

**Third Briefing of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee
held at 9:30 am on 8 April 2006
at Conference Room, 12/F, Murray Building,
Garden Road, Central, Hong Kong**

Minutes of Briefing

Present

Mr Leung Kong-yui	Member Presiding
Mrs Mei Ng	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Vincent Ng	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Kim O Chan	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Mr Chan Kwok-fai, Bernard	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr Hardy Lok	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour Limited
Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke	
Dr Chan Wai-kwan	
Mr Thomas Chow	Deputy Secretary (Transport)1, Environment, Transport and Works Bureau
Mr Bosco Fung	Director of Planning
Mr K K Lau	Deputy Commissioner for Transport/Planning and Technical Services
Miss Wong Yuet-wah	Secretary

In Attendance

Mr Robin Ip	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau (HPLB)
Ms Lydia Lam	Assistant Secretary (Planning)3, HPLB
Mr L T Ma	Project Manager/Hong Kong Island and Islands, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Mr Talis Wong	Chief Engineer/Kowloon, CEDD
Mr Raymond Wong	Chief Town Planner/Sub-Regional Planning, Planning Department (PlanD)

For item 1

Professor Essy Baniassad	Representing the Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK)
Professor Liu Yuyang	Representing the CUHK
Mr Larry Tsoi	Representing the CUHK
Professor Kelly Chow	Representing the CUHK
Mr Anthony Kwan	Assistant Director of Planning/Metro
Mr Raymond Lee	District Planning Officer/Kowloon, PlanD

For item 2

Mr Albert Lai	Representing Citizen Envisioning @ Harbour (CE@H)
Dr Sujata Govada	Representing CE@H
Dr Bill Barron	Representing Civic Exchange
Ms Yan-yan Yip	Representing Civic Exchange
Mr Raymond Chiu	Deputy Director of Planning/District (Acting)
Ms Phyllis Li	Assistant Director of Planning/Special Duties (Acting)

Action

Welcoming Message

The Member Presiding welcomed Members and proponents to the third briefing of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC). He reminded Members that, like the previous two briefings, there was no need for the HEC to form a consensus view on the presentations. The purpose of the briefing was to provide Members with an opportunity to hear the submissions. The proceedings and deliberations of this briefing would be recorded and uploaded to the HEC website. The confirmed minutes would be passed to all Members and the relevant extracts to the proponents for reference.

Item 1 Presentation by the Chinese University of Hong Kong on Kai Tak

1.1 Upon invitation by the Member Presiding, **Professor Essy Baniassad, Professor Liu Yuyang and Mr Larry Tsoi** of the CUHK presented their study on Kai Tak.

1.2 **Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke** appreciated the way the study adopted to integrate the different uses and elements. He suggested that the study should highlight the key elements that needed to be addressed. In response to **Mr Brooke's** enquiry, **Professor Baniassad** said that a stadium was included in their study and that the study attempted to integrate the stadium with other components in Kai Tak holistically in order to retain the uniqueness of the opportunities offered by Kai Tak.

1.3 **Mr Raymond Lee** said that PlanD had received the CUHK's written submission during the Stage 2 Public Participation of Kai Tak Planning Review. The conceptual ideas in the submission were similar to those being formulated

under Kai Tak Planning Review (e.g. connectivity with the surrounding areas and formulation of an open space network), although they might be presented differently. The CUHK's submission would be carefully examined in formulating the Preliminary Outline Development Plan for Kai Tak.

1.4 **Mrs Mei Ng** was pleased to note that the study had put emphasis on greening and integration between open space and residential use. She enquired if the study had touched on the development of water frontage for leisure, recreation and residential uses as well as the measures to improve water quality.

1.5 **Professor Liu** said that the study had proposed a central park between the ex-runway and the edge of Kwun Tong, and a series of small piers along the edge of the ex-runway to provide sea transport to and from other piers along the harbour. **Mr Tsoi** supplemented that the study had also proposed sea transportation along the approach channel to provide a linkage between the ex-apron area and the tip of the ex-runway. The study also recommended an opening of 10 to 20 metres in width on the ex-runway to enhance the connectivity of the two sides and to improve the circulation of water within the approach channel and hence the water quality therein.

1.6 **Professor Baniassad** said that water was a unique potential in Kai Tak and that access to the waterfront should be provided. With good land and water access, parks and other facilities could be developed at the frontage area. **Professor Liu** added that with good water access, various water features could be developed in Kai Tak.

1.7 **Mr Vincent Ng** asked how the streets and roads proposed in the study would be used by people and vehicles. **Mr Tsoi** said that pedestrian-friendly networks would be provided to link the road/rail networks and open space, so that the public could access to the latter conveniently. **Professor Baniassad** remarked that the study in general suggested using as much public transport as possible, especially through rail transport. The new railway station, which was proposed to be situated in the heart of the new park, would be well integrated into the urban fabric of Kai Tak. **Professor Liu** supplemented that in order to increase connectivity for people, the study also proposed subterranean and flyover passages linking Kai Tak and its surroundings. **Mr Ng** shared the concept of providing

convenient and accessible pedestrian linkages between Kai Tak and its neighbouring areas.

1.8 **The Member Presiding** thanked the representatives of the CUHK for their presentation.

Item 2 Presentation by Citizen Envisioning @ Harbour on Planning the Central Harbour-front and Civic Exchange on Central Harbour-front Review

2.1 Upon invitation by the Member Presiding, **Mr Albert Lai and Dr Sujata Govada** of CE@H presented on planning the Central harbour-front, and then **Dr Bill Barron and Ms Yan-yan Yip** of Civic Exchange presented on the Central harbour-front review. **Dr Govada** remarked that their presentation was suggesting a review of the Central harbour-front plan based on sustainable development principles.

2.2 In response to the two presentations, **Mr Robin Ip** said that the planning of the reclamation area of the Central Reclamation Phase III (CRIII) project under the approved Central District (Extension) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) had undergone the due statutory planning process. The draft Central District (Extension) OZP was first exhibited for public inspection in 1998. After the due process of public consultation and considerations of the public views and objections received by the Town Planning Board (TPB), the draft OZP was substantially revised to reduce the proposed scale of reclamation. The original land use proposals were also substantially amended. The revised OZP was subsequently approved by the Chief Executive in Council in February 2002. The Government would now implement the development of the area according to this approved OZP.

2.3 **Mr Ip** continued to say that under the approved Central District (Extension) OZP, about half of the reclaimed area was zoned “Open Space”. The “Open Space” would be developed into a world-class waterfront promenade with continuous pedestrian connections between the existing urban area and the waterfront, bringing people to the harbour and the harbour to the people. The “Other Specified Uses” sites in the CRIII were designated for waterfront related commercial and leisure facilities including festival markets, cafes, restaurants, and retail shops to add vibrancy and attraction to the waterfront. There was also a

“Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) site in the area, designated for high quality commercial/office floor space to help maintain the role and competitive status of the Central Business District (CBD) in meeting the long-term demand for high quality office at this central and prestigious location.

2.4 **Mr Ip** added that three corridors, namely the Statute Square Corridor, the Civic Corridor as well as the Arts and Entertainment Corridor would be provided to enhance connectivity with the surrounding areas. Besides, the Government had conducted comprehensive traffic impact and environmental impact assessments on the area to ensure that the transport network and environment could cope with the planned developments in Central. On the way forward, PlanD would conduct a study to refine the existing urban design framework and prepare planning/design briefs for key development sites of the Central District (Extension) OZP as requested by the TPB.

2.5 **Mr K K Lau** said that an Expert Panel Forum on Sustainable Transport Planning and Central - Wan Chai Bypass (CWB) was conducted in September 2005 and Transport Department (TD) had submitted relevant transport and traffic information to the Expert Panel. The Expert Panel agreed that even without any new developments, the existing road networks in the CRIII area could not cope with future demand and therefore the proposed new road networks should be constructed. It also considered that the proposed new road networks could meet the demand generated by the planned developments. He clarified that based on TD’s submission to the Expert Panel, by 2016, the peak hour vehicular flow along CWB generated by the existing and planned developments in the area would be 3,000 odd passenger car units (pcu) for one way and 7,000 odd pcu for two ways. He supplemented that the vehicle to capacity ratio for the CWB and Gloucester Road, instead of 1.2, would be 0.7 and 0.9 respectively. The planned developments in Central would result in less than 3% increase in traffic flow in the CBD during peak hours instead of 12%. Road P2 would be a dual-two lane road, i.e. four lanes in total, instead of six lanes, with enhanced width at some junctions to allow vehicle turning and meet the traffic requirements thereat.

2.6 **Mr Thomas Chow** clarified that as a transport policy, the planning of transport infrastructure was one of the elements of the overall planning. There would be no case to construct a

road if there was no demand generated by the existing and planned developments. At various HEC public engagement activities, many people considered that connectivity for vehicles and pedestrians was equally important. For example, people with physical disability could only reach the waterfront by vehicles.

2.7 **Mr Bosco Fung** reiterated that in August 2005, having considered three rezoning requests, the TPB re-confirmed that the land use zonings of the Central District (Extension) OZP were appropriate and decided not to agree to the three rezoning requests. TPB requested PlanD to refine the existing urban design framework and prepare planning/design briefs for the key development sites for the Central District (Extension) OZP. As discussed at previous HEC meetings, PlanD would carry out the study in consultation with the TPB, HEC and relevant stakeholders in the community.

2.8 In relation to the environmental aspect, **Ms Phyllis Li** said that the environmental impact assessment (EIA) for the CRIII was approved by Environmental Protection Department under the EIA Ordinance in August 2001. She clarified that “Canyon Effect” was usually created by long and tall buildings without gaps in between along both sides of a street. Ample open space amounting to 8.8 hectares would be provided in the CRIII area and the planned developments there would be primarily low to medium rise. The estimated plot ratio of the “CDA” zone was 3.6 which was very low as compared with the normal plot ratios of 15 to 18 in the existing surrounding commercial developments. As such, there should not be a concern about “Canyon Effect” in the area. The Government would consider requiring the tenderers to carry out air ventilation assessment for the Tamar design schemes and to adopt appropriate design to enhance air ventilation of the project and the area as a whole.

2.9 **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** declared that he and Mr Brooke were ex-members of the TPB, who were involved in the formulation of the Central District (Extension) OZP between 1998 and 2000. In response to Dr Chan’s enquiry, **Dr Barron** said that their proposed review was to look at the fundamental approach and the adequacy of the analysis that the Government had used in justifying its proposals. He felt that the assertion that the traffic would be fine was a flawed one. He understood

from his colleagues that air quality assessment was not required in the environment impact assessment process. He considered that their proposed review provided the last chance to review the approach to the planning of Central harbour-front.

2.10 **Mr Ip** reiterated that the approved OZP had undergone a due statutory process and any request for amendments should follow existing statutory procedures.

2.11 **Mr Raymond Chiu** said that **PlanD** would like to liaise with **Dr Barron** after this briefing for clarification of some data on commercial office space in the latter's presentation, which had a great impact on the analysis and conclusion in respect of the planning of the Central harbour-front.

PlanD

(Post-meeting notes: PlanD provided the data on the new non-government floor area on the Central OZPs to Civic Exchange via the HEC Secretariat on 3 May 2006.)

2.12 **Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke** considered that a holistic approach should be adopted and that it was time to engage the community further on the contents of the OZP, having regard to changing circumstances, such as the change in demand for offices in Central.

Item 3 Any other business

3.1 There being no other business, the briefing was adjourned at 11:50 pm.

**Harbour-front Enhancement Committee Secretariat
July 2006**