

HEC Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review

Minutes of Tenth Meeting

Date : 21 December 2005
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
Mr Bernard CHAN	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr Kim O CHAN	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Mr Steve CHAN Yiu-fai	
Mr LEUNG Kong-yui	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Dr Andrew THOMSON	Representing Business Environment Council
Mr Robin IP	Deputy Secretary (Planning & Lands), Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau
Mr Augustine NG	Assistant Director/Territorial, Planning Department
Mr Lawrence KWAN	Chief Engineer/Traffic Engineering (Hong Kong), Transport Department
Mr Peter PC MOK	Senior Engineer/2(Kln), Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr NG Tak-wah (Secretary)	Senior Town Planner/Sub-Regional 3, Planning Department

In Attendance

Ms Lydia LAM

Assistant Secretary (Planning), Housing,
Planning and Lands Bureau

Mr Raymond WM WONG

Chief Town Planner/Sub-Regional,
Planning Department

For Item 3

Mr Victor KWOK

Henderson Land Development Co Ltd

Mr Augustine WONG

Henderson Land Development Co Ltd

Mr Shuki LEUNG

Henderson Land Development Co Ltd

Mr Phill BLACK

Pro Plan Asia Ltd

Mr K K SUN

Pro Plan Asia Ltd

Mr LI Man-ying

DLN Architects & Engineers

Ms Dora NG

DLN Architects & Engineers

For Item 4

Mr Nelson NG

Hong Kong & Kowloon Ferry
Holdings Ltd

Ms April LAM

Hong Kong & Kowloon Ferry
Holdings Ltd

Mr Tony HUI

Hong Kong & Kowloon Ferry
Holding Ltd

Absent with Apologies

Mr Charles N BROOKE

Mr Leslie CHEN

Representing Hong Kong Institute of
Landscape Architects

Dr Alvin KWOK

Representing Conservancy Association

Mr Jimmy KWOK

Mr Louis LOONG

Representing Real Estate Developers
Association of Hong Kong

Mrs Mei NG

Representing Friends of the Earth

Ms Angela TAM

Chief Executive Officer (2)1, Home
Affairs Department

Action

The Chairman extended a welcome to all Members.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of Last Meeting

- 1.1 The draft minutes of the 9th meeting held on 5 October 2005 were circulated to Members on 25 October 2005. Comments received from Members were incorporated where appropriate. The Meeting confirmed the revised minutes without further amendments.

Item 2 Matters Arising

Harbour Planning Review – Draft Programme for Hung Hom District Study

- 2.1 **The Secretary** reported the planned timeframes of key on-going HEC public participatory programmes for Members' reference as follows:
- (i) *Kai Tak Planning Review – Stage 2 Public Participation Programme* would be completed in January 2006;
 - (ii) *Wan Chai Development Phase II Review - Realization Stage Public Participation Programme* would be held from March to July 2006; and
 - (iii) *CHarM – Design Brief* would be prepared by February/March 2006.
- 2.2 The Meeting agreed that the Hung Hom District Study should be programmed with regard to the progress of the above studies in order not to overwhelm the public with consultative activities. HEC would consider detailed arrangement for the study in early 2006.

Consolidated Update on Various Enhancement Initiatives for Tsim Sha Tsui

- 2.3 The Meeting noted that the matter would be discussed under Item 5.

Report on Hung Hom Bay Waterfront Promenade

2.4 **Mr Raymond Wong** stated that a preliminary design concept of the waterfront promenade was presented by the proponent at the last meeting. Members' comments had been conveyed to the project proponent, who would take into consideration Member's concerns in refining the design. So far, the project proponent had not made any further submission or response yet.

Inventory of Known Projects around the Harbour

2.5 **The Secretary** tabled at the meeting an updated inventory of known projects around the Harbour and reported updated information as underlined in the inventory.

2.6 At the request of **Mr KY Leung**, **PlanD** would undertake to seek input from Lands Department regarding :

PlanD

- (i) possible temporary uses of the former temporary public filling barging point site at Sheung Wan waterfront; and
- (ii) proposal, if any, of erecting advertising boards at the western portion of the former public cargo handling area in Wan Chai Waterfront.

2.7 **Mr Kim Chan** added that, as a standard practice, relevant landscaping clause should be included as a condition in short-term tenancy.

2.8 **Dr Thomson** made the following points concerning the erection of advertising boards near harbourfront:

- (i) advertising boards might obstruct public view towards the Harbour; and
- (ii) actual impact of proposal should be assessed on individual merits taking site characteristics and other unique circumstances into consideration.

- 2.9 **The Chairman** suggested, and the Meeting agreed, that both Lands Department and Government Property Agency (GPA) be informed of the followings:
- (i) the Sub-committee had concerns on the erection of advertising boards at the harbourfront; and
 - (ii) HEC should be consulted on proposals to erect advertising boards along the harbourfront.

(Post Meeting Notes: Lands Department and GPA were informed, on 29 December 2005, of the concerns of the Sub-committee and invited to provide information as outlined in Para. 2.6 above.)

Report on Hoarding Beautification in Central

- 2.10 **The Secretary** reported that the Task Group presented the proposed hoarding beautification through public participation programme to the Central and Western District Council (C&W DC) and its Sub-committee on 6 October 2005 and 9 December 2005 respectively. As both DC and its sub-committee supported the proposal, the Task Group would liaise with C&W DC to consider detailed proposal, including outline programme and funding requirement, before reporting back to the Sub-committee and HEC.

**Task Group
on Central
Harbourfront
and Me**

Report on Harbour Planning Principles

- 2.11 **Mr Raymond Wong** reported that comments received had been consolidated and PlanD had also discussed with Dr Thomson, the Task Group Convenor, on the overall approach. He stated that responses to comments received would be considered by the Task Group before reporting back to the Sub-committee and HEC in early 2006.
- 2.12 **Dr Thomson** supplemented the followings:
- (i) public feedback indicated that the Harbour Planning Principles had received broad acceptance and general support; and

**Task Group
on Harbour
Planning
Principles**

- (ii) the Harbour Planning Principles could be consolidated to enable further work to proceed, in next stage, the Task Group would be preparing guidelines and good practice with reference to the Harbour Planning Principles.

2.13 **The Chairman** suggested, and the Meeting agreed, that the Harbour Planning Principles upon revision be submitted to HEC for endorsement in March 2006.

Progress of 'CHarM'

2.14 **The Secretary**, on behalf of the Convenor of the Task Group, reported that:

- (i) a workshop with concerned stakeholders was held on 8 October 2005, about 40 participants from academics, professionals, local organizations, business sector and Government departments took part to exchange views on enhancing the Central Ferry Piers and its adjoining areas;
- (ii) exhibition of enhancement concepts was held from 17 to 26 November 2005;
- (iii) a public forum to gauge feedback and to discuss various concepts and concerns was held on 26 November 2005; and
- (iv) consultants were preparing reports on the various public events for consideration of the Task Group, and these reports would form the basis for the preparation of Design Brief.

Item 3 Proposed Amendment to the Notes for the "CDA(1)" site at King Wah Road, North Point (Paper No. 16/2005)

3.1 **The Chairman** welcomed Messrs Victor Kwok, Augustine Wong, and Shuki Leung, representing Henderson Land Development Company Limited (Henderson), their planning consultants, Messrs Phill Black and K.K. Sun, and their architectural design

consultants, Mr LI Man-ying and Ms Dora Ng, to the meeting.

- 3.2 At the invitation of the Chairman, **Mr Raymond Wong** stated that the proposal to be presented was an application for zoning amendment recently submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB). At the request of a Sub-committee Member, the proponents were invited to brief the Meeting on the proposal.
- 3.3 **Mr Black**, with the aid of visual presentation, outlined the followings as detailed in the paper:
- a. background to the proposal;
 - b. proposed zoning amendment to include “flat” use under column 2 of the Notes for “Comprehensive Development Area (1)” (“CDA(1)”) of the concerned statutory outline zoning plan (OZP);
 - c. proposal with residential development at plot ratio (PR) 8, providing 156 flats, on the landward side of the site, and cultural facilities with waterfront open space along the harbour-side; and
 - d. design considerations with respect to Harbour Planning Principles in planning the scheme.
- 3.4 **Messrs Kim Chan and Steve Chan** declared that they had previous business dealings with the applicant but had no direct involvement in the current proposal or submission.
- 3.5 In response to **Mr KY Leung**, **Ms Dora Ng** confirmed that the development scheme had taken future widening of the Island Eastern Corridor (IEC) into account.
- 3.6 **Dr Thomson** supported the proponents’ efforts in planning the development scheme with reference to the Harbour Planning Principles, and raised the following concerns:

- (i) how local community be engaged during the process;
- (ii) how the scheme would meet the concerns of the local community; and
- (iii) how vibrancy could be achieved given the proximity of the IEC to the subject site.

3.7 **Mr Steve Chan** raised concerns on ways to successfully creating a vibrant waterfront in the area with three sites being developed by different developers in the vicinity.

3.8 In response to the queries, **Mr Black** explained that:

- (i) public consultation was part of the town planning and plan preparation process and the proponent would gain feedback from the process in refining the detail design;
- (ii) local concerns would be considered together with Harbour Planning Principles when planning and designing the scheme which was still at preliminary stage, however, with long established residential use in the vicinity, the proposed residential use would be compatible with the adjoining areas. Besides, the overall development intensity of residential development would be lower comparing with proposed commercial uses; and
- (iii) the current zoning, even with the Notes amended as requested, required submission of Master Layout Plan for consideration and approval of the TPB. Such requirement would facilitate integrated planning and co-ordinated development in the general areas. Notwithstanding, Members would be further consulted at the stage of scheme design, if the zoning amendment was agreed by the TPB.

3.9 In reply to **the Chairman** on the proposed development parameters, **Ms Dora Ng** advised the followings:

- (i) the proposed plot ratio of 8 applied to the

- (ii) southern landside portion of the site only; and
the maximum permissible building height was 165mPD.

3.10 The Meeting noted that a hotel development of about 41 storeys with PR 15 had been approved at a site, also zoned “CDA(1)”, to the east of the application site.

3.11 After thorough discussion, the Meeting had no objection to the proposed zoning amendment. **The Chairman** proposed, and the Meeting agreed, that a letter be sent to the TPB before the end of the public consultation period on 30 December 2005, stating the following points:

Secretary

- i) the Sub-committee supported the application for amendment to the North Point Outline Zoning Plan to include “Flat” use under Column 2 of the Notes of the “CDA(1)” zone, as it represented a lower development intensity hence more favourable in terms of layout design, building height and massing effect as compared with a commercial development. The Sub-committee also considered that residential development was compatible with the harbourfront and may enhance vibrancy and maintain public access/view at this part of the harbourfront;
- ii) the Sub-committee also welcomed the initiative of the project proponent to adopt the Harbour Planning Principles as the basis in planning and design of the proposed development in the said “CDA(1)” site;
- iii) the Sub-committee requested the TPB to ensure that the spirit of the Harbour Planning Principles would be complied with when considering any proposed development scheme submitted to it at the subject site;
- iv) the Sub-committee invited the TPB to determine the appropriate design parameters related to the massing, building height and visual/pedestrian access to the Harbour, at the subject site; and

- v) the Sub-committee requested the TPB to ensure that developments along the waterfront in which the subject site fell were well co-ordinated so as to safeguard public access and enjoyment of the harbourfront.

(Post Meeting Notes: A letter, after circulating to Members and incorporating their comments, was sent to the TPB on 29 December 2005.)

- 3.12 **Mr Augustine Wong** thanked the Sub-committee for its support of the proposed amendment, and undertook to consult the Sub-committee on the details of the development proposal as and when opportune. **Henderson Land Development**

Item 4 Proposed Installation of LED Screen on roof of Pier No.4, Central

- 4.1 **The Chairman** welcomed Mr Nelson Ng, Ms April Lam, and Mr Tony Hui, representing the Hong Kong and Kowloon Ferry Holding Ltd to the meeting to present their proposal.
- 4.2 **Ms Lam**, with the aid of visual presentation, outlined the following:
 - a. background to the proposal; and
 - b. the proposal that involved mounting, on the roof-top of Pier No.4, an LED screen of 5.8m(H) x 10.2m(W), towards Central, to broadcast news, advertisements, traffic and weather information.
- 4.3 **Mr Nelson Ng** stressed that with increasing fuel price the company had been experiencing tremendous financial pressure, the proposed advertising sign would generate much needed revenue, in the order of about HK\$2M annually, to support ferry services. Government departments consulted had no adverse

comments on the proposal.

- 4.4 **Dr Thomson** opined that some key issues needed to be addressed when assessing harbourfront development, these being:
- suitability of the proposed location for the proposed use or development;
 - public amenity and public needs against private or commercial developments;
 - possible visual impact on the Harbour;
 - cost in social and economic terms; and
 - public and local community views.
- 4.5 In response to **Mr Steve Chan's** question on the regulatory procedures, **Mr Raymond Wong** said that the Government Property Agency (GPA) was overseeing the management of the subject pier and was the approving agent for the subject advertisement board. Since the pier fell within the harbour-front area, GPA had duly advised the proponent to consult the HEC before final decision was made.
- 4.6 **Mr. KY Leung** remarked and the Meeting agreed that ferry operators had been facing very difficult operating environment and the need for operators to generate non-fare revenue to maintain reliable services to the public as well as stabilising fare was noted. He further commented that the proposal would increase the overall building height of the ferry pier, and consequently might affect public access to the harbourfront, which in turn was a public demand, reflected through various surveys and public activities of HEC.
- 4.7 **Mr Kim Chan** said that the location and size of the proposed sign would be a main concern. In addition, the proposal might attract other similar developments at other piers. **Mr Steve Chan** added that possible noise and glare might significantly affect the overall atmosphere of the areas.

- 4.8 **Mr Bernard Chan** suggested a flexible design be adopted to minimize adverse impact on public viewing of the Harbour. On the overall planning and design, **Dr Thomson** indicated that the proponent could consider the followings:
- alternative location to the present proposal;
 - alternative composition, i.e. multiple screens, screens mounted on building façade;
 - integrating public access or uses into the proposal; and
 - holistic and long-term planning to include other uses i.e. commercial areas such as alfresco dining or restaurant as a more sustainable revenue source.
- 4.9 In reply to **the Chairman's** query, **Mr Lawrence Kwan** said that from traffic engineering point of view, signboards should not obstruct sightline of drivers for safety reasons. Based on the preliminary layout as presented, the proposal was unlikely to have adverse impact on adjoining roads.
- 4.10 **The Chairman** stated that public enjoyment of the harbourfront and viability of ferry services to the public should both be considered and balanced. **Mr KY Leung** remarked that a sustainable ferry operation should be a key transport policy. He considered that the Government should have a holistic framework to assist ferry operators instead of relying on their own initiatives in generating non-fare revenue.
- 4.11 After deliberation, **the Chairman** proposed, and Members agreed, that GPA be informed of the followings:
- (i) the Sub-committee did not support the proposed LED screen as submitted, as it would affect visual access to the harbour and the visual quality of the harbourfront; and

- (ii) Members raised concerns on possible similar uses and developments above other ferry piers in the areas.

(Post Meeting Notes: GPA was informed, on 3 January 2006, of the concerns of the Sub-committee.)

Item 5 Consolidated Update on Various Enhancement Initiatives for Tsim Sha Tsui (Paper No. 16/2005)

5.1 **Mr Raymond Wong**, with the aid of visual presentation, covered the following aspects as outlined in the paper:

- a. background and purpose of the presentation;
- b. an overview of various enhancement initiatives for Tsim Sha Tsui (TST), namely
 - (i) the Area Improvement Plan (AIP) jointly commissioned by the Planning Department and Transport Department (TD);
 - (ii) the Greening Master Plan undertaken by the Civil Engineering and Development Department;
 - (iii) the Promenade Beautification Project undertaken by the Tourism Commission; and
 - (iv) the relocation of the existing public transport interchange at the Star Ferry Pier.

5.2 In reply to **Mr Kim Chan**, **Mr Raymond Wong** said that no decision had been made on the form of the pedestrian link at the junction of Nathan Road and Salisbury Road. As explained by representatives of TD to the Sub-committee in October 2005, the proposal had to take into account the need of pedestrian and vehicular traffic. Notwithstanding, TD was further studying the matter.

5.3 **Dr Thomson** made the following comments:

- (i) quality of the present paving were far from satisfactory. High quality paving materials and finishing should be used;

- (ii) vibrancy was a key consideration, hence more diverse activities and experiences should be injected into the area; and
- (iii) there should be more marine uses and better public access to the water.

5.4 In reply, **Mr Raymond Wong** stated that a variety of uses and specific proposals were being proposed in various initiatives. For instance, as part of the Promenade Beautification Project, a proposed restaurant for alfresco dining was under construction. Besides, various pedestrianisation schemes proposed under the AIP would enhance the pedestrian environment of the area, make the area more vibrant and improve pedestrian linkage between the hinterland and the harbour-front.

5.5 **Mr Augustine Ng** supplemented that as mentioned in the previous presentation (i.e. on 9 March 2005), marine activities should be considered in the context of the daily operation of the busy harbour and ferry services. However, special areas had been identified in the harbour for water-based activity on an occasional basis.

5.6 Concerning the improvement works proposed in TST, **Mr Augustine Ng** suggested Members to take note of the recently released Public Consultation Report for the AIP, which summarized public comments received on the proposed planning framework. While there was strong public support to some of the proposals, there were also issues still being debated. For such more controversial proposals, further consultation with concerned stakeholders would be held.

5.7 The Meeting noted that the above initiatives/proposals had been presented to HEC or the Sub-committee in previous occasions, and the present presentation was a consolidated update, Members had no further comments.

Item 6 Any Other Business

- 6.1 **The Secretary**, tabled at the meeting a letter from the Designing Hong Kong Harbour District to the Chairman and Members of the HEC concerning its letter to the Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury on the KCRC freight yard in Hung Hom. The Meeting noted that as a general practice the HEC secretariat would circulate correspondences addressed to HEC to all Members.
- 6.2 There being no other business, the meeting closed at 5.30pm. The next meeting was scheduled for 22 February 2006.

**HEC Sub-committee on
Harbour Plan Review
January 2006**