

## **HEC Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review**

### **Minutes of Twenty-fourth Meeting**

Date : 24 September 2008  
Time : 2:30 pm  
Venue : Conference Room, 15/F, North Point Government Offices  
333 Java Road, North Point

#### **Present**

Mr Vincent Ng (Chairman)	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Dr Andrew Thomson	Representing Business Environment Council
Dr Sujata Govada	Representing Citizen Envisioning @ Harbour
Mr Kim Chan	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Dr Chan Fuk-cheung	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Paul Zimmerman	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour Ltd.
Mr Patrick Lau	
Miss Amy Yuen	Principal Assistant Secretary (Planning and Lands) 2, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Jeff Lam	Assistant Director (Headquarters), Lands Department (LandsD)
Mr Raymond WM Wong	Assistant Director/Territorial, Planning Department (PlanD)
Ms Ying Fun-fong	Chief Engineer/Transport Planning, Transport Department
Mr Peter Mok	Senior Engineer/Kowloon 2, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Ms Sally Fong (Secretary)	Senior Town Planner/Studies & Research 3, PlanD

#### **In Attendance**

Ms Lydia Lam	Assistant Secretary (Planning) 3, DEVB
Mr Raymond Lee	Chief Town Planner/Studies & Research, PlanD

**Absent with Apologies**

Dr Alvin Kwok	Representing Conservancy Association
Mrs Mei Ng	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Yu Kam-hung	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr Mason Hung	Representing Hong Kong Tourism Board
Mr Nicholas Brooke	
Mrs Ann Ho	Chief Executive Officer (2) 1, Home Affairs Department

**Action**

**Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 23<sup>rd</sup> Meeting**

- 1.1 The draft minutes of the 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting held on 28 July 2008 were circulated to Members for comment on 18 September 2008. A revised draft, incorporating comments received, was circulated to Members on 23 September 2008. The meeting confirmed the revised draft minutes without amendment.

**Item 2 Matters Arising**

Views of the Sub-committee on various proposals presented at the 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting (paras. 3.7, 4.6 and 6.5 of the minutes of the 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting)

- 2.1 The meeting noted that the relevant parts of the confirmed minutes of meeting would be forwarded to the concerned parties/approving authorities for reference after the meeting.

[Post-meeting note: The relevant parts of the confirmed minutes of meeting were forwarded to the concerned parties/approving authorities for reference on 26 September 2008.]

MTR West Island Line - Proposed Reprovisioning of Kennedy Town Swimming Pool and Temporary Works Areas (para. 5.6 of the minutes of the 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting)

- 2.2 The meeting noted that, as confirmed by Mass Transit Railway Corporation Ltd. and the relevant bureaux/departments, the 2 piers at the ex-abattoir site originally planned for demolition

Action

could be retained for public use in future. Detailed arrangement would be worked out and reported to the Sub-committee as appropriate.

[Post-meeting note: On 16 and 28 October 2008, two information notes prepared by the Highways Department on the updated status of the piers were circulated to Members.]

Amendments to the Draft Quarry Bay Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H21/24 (paras. 6.3(h) and 6.3(i) of the minutes of the 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting)

- 2.3 The existing gross floor area (GFA) and the total GFA of the area covered by the draft Quarry Bay OZP upon full development provided by PlanD were emailed to Members via the Secretariat on 23 September 2008.
- 2.4 The meeting noted that the suggestion of uploading the powerpoint presentation materials onto the website would involve additional resources. The current practice of providing copies of the presentation materials upon request would be maintained for the time being.

Harbour-front Enhancement Opportunities (para. 8.4(d) of the minutes of the 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting)

- 2.5 The format of the Inventory had been revised to take account of the comments raised by Members at the last meeting. **The Chairman** suggested that further comments on the Inventory and those relating to the Paper on “Harbour-front Enhancement Opportunities”, if any, could be discussed under AOB.

Project No. 9327WF – Laying of Western Cross Harbour Main and Associated Land Mains from West Kowloon to Sai Ying Pun (para. 7.8 of the minutes of the 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting)

- 2.6 Additional information submitted by the Water Supplies Department (WSD) on the project was circulated to Members on 19 and 24 September 2008. **The Chairman** invited the following representatives of the Project Team to highlight the key points:

Mr Jaime Rosario        )   WSD  
Ms Wong Yuet-wa        )

Action

Mr Ching Sai-hung ) Mott Connell Ltd.  
Mr Leung Tse-kin )

2.7 **The Project Team** gave a presentation with the aid of powerpoint slides.

2.8 Members had the following views/questions:

- (a) the current location of the Yau Ma Tei Salt Water Pumping Station on the waterfront had already posed constraints on the future development of the area. There would be further constraints with the implementation of the proposed water mains. The Sub-committee should be provided with an overview of all the constraints and proposed uses which might affect the future West Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD) development;
- (b) in view of the current re-planning of the water mains, opportunity should be taken at this juncture to explore the possibility of relocating the salt water pumping station away from the waterfront;
- (c) WSD should work with the HATS project team at the early planning stage to ensure that an integrated design would be drawn up for the future landscaped area in Sai Ying Pun;
- (d) there was a need to minimise the time-span of the project so as to minimise the disruption to public usage of the waterfront promenade;
- (e) more effort on the reinstatement work is required. In addition to tidying up the affected portion of the West Kowloon Waterfront Promenade, an integrated strategy should be worked out in an early stage to ensure the delivery of a quality and compatible waterfront in West Kowloon in the long term; and
- (f) WSD should brief the Sub-committee on all their projects which might have an impact on the waterfront.

2.9 In response, **the Project Team** elaborated the following points:

- (a) the Yau Ma Tei Salt Water Pumping Station was an essential facility constructed in 1994 as part of the

Action

infrastructure to support the future development in West Kowloon including supplying salt water to WKCD. To minimise its interface with the future WKCD development, the pumping station was located at the fringe of the WKCD site and not directly abutting the seawall. WSD would coordinate with the relevant departments to resolve any interface issues between the works for the water mains and those for the WKCD; and

- (b) when comparing with the proposal presented to the Sub-committee in July 2008, the size of the temporary works area had been reduced by 1,200m<sup>2</sup> and the construction period had been shortened from 36 months to 33 months. WSD would closely monitor the work progress with a view to reinstating and opening the affected portion of the waterfront promenade for public enjoyment at the earliest possible time.

2.10 **The Chairman** remarked that Members' request for complete information on all projects affecting the future WKCD development was a general issue which should be dealt with separately. Nonetheless, he stressed that piecemeal utilisation of harbour-front land for public utility facilities should not be encouraged.

2.11 Members' further comments were summarised below:

- (a) WSD should review the design of the works site with a view to enhancing the harbour-front;
- (b) the Yau Mei Tei Typhoon Shelter area should be considered as an integral part when considering enhancement of the future West Kowloon waterfront for public enjoyment in the long run;
- (c) project departments, including WSD, should present their projects together with an enhancement proposal as a package for the Sub-committee to consider; and
- (d) project departments should exercise due diligence to minimise the time span and land requirements of their projects at the outset. They should also demonstrate how to enhance the harbour-front in accordance with the Harbour Planning Principles (HPPs).

**Action**

2.12 In response, **the Project Team** explained as follows:

- (a) for the works area in Sai Ying Pun, WSD would work with the Drainage Services Department and the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) to finalise the design of the future landscaped area; and
- (b) for the works area in West Kowloon, to minimise its impacts on public use of the waterfront, the site would be fenced off by decorative hoardings and the affected cycle track/footpath would be diverted. As for the long-term arrangement of the Yau Ma Tei Salt Water Pumping Station, it would need to be considered together with the WKCD project.

2.13 **Miss Amy Yuen** pointed out that while WSD could consider the enhancement measures to minimise the impact of the temporary works area, the long-term planning of the WKCD site including the provision of a permanent waterfront promenade was within the purview of the WKCD Authority. The Home Affairs Bureau (HAB) had on various occasions assured Members that HEC would be consulted at various stages of the WKCD development. Members' comments in respect of enhancement of the salt water pumping station in the long term to tie in with the future WKCD development could be conveyed to HAB for reference.

**Secretariat**

2.14 **The Chairman** summarised Members' views as follows:

- (a) the Sub-committee noted that the project was a necessary utility infrastructure to maintain stable water supply for Hong Kong Island. While the Sub-committee was not in a position to approve or reject the project, it served to advise the Government on ways to safeguard proper use and enhancement of the harbour-front for public enjoyment; and
- (b) the Sub-committee was concerned with the loss of a portion of the West Kowloon Waterfront Promenade, which was a quick-win project championed by HEC. To make the proposal more acceptable, the project should bring added value to the harbour-front by including enhancement measures as part of the project, with reference to HPPs.

- 2.15 In response to the Chairman's suggestion, **the Project Team** undertook to revert to the Sub-committee with information on how to landscape/beautify the affected portion of the West Kowloon Waterfront Promenade during construction stage of the project.

**Item 3 How Much are the Harbour Planning Guidelines and Principles Staying Alive? A case study of the CDA(1) site on 14-20 King Wah Road (Paper No. 19/2008)**

- 3.1 **Mr Kim Chan** declared an interest in this item as he had current business dealings with Henderson Land Development Co. Ltd., the developer of the subject site. The meeting agreed that Mr Chan could stay at the meeting as an observer.

- 3.2 **The Chairman** said that this item related to a s16 planning application being processed by the Town Planning Board (TPB). The applicant briefed the Sub-committee on the proposal on 23 January 2008. The Paper submitted by the applicant (Paper No. 3/2008) and an extract of the confirmed minutes of the said meeting were tabled for Members' reference. The Sub-committee's views had subsequently been conveyed to TPB for reference.

- 3.3 "A Coalition Against the Proposed Development on King Wah Road" (the Coalition), representing a group of local residents, would like to share their views on the proposed development with the Sub-committee. The following representatives of the Coalition were invited to the meeting:

Mr Fung Shu-sum  
Dr Chang Kow-chuen, Rocky

- 3.4 **The Chairman** extended a welcome. He stressed that the Sub-committee, being an advisory body to the Government, was not an adjudicating body on planning application. The local residents should convey their views on the proposed development to TPB directly. Nonetheless, the Sub-committee was open-minded and welcomed the public to share with it their views on the planning of the harbour-front areas.

- 3.5 **The Coalition** noted the Sub-committee's advisory role and then gave a presentation with the aid of powerpoint slides.

**Action**

3.6 Members appreciated the recognition of the HPPs/HPGs by the public and had the following comments/questions:

- (a) the local residents' concern that the proposed development, together with the new hotel under construction and the future development at the Oil Street site, would form a wall of development along North Point harbour-front was acknowledged;
- (b) whether the Coalition had any suggested alternatives for the site, bearing in mind the development cost involved. Whether the local residents had any preference in terms of development density and building mass;
- (c) new developments which would bring traffic burden to the junction of Hing Fat Street and Gordon Road were undesirable; and
- (d) the local residents could put forth their vision for the North Point harbour-front, and work with the District Council, government and the private developer with a view to exploring an acceptable option like transfer of plot ratio.

3.7 **The Coalition** pointed out the following:

- (a) the subject site was located so close to the Island Eastern Corridor that it was not suitable for residential development, no matter what development density or building mass the residential development would be;
- (b) being the key stakeholders, the local residents had the right to raise objection to the proposed development. They did not intend to present a solution, but to share with Members their observations on how the applicant had failed to observe the HPPs/HPGs; and
- (c) apart from residential or commercial, the site could be developed for cultural or leisure use, which was in line with the HPGs.

3.8 Members generally considered that private developers should engage the public more in the planning and development process. Community views would assist the relevant parties/authorities to consider the proposals. The project proponents

**Action**

should also demonstrate the compliance of HPPs/HPGs, including public engagement, in their TPB submissions. Besides, HEC could encourage public engagement in the planning and development of private sites.

3.9 **The Coalition** suggested that HEC could facilitate the communication amongst the project proponent, the local community and other stakeholders by educating members of the general public on their right to participate in harbour-front planning and development.

3.10 **Mr Raymond Wong** said that as the Sub-committee meetings were open meetings, members of the public would have full knowledge of the projects to be discussed. The Government would also take a proactive approach to engage the public on large-scale projects. For the subject case, as TPB had deferred the consideration of the application, additional views of the Sub-committee, if any, could be conveyed to TPB.

3.11 **The Chairman** appreciated the initiative of the Coalition to share their views with the Sub-committee. Referring to the meeting minutes tabled at the meeting, he pointed out that the Sub-committee had raised comments on aspects including visual impact and air ventilation when the application was presented to it in January 2008, which were similar to the local views. The Chairman suggested and the meeting agreed that the additional views expressed by Members at this meeting be conveyed for TPB's consideration.

**Secretariat**

3.12 **The Coalition** suggested the Sub-committee consider revising "comments" in para. 6.4 of the said meeting minutes to "concerns".

3.13 **The Chairman** thanked the Coalition for attending the meeting and their support for the Sub-committee's work.

**Item 4 Lei Yue Mun Waterfront Enhancement Project (Paper No. 18/2008)**

4.1 **The Chairman** invited the following representatives of the Project Team to the meeting:

Action

Mrs Winifred Chung	)	Tourism Commission
Ms Anita S.W. Tsui	)	
Miss Queenie Leung	)	
Mr M. K. Yip	)	Architectural Services Department
Mr Jacky K. F. Chan	)	(ArchSD)
Mr Benny K. W. Ng	)	Thomas Chow Architects Ltd.
Mr Simon K. W. Wong	)	
Mr Steven S. K. Tong	)	CEDD
Mr Oliver T. M. Yeung	)	
Ms Helen Cochrane	)	Meinhardt Environment Ltd.
Mr Fredrick Leong	)	
Mr Keith Tsang	)	Metcalf & Eddy - Maunsell
Mr Gary Shing	)	Joint Venture

4.2 **The Project Team** presented the proposal with the aid of powerpoint slides.

4.3 Members had the following comments/questions:

- (a) whether construction of the proposed breakwater and landing facility would be subject to the “overriding public need” test under the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (PHO);
- (b) whether dredging works would be involved and any measures to prevent water contamination;
- (c) to what extent the proposals had respected the HPPs;
- (d) more information on the connectivity to the hinterland to enhance accessibility to the waterfront, and how the project would enhance the local setting and integration with the existing developments should be provided for reference;
- (e) the scale of the proposed structures was rather heavy from visual perspective. The ocean-themed lookout points and the carp-shaped viewing platform might not be visually compatible with the surrounding natural setting;

Action

- (f) Lei Yue Mun had a unique landscape with rocky shoreline and natural beach, which in itself was very attractive and hence it was important to preserve this. Instead of creating an artificial theme park type of attraction, consideration should be given to reinforce its existing character and natural setting;
- (g) while the proposed landing facility might improve marine access, alternative locations not affecting the rocky shoreline should be considered;
- (h) what types of marine transport would be provided to facilitate marine accessibility of the area. As a project to promote tourism, consideration could be given to provide tourist transport from other tourism nodes like Tsim Sha Tsui and Central;
- (i) supporting facilities such as ticketing booths and toilets should be provided at suitable locations;
- (j) to what extent the natural coastline would be affected by the project; and
- (k) whether local views had been incorporated.

4.4 **The Project Team** had the following responses:

- (a) the rocky outcrop where the Lighthouse was located would not be affected by the proposed landing facility. The affected shoreline, about 100m long, was not of high ecological value;
- (b) the proposed landing facility was outside the boundaries of the Harbour and would not be subject to the requirements under PHO; and the decision on proposed landing site was made by the Kwun Tong District Council (KTDC) at its meeting on 19 May 2005;
- (c) based on the sampling results, most of the mud in the dredging area was contaminated. To prevent water contamination, dredging work would be carried out within a specified limit and silt curtain would be installed. Moreover, the water quality would be closely monitored. Dredging programme would be adjusted to

Action

ensure that the water quality was within the acceptable level;

- (d) in terms of connectivity, the idea was to create a scenic path leading people from the seafood restaurants and the basketball court to the lookout points and Tin Hau Temple;
- (e) some local residents had plans to erect a Tin Hau Statue in the area, but no detail was available so far;
- (f) the current design had been endorsed by the KTDC and Hong Kong Tourism Board. Whilst past projects had put more emphasis on reinforcing the traditional setting, this project aimed to enhance the Lei Yue Mun waterfront with an international appeal to demonstrate how “East meets West”. Yet, Tourism Commission kept an open mind and would try to strike a fine balance; and
- (g) the proposed public landing facility would serve private yachts and harbour tour cruises from other parts of the Harbour.

4.5 **The Chairman** summarised that the Sub-committee had no in-principle objection to enhancing the Lei Yue Mun waterfront. Members generally considered that the existing natural setting of Lei Yue Mun with its rocky shoreline was very attractive and should be respected. There was no apparent merit to introduce artificial elements to the area.

4.6 **The Project Team** pointed out that the proposal was still at the conceptual stage. The proposed ocean-theme was to take on board the comments gathered from KTDC and other key stakeholders to reflect the unique historical background of Lei Yue Mun. Comments of the Sub-committee would be duly considered at the detailed design stage.

**Tourism  
Commission**

[Post-meeting note: A Member sent further comments on the proposal to the Sub-committee on 25 September 2008, which were forwarded to the Tourism Commission for reference on the same day.]

4.7 **The Chairman** thanked the Project Team for attending the meeting.

**Item 5 Temporary Promenade along Kwun Tong Public Cargo Working Area (Paper No. 20/2008)**

5.1 The following representatives of the Project Team were invited to the meeting:

Mr Wong Chi-fai, Gary ) LCSD  
Mr Fung Cho-keung )

Mr Chung Ming-cheong ) ArchSD  
Mr Nam Siu-wai, Andrew )

Mr Chau Kwai-tim, Edmund ) CEDD  
Mr Lam Kwai-sang )

5.2 **The Project Team** presented the proposal with the aid of powerpoint slides.

5.3 Members had the following views/questions:

(a) it appeared that the design of the project put a lot of emphasis on night-time activities. More focus should be given to enriching the day-time activities, particularly on ameliorating the adverse impact imposed by the highway structure;

(b) the target activities/users should be clearly defined at the outset because this would affect the design of the promenade. In this regard, what preferred activities had been identified in the public consultation;

(c) the proportion of passive and active recreational spaces should be further considered. Some suggested activities included fishing, playground with sandpit and climbing wall;

(d) suggestions on facilities to be provided included:

(i) facilities to cater for fishing, dogs, etc.;

(ii) seating accommodation and power supply for audio/visual equipment to facilitate performances to be conducted at the multi-purpose piazza;

**Action**

- (iii) adequate shading for the sitting benches;
  - (iv) mooring facilities for vessels/junks; and
  - (v) supporting facilities like refreshment kiosks, toilets, etc.;
- (e) extending the proposed promenade to cover the adjoining sites and areas under the Kwun Tong Bypass should be considered;
- (f) integration with the open space on the other side of Hoi Bun Road and how to enhance accessibility to the site from the general Kwun Tong area should be considered;
- (g) the flyover structure was visually intrusive. Participation of community in beautifying it could be considered; and
- (h) whether there was any restriction on the opening hours of the promenade, and whether the opening hours would be adjusted for festive functions.

5.4 **The Project Team** had the following responses:

- (a) a joint site visit with KTDC members had been carried out on 9 September 2008. They generally considered that the planned promenade should be designed to cater for multi-purpose use, including a performance venue;
- (b) there was a general lack of performance venue in the Kwun Tong area. The subject site, with a considerable distance away from the major residential areas, could serve the purpose without causing significant noise nuisances to the existing residents;
- (c) the proposed promenade could also serve as a breathing space for the workers in the nearby industrial/office buildings and a venue for school activities during day time;
- (d) the Project Team would liaise with Highways Department to beautify the flyover structure. Engagement of the public and students to participate in the beautification works would also be considered;

**Action**

- (e) in terms of connectivity, 2 entrances were proposed at the north and south ends of the promenade. Besides, consideration was being given to widen the south entrance and extend the multi-purpose piazza towards Hoi Bun Road;
- (f) the light tower and “mist piazza” near the south entrance would serve as a landmark attracting visitors;
- (g) arbours were proposed to provide shading for the performance/activity area; and
- (h) the project, tentatively scheduled to commence in early 2009 for completion by end 2009, was the first step towards implementation of the planned promenade along the entire Kwun Tong waterfront. Design flexibility would be provided to cater for its future extension to the remaining Kwun Tong Public Cargo Working Area and integration of the planned promenade in the long term.

5.5 **The Chairman** remarked that the vision of the Sub-committee was to provide a continuous waterfront promenade along the entire harbour-front, and the current proposal constituted only a very small part of it. Members had made some suggestions on its design and proposed activities. The Government should expedite implementation of this project as well as other quick-win projects for public enjoyment.

5.6 He thanked the Project Team for attending the meeting.

**Item 6 Alternative Use of Four Vacant Piers at the Western Wholesale Food Market (Paper No. 21/2008)**

6.1 The following representatives of the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD), the Proponent, were invited to the meeting:

Mr Chan Chi-chiu  
Mr Yen Wai-hon

6.2 **The Proponent** made a presentation with the aid of powerpoint slides.

6.3 Members had the following comments/questions:

- (a) the piers should not be demolished because, once demolished, they could hardly be reinstated due to the requirements under PHO. Whether it was possible to strengthen the loading of the piers for other beneficial uses by reinforcing the pier structures;
- (b) information on the maintenance cost of the piers should be provided for reference. Moreover, in assessing the economic value of the piers, not only short-term cost savings, but also long-term community benefits should be considered;
- (c) given their harbour-front location, the piers would probably be of a high land value. In considering the land value of the piers, the associated opportunity cost forgone should also be assessed;
- (d) instead of demolishing the piers, the Government should estimate the cost of fixing the piers for public enjoyment and enhancing their connectivity with the adjoining harbour-front;
- (e) car parking was not a desirable use from harbour-front enhancement point of view. The stakeholders, including the private sector, should be engaged to determine the alternative beneficial uses of the piers;
- (f) the entire wholesale market site could be enhanced as an attraction point by incorporating seafood restaurants and improving public access to the waterfront. Reference could also be made to the proposals in the "Harbourfront Connectivity Study" by the Harbour Business Forum; and
- (g) a separate study funded by HEC to identify the constraints and formulate the enhancement plan for the whole site could be considered.

6.4 **The Proponent** responded as follows:

- (a) according to the advice of CEDD, the one-off cost of rehabilitating each pier for general use and the

**Action**

subsequent annual maintenance cost were estimated to be \$2M - \$3M and \$0.3M - \$0.4M respectively. It would not be cost-effective to lease out the piers for general commercial uses like car parking. Nonetheless, if the piers were to be retained for public enjoyment, the matter should be considered from a different perspective; and

- (b) DEVB could assist to coordinate enhancement of harbour-front sites including the subject piers.

**6.5 The Chairman** made the following points:

- (a) the Sub-committee did not support the removal of any under-utilised piers from the harbour-front. If the piers were no longer required by AFCD for wholesale market use, they should be returned to the Government for consideration of an appropriate harbour-front use, which could be enjoyed by members of the public with reference to HPPs; and
- (b) the suggestion of identifying individual harbour-front sites for detailed study should be further considered as it required coordination with other district review studies to be carried out under the overall Harbour Plan Review and would have resources implications.

**6.6 Miss Amy Yuen** said that the purpose of the submission was to follow up the Audit Report and the request of the Public Accounts Committee. The Sub-committee's concern on demolition of the piers was fully acknowledged and Members' view would be taken into account in considering the way forward.

**DEVB and  
AFCD**

**6.7 The Chairman** thanked the Proponent for attending the meeting.

**Item 7 Any Other Business**

**Signage at Rooftop of CITIC Tower**

**7.1 The Chairman** said that the proposal to erect a signage on the rooftop of CITIC Tower was presented to the Sub-committee on 28 November 2007. The relevant meeting minutes were tabled for Members' reference. The additional information submitted

**Action**

by the Project Team on 2 September 2008 had been circulated to Members for consideration. The following representatives of the Project Team were invited to brief Members on the latest proposal:

Mr Larry Lee - Defi Group Asia Ltd.  
Mr Ronald Lai - LandElite Surveyor Company Ltd.  
Mr Nicolas Oxley - CITIC Tower Management Ltd.

7.2 **The Project Team** gave a presentation with the aid of powerpoint slides.

7.3 Members had the following comments/question:

- (a) whilst there were improvements to the design of the signage, the question was whether there were any guidelines for relaxation of the building height restrictions under the lease or the relevant land use zone. The proposed signage should only be supported if it would not result in an increase of building height to exceed the permissible limit;
- (b) the views of the stakeholders, in particular the visual receivers fronting the backward side of the proposed signage, should be taken into account; and
- (c) how the proposed signage would enhance the harbour-front and the Harbour image.

7.4 **Mr Raymond Wong** said that the height restriction stipulated on the OZP generally referred to the height of the main roof of the building. As for lease matter, it would be under the purview of LandsD. **Mr Raymond Lee** pointed out that the general planning and land administration practices for considering such proposals had been explained to Members at the meeting in November 2007.

7.5 **The Chairman** said that the role of the Sub-committee was to give advice to the approving authority on individual development proposals. Final decision on the proposals rested with the approving authority. The Sub-committee should focus its comments from harbour-front enhancement perspective. In this case, the signage itself and the implication on building height should not be considered in isolation.

Action

7.6 Members in general did not support the proposed signage which would increase building height. It was considered that the HPGs could be strengthened in future to provide further guidance on this type of proposals to safeguard visual access to the Harbour.

7.7 **The Chairman** concluded that the Sub-committee did not see any merits to support the proposed signage which would increase the building height.

7.8 **The Project Team** pointed out that the proposed signage was only a very small logo which would enhance the outlook of the Harbour. Regarding the visual access to the Harbour, the occupants in JW Marriott Hotel Hong Kong, which was located 300m away and had a building height comparable to the CITIC Tower, would unlikely be affected. Further behind the hotel was only a hill slope.

7.9 The meeting agreed that the Sub-committee's view would be conveyed to the relevant approving authority for reference. **The Chairman** thanked the Project Team for attending the meeting.

**Secretariat**

Inventory of Known (Planned and Proposed) Projects at Harbourfront

7.10 The meeting agreed that a separate discussion session be arranged to review the Inventory.

[Post-meeting note : A discussion session on the Inventory with the participation of the Chairman, Mr Paul Zimmerman and Dr Sujata Govada was held on 2 October 2008. Members' suggestions would be taken into account in updating the next Inventory list.]

**Secretariat**

Issues referred by HEC for the Sub-committee to follow up

7.11 At its last meeting on 18 August 2008, HEC referred various issues raised by Mr Paul Zimmerman to the Sub-committee for follow up. Mr Zimmerman's submission was tabled for Members' reference.

(i) *Information and review sought on West Kowloon*

7.12 **The Secretary** said that the Sub-committee was consulted from time to time on the proposed land use/works in West Kowloon.

Action

The Sub-committee could also invite project proponents to make presentation if necessary.

- 7.13 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** opined that the Sub-committee should be briefed on the constraints which would affect the future WKCD development.

[Post-meeting note: Information on the existing constraints to the future WKCD development was forwarded to Members on 12 November 2008.]

- 7.14 For the amendments of the South West Kowloon OZP, the meeting noted that the related objections would be dealt with by TPB.

(ii) *Information and review sought on Kennedy Town*

- 7.15 **The Secretary** said that there was not yet a decision on Route 4. Subject to Members' views, the Transport and Housing Bureau (THB) could be invited to brief Members on the need for Route 4 at an appropriate juncture.

- 7.16 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** considered that the briefing should be arranged as soon as possible.

[Post-meeting note: The request for a briefing on the need of Route 4 had been conveyed to THB.]

**THB**

(iii) *Information and review sought on Short Term Tenancies*

- 7.17 The meeting noted that Lands Department was compiling the required information and would brief the Sub-committee when ready.

**LandsD**

Others

- 7.18 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested inviting LandsD, THB and LCSD to brief the Sub-committee on their projects along the harbour-front in the next 3 consecutive meetings.

- 7.19 **The Chairman** noted that Mr Zimmerman had put forth the same suggestion at the last HEC meeting and it was suggested that the matter be referred to the Task Group for Management Model for the Harbourfront (TGMMH) to consider.

**Action**

- 7.20 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** considered that while matters relating to policy coordination should be discussed by HEC/TGMMH, individual projects could be discussed by the Sub-committee.
- 7.21 Whilst **Mr Raymond Wong** pointed out the agenda of the Sub-committee was so heavy that it might not be possible to accommodate briefings by all individual departments in its regular meetings, the meeting noted that LandsD would brief the Sub-committee on short term tenancies in the harbour-front areas in due course.
- 7.22 There being no other business, the meeting closed at 7:00pm.

**HEC Sub-committee on  
Harbour Plan Review  
November 2008**