrancy to the harbourfront areas under the new franchise. In this connection, he had reservation in supporting the renewal of the franchise unless there were pier/harbourfront enhancement plans.
- 3.10 **Dr Eunice MAK** opined that accessibility to the public viewing space at SF piers should be improved under the new franchise. Taking Central Pier No. 7 as an example, she opined that it was unsatisfactory that members of the public would have to walk through a common corridor which would also lead to a private restaurant before they could access the public viewing area. As regards the Tsim Sha Tsui SF Pier, its public area should be

enlarged so that the pier could become an attraction itself.

3.11 **The Chair** enquired if there was any restriction under the new franchise for SF to bring in a partner for managing the SF piers for commercial and retail purposes for generating non-fare box revenue.

3.12 **Ms Stella LEE** made the following responses-

(a) under the new franchise, SF undertook to (i) provide free Wifi services at the passenger waiting area of the SF piers in Central, Wan Chai and Tsim Sha Tsui; (ii) strengthen staff training on English and Putonghua and customer service; and (iii) provide affordable services and fare concessions if viable. Meanwhile, passenger information counters had already been set up at the SF piers in Central, Wan Chai and Tsim Sha Tsui to provide ferry service information in response to public requests;

(b) the Government would collaborate with SF in a pragmatic manner, rendering policy support and necessary assistance for implementing pier enhancement proposals including revitalising the SF piers and bringing in more vibrancy to the harbourfront through partnership; and

(c) THB and TD would encourage SF to improve the public accessibility of the existing or new areas (if any) for easier public access to the harbourfront.

3.13 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** expressed his views as follows-

(a) he was disappointed that SF was not invited to attend the meeting with the Government;

(b) in the light of the different land control mechanisms, SF had faced difficulties in effectively managing the SF piers and their surrounding areas. As such, a place-making exercise for the Central, Wan Chai and Tsim Sha Tsui SF piers would be required to examine their planning,

design, zoning and management;

- (c) he opined that materials of previous discussions about the issue at HC should be provided to Members for reference so as to facilitate a thorough discussion; and
- (d) he saw the need to rationalise the zoning of space and render the public areas more easily accessible.

3.14 **Mr Freddie HAI** echoed with Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN's views. He opined that SF was an important Hong Kong icon that should be preserved. The whole experience of ferrying across the harbour was overshadowed by the chaotic situation at the TST covered concourse area. He therefore agreed in principle that the Government should allow SF to generate non-fare box revenue to cross-subsidise the ferry operation (including improving its fleet and services) and to bring the covered concourse area into proper management with strategic retail offerings to enhance the overall experience. However, he agreed that the current proposal had fallen short of defining clearly the management responsibilities of each element in the precinct.

3.15 **Mr Vincent NG** said that he had no objection to the proposed new franchise so that the ferry operation could continue. However, he had reservation on whether SF could do a good job in taking up the additional responsibilities of managing the ground floor of the Central Terminal Building and the Observation Deck of the Wan Chai SF Pier under the new franchise. If SF failed to enhance the harbourfront areas, it would be hard to reclaim the site from SF if the management of the site had been bundled with the new franchise.

3.16 **Mr Ivan HO** said that THB/TD should provide further details on SF's pier improvement and harbourfront enhancement plan before the whole proposal could be supported by the HC.

3.17 **Ms Stella LEE** responded that the Tsim Sha Tsui SF Pier was undergoing some minor upgrading /repairing works,

**Action**

including improvement of lightings and refurbishment of concrete walls and ceilings. In a longer term, TD would continue to coordinate with relevant works departments for large scale renovation works. She added that the canopy outside the Tsim Sha Tsui SF Pier was managed by the Government. TD would work with relevant departments for refurbishment works if necessary.

**3.18 Ms Vivian HO** supplemented the followings-

- (a) it was the established practice for the Government to allow SF to sub-let the surplus space at the SF piers for commercial and retail purposes so as to generate non-fare box revenue for cross-subsidising SF's operation; and
- (b) THB and TD would work collaboratively with all relevant departments and stakeholders on SF's piers / harbourfront enhancement plans in the long run to safeguard the public's enjoyment of the harbourfront and facilitate better utilisation of the harbourfront public space at the SF piers by visitors.

**3.19 Mr Kelly CHAN** believed that the Government should have provided certain protective clauses in the new franchise agreement for managing SF's performance and refining the use of public space if required.

**3.20 The Chair** raised the following comments-

- (a) THB/TD should consult HC at an earlier stage so that Members' comments could be taken on board when preparing the proposed new franchise;
- (b) THB and TD should consult HC again to report the details of SF's longer-term plans for pier improvement and harbourfront enhancement; and
- (c) the proposal which lacked pier enhancement plans could hardly be supported by the Commission.

- 3.21 **Ms Doris HO** supplemented that to her understanding, the proposed new franchise concerned primarily the ferry operation, and that the Government, led by THB/TD, planned to pursue harbourfront enhancement with SF outside the franchise renewal exercise, in particular how to improve harbourfront vibrancy through provision of more commercial floor space to SF and SF's integrated management of the harbourfront areas. Subject to the mutual agreement between the Government and SF on the provision of additional commercial Gross Floor Area (GFA), SF was required to submit a planning application to the Town Planning Board. As part of the town planning board procedures, it was envisaged that SF would be required to consult HC on the detailed design of the harbourfront enhancement plan.
- 3.22 **Ms Vivian HO** reiterated that THB and TD would work with relevant authorities including HC when SF proposed any concrete harbourfront enhancement works and would relay Members' comments to SF for consideration.
- 3.23 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that it was unclear whether the proposed new franchise would involve any changes in the land allocated to SF. Unless THB/TD could provide sufficient details on the new franchise agreement to the HC for considering its full implication on the harbourfront, he could not support the franchise renewal.
- 3.24 **The Chair** said that he supported the proposed new franchise to SF on the basis that THB/TD would come back with SF again, say in six months' time, and provide long-term plan for pier improvement and harbourfront enhancement.
- 3.25 **Mr Ivan HO** agreed that HC could support the proposed new franchise in principle, but he requested more details on the pier plan showing the areas to be designated for commercial use and open space under the proposed new franchise.

**Action**

- 3.26 **Dr Eunice MAK** said that she had reservation in supporting the proposed new franchise even in principle, unless she could be assured of sufficient public space in the piers and their surrounding area.
- 3.27 **Mr Walter CHAN** shared the views of Dr Eunice MAK and did not support the proposed new franchise even in principle, unless more provisions about the use of public space and harbourfront enhancement were provided.
- 3.28 **Ms Bernadette LINN** invited THB to clarify the timing for signing the new franchise agreement and whether it would be possible to have a holding-over period for the existing franchise for working out details to address Members' concern. If it was the intention of the Government to sign the new franchise agreement before the expiry of the current one, she asked whether THB or TD would give a clear picture to Members on the provision of additional space to SF for commercialisation under the proposed franchise.
- 3.29 **Ms Vivian HO** responded that the authority to approve the grant of new franchise rested with the Chief Executive in Council. It was the Government's plan to arrange for the proposed new franchise to take effect on 1 April 2018, i.e. immediately upon the expiry of the current one to ensure continued operation of ferry services. As for the details of the provision of public open space and the enhancement works proposals, THB/TD, together with SF, would consult HC again in, say, six months' time. Regarding Members' concern on the performance of SF in managing the newly allocated areas and enhancing its piers, she said that there was a protective clause in the franchise for managing SF's performance.
- 3.30 **The Chair** suggested and THB agreed to work with the Secretariat for providing clarification and details of the enhancement of the SF piers to address Members' concern.

*[Post-meeting note: Having further considered the timing of the franchise renewal for the continued operation of the two franchised*

*ferry routes operated by SF, the Chair noted that the Administration would go ahead with taking forward the proposed new franchise but together with SF, THB/TD would consult the Harbourfront Commission again on SF's proposals of pier enhancement works at the Central and Wan Chai SF Piers in, say, six months' time. The Administration and SF would also consult HC on the proposed enhancement works of the Tsim Sha Tsui SF Pier once ready.]*

**Item 4      “Water Taxis in Hong Kong : Their Potential and Future” - A Study by Students of the Worcester Polytechnic Institute**

- 4.1    **The Chair** welcomed representatives from the Worcester Polytechnic Institute (WPI) of the United States and the Designing Hong Kong to the meeting.
- 4.2    **Mr Marco Andrew INTERLANDI** and **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** presented their findings on water taxis in Hong Kong with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 4.3    **The Chair** invited representatives from the Transport Department (TD), the Tourism Commission (TC) and the Marine Department (MD) to make respective responses to the presentation.
- 4.4    **Mr Peter WONG** remarked that TD was aware of the suggestion, and was working with the TC in sounding out the trade and encouraging them to consider and suggest viable business models for operating water taxi services in Hong Kong.
- 4.5    **Mr CHEUK Fan-lun** said that MD had provided information on the licensing requirement to the WPI team at an earlier workshop with them. MD could discuss with the team and HC in further details when necessary.
- 4.6    **Mr Simpson LO** informed the meeting that as announced in the Development Blueprint for Hong Kong's Tourism Industry



**Action**

published in October 2017, the Government would explore the feasibility of providing water taxi services. TC was working closely with THB, TD and relevant departments in sounding out the relevant trades to see whether the proposal would be financially viable and supported by them. TC would further update HC when ready.

- 4.7 **Prof Becky LOO** supported the recommendations made by the WPI team given that it would be welcomed by the community. Her only concern was marine traffic safety and enquired if the team had included this aspect in their study.
- 4.8 **Mr Marco Andrew INTERLANDI** responded that marine traffic safety was discussed and covered in their report findings. As regards additional safety measures such as that for the elderly, it could be covered later if the business was going to be developed.
- 4.9 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that he saw the potential of operating water taxi service safely at the eastern/ central parts of the Harbour where marine traffic was less busy.
- 4.10 **The Chair** thanked the WPI team for their presentation and asked relevant Government departments to take into account the team's findings when examining the water taxi proposal. He added that HC would encourage relevant parties to take forward the proposal if found feasible.

**Item 5 Progress Report from Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island (Paper No. HC/01/2018)**

- 5.1 **The Chair**, in his capacity as the Chair of the Task Force, took Members through the progress report.

**Item 6 Progress Report from Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront**

**Development (Paper No. HC/02/2018)**

- 6.1 **Mr Vincent NG**, the Chair of the Task Force, briefed Members on the progress report.
- 6.2 **The Chair** congratulated the Home Affairs Bureau on successfully organising the Volvo Ocean Race at Kai Tak in January 2018. As for the Kai Tak Sports Park, an informal session would be held on 7 March 2018 to brief the Task Force members on the revised proposal. He also expressed his hope for the project team of the Government Flying Service Kai Tak Division to consider Members' comments in taking forward the project.

**Item 7 Progress Report from Task Force on Harbourfront Developments in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing (Paper No. HC/03/2018)**

- 7.1 **Prof Becky LOO**, the Chair of the Task Force, briefed Members on the progress report. On the proposed Short Term Tenancy Fee-paying Public Car Park at Chi Kiang Street, To Kwa Wan, she said that while Task Force Members had requested the relevant departments to formulate a medium-to-long-term plan to address the parking problem for the area concerned before the proposed temporary use could be supported by the Task Force, it was noted that the Government had already been inviting tender for the short-term tenancy public car park at the subject site until March 2019. She added that the relevant departments had circulated to Members the supplementary information and further responses in December 2017 and January 2018 respectively for Members' information without seeking Members' approval on the proposal.
- 7.2 **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** said that the Secretariat would relay Members' comments on the proposed Short Term Tenancy Fee-paying Public Car Park at Chi Kiang Street to relevant departments for consideration.

- 7.3 **Mr Vincent NG** commented that harbourfront areas should be reserved for recreational use and public enjoyment rather than temporary car parks or barging facilities.
- 7.4 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** concurred with Mr Vincent NG's views and suggested relevant departments to conduct a study on the feasibility of share-using temporary barging facilities.
- 7.5 **The Chair** agreed to Members' views. He also suggested the Government to review relevant guidelines on having temporary car parks and barging facilities at the harbourfront.

#### **Item 8 Another Other Business**

A. *Progress of Territory-wide Harbourfront Enhancement Projects to be Funded by the Dedicated Funding*

- 8.1 Upon invitation of the Chair, **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** reported two of the six projects to be funded by the \$500 million dedicated funding. The views from stakeholders were collected in respect of the consultancy study for the formulation of a new model to plan, manage, operate and maintain future integrated harbourfront development. The scope of the study would be prepared and presented for Members' comments at the next meeting. As regards the consultancy services on the design elements for enhancing visitors' experience in the harbourfront, it was noted that TD and Lands Department were also taking forward various initiatives regarding walkability and way-finding, which might overlap substantially with the original scope of the study. In order to take a more targeted approach and for better work delineation between government departments, time had been taken to further refine the study scope. It was expected that the scope of the study could be presented to Members at the next meeting.

**Action**

B. Study on a Possible Framework to Encourage the Delivery of Community-Led Improvement Projects and Initiatives

8.2 **The Chair** said that as mentioned by Mrs Margaret BROOKE of Business Environment Council to Members at the last meeting, Very Hong Kong, a non-governmental organisation, was conducting a study on how to take forward community-led projects and initiatives in the territory including the harbourfront areas. A note setting out the progress and inviting Members to join an activity of the study was tabled for Members' information and consideration.

8.3 There being no other business, the meeting ended at 5:50 pm.

**Secretariat  
Harbourfront Commission  
June 2018**

**Proposed Amendments to the  
Terms of Reference of the Harbourfront Commission  
as Circulated to Members on 27 December 2017**

*[Legend*

*Comments proposed by –*

*(a) Mr Nicholas Brooke: in red text*

*(b) Mr Paul Zimmerman: in blue text*

*(c) Harbour Unit & department: in yellow highlight*

*(justifications for the proposed amendments are set out in the Footnotes.)*

The Harbourfront Commission is set up to –

- (a) play an advocacy, oversight and **pro-active** advisory role in the envisioning, planning, urban design, **financing**<sup>1</sup>, ~~development~~, marketing, ~~and~~ branding, ~~development~~, management and operation of the harbourfront areas, ~~and their adjacent waters~~ **within the harbour limit**<sup>2</sup> and **associated** facilities on a continuous and ongoing basis;
- (b) ~~exercise overall~~ **coordinat**~~ion~~ and **monitoring of**<sup>3</sup> harbourfront planning, urban design, **financing**<sup>1</sup>, development and management to ensure effective integration of these major aspects; ~~and~~
- (c) foster and encourage the development, management and maintenance of the harbourfront **areas and their adjacent waters** **within the harbour limit**<sup>2</sup> **in the best interest of the public by the government** ~~in~~ **and/or through a wide range of contractual entrustment**<sup>4</sup> /partnership ~~arrangements~~ with the private sector (including the community, social enterprises and non-governmental organisations);

---

<sup>1</sup> The financing of private projects would be subject to private sector's initiative and it would be difficult for the Harbourfront Commission (HC) to play a role in their financing. As regards public projects, they would be subject to the public works procedures as stipulated by the Government.

<sup>2</sup> To better tally with the wording used in the General Circular No. 3/2010 "Harbourfront Enhancement" and to specify more clearly the boundary of adjacent waters which are relevant to the work of the HC.

<sup>3</sup> To make corresponding textual amendments as a result of those proposed by Mr Paul Zimmerman.

<sup>4</sup> To retain the original flexibility in allowing private participation in harbourfront -initiatives.

(d) provide advice and guidance to the community and stakeholders including the Harbour Office, government departments, ~~Town Planning Board,~~<sup>5</sup> project proponents and others as needed in taking forward harbourfront development initiatives; and

(e)<sup>6</sup> lead relevant studies ~~or participate in studies~~ commissioned by the Harbour Office on behalf of the Commission, including providing advice on the preparation of briefs/scope of work, ~~considering and providing comments on the overall~~ assessment criteria for ~~in~~ selecting consultants, evaluation of the study process and outcomes, and ~~commenting on the~~ recommendations.

---

<sup>5</sup> It has all along been the practice for HC's advice to be provided to bodies such as the Town Planning Board (TPB) and the West Kowloon Cultural District in so far as harbourfront matters are concerned. There is no need to pinpoint TPB which can be covered under the category of "others"..

<sup>6</sup> Studies to be commissioned by the Harbour Office on behalf of HC would generally take the form of tender exercises, which are subject to stringent Government Stores and Procurement Regulations. The proposed amendment aims to suggest having the Harbour Office as HC's executive arm so as to ensure compliance with the relevant rules and regulations.