

# HEC Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review

## Minutes of Fourteenth Meeting

Date : 27 September 2006  
Time : 10:00 am  
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 Alvin Kwok	Representing Conservancy Association
Mr Kim O Chan	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Mr Louis HB Loong	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Miss Wong Yuet Wah	Principal Assistant Secretary (Planning and Lands) 2, Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau
Mr Raymond WM Wong	Assistant Director, Territorial (Atg) Planning Department
Mr Peter Mok	Senior Engineer 2/Kowloon, Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr Lawrence Kwan	Chief Engineer/Traffic Engineering, Transport Department
Ms Angela Tam	Chief Executive Officer (2)1, Home Affairs Department
Ms Sally Fong (Secretary)	Senior Town Planner/Sub-Regional 3, Planning Department

### In Attendance

#### For Item 3

Dr Lai Pong Wai	The Chinese University of Hong Kong
Dr Lee Wai Ying	The Chinese University of Hong Kong
Prof Liu Yuyang	The Chinese University of Hong Kong
Mr Charles Cheng	The Chinese University of Hong Kong

#### For Item 4

Mr Thomas Wan	Architectural Services Department
Mr Tony Mui	Architectural Services Department
Mr Patrick Hau	Architectural Services Department
Mr Andy Lewis	Architectural Services Department
Mr Tony Suen	Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Ms Melissa Yick	Leisure and Cultural Services Department

For Item 5

Ms Christine Tse

District Planning Officer/Hong Kong  
Planning Department

Ms Lily Yam

Senior Town Planner/HK(4)  
Planning Department

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr Leung Kong-yui

Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and  
Transport in Hong Kong

Mrs Mei Ng

Representing Friends of the Earth

Mr Leslie HC Chen

Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape  
Architects

Dr Andrew Thomson

Representing Business Environment Council

Mr Charles N Brooke

Mr Bernard Chan

Representing Hong Kong Institute of  
Surveyors

Mr Steve Chan Yiu-fai

Mr Jimmy Kwok

**Action**

**The Chairman** extended a welcome to all Members.

**Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of Last Meeting**

- 1.1 The draft minutes of the 13<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 12 July 2006 were circulated to Members on 4 August 2006. No comments were received from Members. The meeting confirmed the minutes without amendments.

**Item 2 Matters Arising**

Stormwater Pumping Station in Sheung Wan  
*[para. 2.5 of the minutes of the 13<sup>th</sup> meeting]*

- 2.1 **The Secretary** reported that Prof. Jim Chi-Yung's views had been sought on the proposed improvements to the landscaping scheme for the Stormwater Pumping Station in Sheung Wan. Prof. Jim was of the opinion that some of the proposed tree species were suitable for coastal planting and some were not. His comments had been forwarded to the Drainage Services Department (DSD) for consideration in finalizing the design of the landscaping scheme.

Hung Hom District Study

*[para. 5.4 of the minutes of the 13<sup>th</sup> meeting]*

- 2.2 **The Secretary** reported that the draft assignment briefs for the Hung Hom District Study and its associated Public Engagement Programme had been prepared and circulated for departmental comment. Subject to the comments received, the briefs would be finalized and forwarded to Members for reference before issue for tender invitation.

**Secretariat**

Waterfront Connectivity between Shun Tak Centre and the Western Wholesale Market

*[para. 7.3 of the draft minutes of the 13<sup>th</sup> meeting]*

- 2.3 This subject was discussed under Agenda Item 5.

Inventory of Known Projects Around the Harbour

- 2.4 Referring to the updated inventory of known projects around the Harbour tabled at the meeting, **the Secretary** drew Members' attention to the following items:

- (a) Sites No. C3 and C4 - These two newly added items were related to the Central Ferry Piers Nos. 7 & 8 and No. 3. For Piers Nos. 7 & 8, a planning application for using part of the roof viewing decks for restaurants and utility installations was scheduled for consideration by the Town Planning Board (TPB) on 29 September 2006. For Pier No. 3 which was zoned "OU(Pier)", it was the subject of an application for amendment to the Notes to replace a number of commercial-related use terms under Column 2 by a single use term 'Shops and Services (excluding Motor-vehicle Showroom)' to allow for a wider scope of commercial uses to be considered by TPB on application. This proposed amendment was technical in nature and would be considered by the TPB on 1 December 2006.
- (b) Site No. NP2 – This item was related to a site zoned "Comprehensive Development Area (1)" ("CDA(1)") at King Wah Street, North Point. Previously, a presentation was made by the proponent to the Sub-committee regarding a proposal for residential use of the "CDA(1)" site. On 1 September 2006, TPB considered an application and agreed to add 'Flat' in Column 2 of the Notes for the "CDA(1)" zone, but requested PlanD to review the development intensity and building height for this waterfront site and to

prepare a planning brief in guiding the development of the site. On 20 September 2006, a new application at the subject site for a proposed comprehensive development comprising office, eating place, shop and services, and place of recreation, sports or culture uses with a plot ratio of about 15 and a maximum building height of 165mPD was received. The application was scheduled for consideration by the TPB on 17.11.2006.

- (c) Site No. KT3 - This was a new item relating to a planning application for residential development with retail shops at a site zoned "CDA(2)" at Kai Tak (South). At the request of the applicant, TPB had deferred the consideration of the case.
  - (d) Site No. YT1 – This item was related to a "CDA" site at Yau Tong. On 22 September 2006, the TPB considered a planning report submitted by the proponent and agreed that the justifications put forward for reclamation at Yau Tong Bay under Options 1 & 2 did not meet the 'overriding public need test' and the development intensity proposed under Option 3 (the no-reclamation scheme) was considered excessive. TPB agreed that PlanD would continue to engage the proponent in preparing a conceptual development scheme based on the 'no reclamation' approach with appropriate development intensity and design.
- 2.5 Referring to Site No. C3 (i.e. Central Ferry Piers No. 7 and 8), which would soon be considered by the TPB on 29 September 2006, **Dr Alvin Kwok** asked whether the applicant had made any arrangement to consult the Sub-committee. Also noting that the "OU" zoning for Central Ferry Piers No. 7 and 8 and Central Ferry Pier No. 3 had different annotations (with the former for "Pier and Associated Facilities" only and the latter for "Pier"), he asked if the provision in the Notes for the ferry piers would be different.
- 2.6 **The Secretary** replied that the applicant had not approached the Secretariat for consultation with the Sub-committee. Nonetheless, information regarding this application had been uploaded onto the HEC's web page.
- 2.7 Noting that the application would be considered by the TPB on 29 September 2006 and that it was always difficult to request the applicant to consult the Sub-committee well before consideration of the case by TPB due to the different meeting schedule of the TPB and HEC, **the Chairman** suggested that if Members had any concerns about the application, their views could be passed to the

TPB's Secretariat.

- 2.8 With regard to the question on the zoning annotations, **the Secretary** stated that the proposed amendment to the use terms was in line with the broad use terms agreed by the TPB previously. Piers No. 7 and 8 were zoned "OU(Pier and Associated Facilities)" under the Central District OZP, while Pier No. 3 was zoned "OU(Pier)" under the Central District (Extension) OZP. The set of Notes for the two "OU" zones were slightly different. The Remarks with respect to the development restrictions for these two "OU" were also different.

### **Item 3 Vision Study on the Central Piers and Surrounding Areas**

- 3.1 **The Chairman** welcomed the Study team from the Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK) to the meeting.
- 3.2 With the aid of a visual presentation, **Dr Lai Pong Wai** and **Prof Liu Yuyang** gave a detailed presentation of the Study. They explained that the visionary scheme for the Central Piers was formulated with a view to transforming the Central Piers into a vibrant and sustainable world-class waterfront. In deriving the key development principles and formulating a design scheme for the Central Piers, the Vision Study had embraced the concepts of "Vibrancy", "Integration", "People-oriented" and "Sustainability" in the design process.
- 3.3 It was highlighted that the idea of lotus as being porous, permeable by water and air set the overall design direction for the proposed scheme. Members' attention was also drawn to the three main themes of the proposed scheme, i.e. Businessman's Wharf, Playground of CBD and Cosmopolitan Harbourfront of Asia, and the following features:
- (a) a biologically diverse, rainforest-like multi-level open space system with a 40m-wide landscaped promenade and separation of traffic and pedestrian flow;
  - (b) a series of elevated walkways/decks and pier links providing a weaving of different green walkways (with punctures for trees planting) to facilitate pedestrian movement and integration with the surroundings;
  - (c) a sunken Central-Wanchai bypass to reduce noise and air pollution as well as to free up ground space for north-south

pedestrian movement;

- (d) mixed use with a boutique hotel and commercial programmes with distinct themes relating to sports, entertainment and fashion; and
- (e) iconic architecture to create a visual phenomenon.

3.4 **The Chairman** commended the efforts of the CUHK's study team. Members had the following comments and questions:

- (a) the findings/proposals of the Vision Study were generally in line with the design brief developed under the CharM programme. The Government might consider implementation of some of the proposals put forward by the Vision Study;
- (b) with emphasis on a rainforest setting, it was doubtful as to whether there was a need for a boutique hotel in the waterfront area;
- (c) in terms of pedestrian accessibility, how pedestrian movement to the waterfront area could be facilitated, which was also a major concern of the Central and Western District Council;
- (d) as Central Piers were functional ferry piers, the implications arising from the proposed scheme on the convenience of regular commuters using the piers should be addressed;
- (e) whether feasibility had been explored for the proposed early sunken Central-Wanchai Bypass, as it appeared technically in doubt; and
- (f) what was the way forward of the Study's proposals.

3.5 In response, **Prof Liu Yuyang** made the following points:

- (a) in order to achieve an all-time and all-season waterfront destination, some forms of development in the area would be desirable. It was considered that hotel or even hostel type development would be appropriate, as it drew transient visitors/guests into the area and would support an array of commercial activities. Besides, the proposed area for hotel development would only take up 5% of the footprint;
- (b) currently, there was an existing pedestrian network linking

Central Market, IFC and Exchange Square. Additional connectivity was proposed in terms of an intertwined system of piers links, elevated walkways with a series of south-end connections to IFC podium to facilitate convenient movement from Soho area in Central to the 40-m wide promenade. The proposed links would reduce the walking distance for commuters from the piers to their workplaces in Central and in a much more pleasant setting; and

- (c) the proposed early sunken Central-Wanchai By-Pass was only conceptual at this stage, hence its feasibility had yet to be demonstrated.

3.6 **Dr Lai Pong Wai** added that engineering feasibility was not a consideration in the Study, and the proposed scheme was not meant to be a final design blueprint. Nevertheless, if any of the concepts were considered worth pursuing, the Government might further investigate their technical feasibility. He emphasised that the visionary scheme for a rainforest setting in the urban area would allow multi-levels of accessibility and activities.

3.10 **Dr Alvin Kwok** enquired about the possibility for the Sub-committee to work with CUHK further on the design concepts for the Central Piers.

3.11 Noting that CUHK's Study had already been referred to PlanD for consideration, **the Chairman** said that the CUHK's study findings could serve as inputs to the Urban Design Study for the Central Reclamation areas covering the Central Ferry Piers soon to be commissioned by PlanD. The Sub-committee would be able to provide comments when proposals made under the Urban Design Study were submitted to the Sub-committee for discussion.

3.12 As Members had no further comments to make, **the Chairman** thanked the representatives of CUHK for attending the meeting.

#### **Item 4 The Proposed "Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park Phase II" Development (Paper No. 7/2006)**

4.1 **The Chairman** welcomed Messrs Thomas Wan, Tony Mui, Patrick Hau and Andy Lewis of the Architectural Services Department (ArchSD), and Mr Tony Suen and Ms Melissa Yick of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) to the meeting.

4.2 With the aid of a visual presentation and an architectural model displayed at the meeting, **Mr Andy Lewis** and **Mr Tony Mui** gave a

detailed summary of the background to the proposal and the latest design scheme of the proposed Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park Phase II. The following main points were highlighted in the presentation:

- (a) the site was subject to massive engineering constraints, with the Western Harbour Tunnel underneath, the presence of several box culverts and setback requirement from the ventilation building for the tunnel, hence resulting in small fragmented pieces of usable spaces;
- (b) in addition to the intention to provide a Memorial Park to befit the character and stature of Dr Sun Yat Sen, there was a need to include a range of recreational facilities to meet the pressing needs of the local community in the Central and Western District;
- (c) a number of concept studies had been conducted before coming up with the current design configuration, which accommodated three required elements - Memorial Garden at the centre, the swimming pool complex next to the existing Western Park Sports Centre, and other active recreational facilities (including a 7-a-side soccer pitch) at the eastern portion of the site;
- (d) the proposed Memorial Park took on a design approach different from the Sun Yat Sen Park overseas. The present design aimed to reflect the 'intimate relation' between Dr Sun Yat Sen and Hong Kong. The main ceremonial space was an open lawn of circular shape (about 95m-100m in diameter) which provided the setting for the centerpiece statue of Dr Sun Yat Sen. The reflecting pool, baptismal carving and chimes, etc were key design elements strategically arranged along two central axis over the lawn to metaphorically convey imageries of Dr Sun Yat Sen in terms of his religious belief, academic life and revolutionary principles. The Memorial Garden set in the centre of the site gently sloping upward from the waterfront to the inland would also create visual interest from the harbour, with reflecting pond near the waterfront, the statue of Dr Sun Yat Sen in the middle of the Park and the Pai Lau entrance further up at the Park; and
- (e) the current access to the Park was through the main entrance located at Connaught Road. Upon completion of the project, more pedestrian access points would be provided.

4.3 With respect to the proposed swimming pool complex, **Mr Thomas**

**Wan** supplemented that the design took on an approach to maximise interpenetration between the building's interior and the exterior landscape. The piazza, swimming pool, spectator stand and roof garden spaced in layering/terracing arrangement were all open to views of the harbour.

4.4 Members had the following questions and comments:

- (a) the development was a Memorial Park to befit the character and stature of Dr Sun Yat Sen, but the only area dedicated for such purpose was confined to the central part of the site while the remaining areas were used for sports facilities. Besides, it was uncertain as to how the stature or philosophies of Dr Sun Yat Sen could properly be reflected simply by erecting the statue and by metaphorical naming of the park facilities;
- (b) since the Memorial Garden would convey Dr Sun Yat Sen as a revolutionary figure, whether LCSD would allow the public to use the lawn area for political propaganda or public demonstration;
- (c) could the rooftop of the adjacent Western Park Sports Centre be accessible to the public as it might serve as an additional and higher vantage point for viewing;
- (d) whether the proposed swimming pool could be further setback to allow for a wider waterfront promenade;
- (e) whether it was possible to allow a wider gap between the swimming pool complex and the adjacent Western Park Sports Centre;
- (f) consideration could be given to provide a flower clock in the Park as a landmark attraction; and
- (g) whether access to the Memorial Park would be provided along the waterfront promenade.

4.6 In response, **Mr Andy Lewis** made the following points:

- (a) one of the requirements of the project was to address the shortfall of recreation facilities in the Central and Western District and this imposed limitation to the scope of the Memorial Park dedicated for remembrance of Dr Sun Yat Sen. Nevertheless, the Memorial Garden was given the 'centre stage' location in order to emphasize its importance;

- (b) the lawn area would be accessible and open to the public. The selection of grass species for the lawn would take into account its heavy public usage;
- (c) due to technical constraints, the swimming pool complex could not be shifted either further inland or to its east;
- (d) access to the rooftop of the adjacent Western Park Sports Centre was not certain as there might be structural concern. As upgrading works of the building for the East Asian Game 2009 were being planned by ArchSD, the Sub-committee's views on this aspect would be conveyed to concerned colleagues for consideration; and
- (e) multiple access points to the park would be provided along the waterfront promenade.

ArchSD

4.7 **Ms Melissa Yick** added that according to LCSD's policy, the lawn would be open to the public, except during maintenance. As to the use of the lawn for public gathering/activities, booking would be required.

4.8 **The Chairman** expressed concern on the possible adverse impact on visual permeability due to the close proximity of the proposed swimming pool structure with the existing Western Park Sports Centre. The two buildings standing side by side, separated with only a narrow opening, would appear quite massive. In this respect, he asked whether the proposed swimming pools would need to be covered.

4.9 **Mr Kim O Chan** asked whether the scale of the proposed swimming pool complex could be reduced. Instead of accommodating separate office/administrative facilities within the proposed complex, he asked whether share use of office and administrative facilities in the adjacent Western Park Sports Centre could be considered.

4.10 In response to Members' queries, **Mr Andy Lewis** made the following main points:

- (a) the swimming pool complex could not be shifted further away from the Western Park Sports Centre as constrained by a drainage reserve at the eastern edge of the complex. Nevertheless, ArchSD was looking into the possibility of opening up the ground floor lobby of the Western Park Sports Centre to facilitate accessibility of the park users;

- (b) the swimming pools were to be covered as to provide an all-year round training facility to better serve the local residents. The Central and Western District Council strongly supported such provision;
  - (c) the design of the swimming pool complex aimed to create visual penetration to play down its overall scale. Views of the Sub-committee would be considered at the detailed design stage to allow for visual permeability of the swimming pool complex.
- 4.11 With the Chairman's permission, a member of the public expressed concern if there might be any health impacts on the users of the soccer pitch, due to its close proximity to the existing ventilation building.
- 4.12 **Mr Andy Lewis** said that ArchSD had carried out an environmental review with respect to the noxious gaseous emissions from the ventilation building. He pointed out that as long as the proposed soccer pitch was located outside the exclusion zone around the Ventilation Building, it would be considered acceptable under the relevant environmental and health standard guidelines.
- 4.13 As Members had no further comments to make, **the Chairman** thanked the representatives of ArchSD and LCSD for attending the meeting.

**Item 5 Planning of a Waterfront Promenade/Open Space Development between Shun Tak Centre and Western Wholesale Market (Paper No. 8/2006)**

- 5.1 **The Chairman** welcomed Ms Christine Tse and Ms Lily Yam to the meeting.
- 5.2 After a brief introduction by **Ms Christine Tse**, with the aid of a visual presentation, **Ms Lily Yam** briefed Members on the existing use of the waterfront area between Shun Tak Centre and the Western Wholesale market and implementation of the planned open space development along this stretch of waterfront area. She highlighted the following points:
- (a) a waterfront promenade, of about 1200m in length, zoned "Open Space" was planned along the Sheung Wan waterfront extending from the Ex-gala Point to the Western Wholesale Food Market;
  - (b) the current open space use within this area included a

temporary park, i.e. the Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park (SYSMP) Phase I, and a section of promenade along Western Fire Services Street constructed by the Central and Western District Office. There were also various temporary uses under short-term tenancy including temporary carparks and a number of Government installations/facilities;

- (c) the proposed stormwater pumping station development at the Ex-gala Point site would include a 10-m wide promenade for public enjoyment. The SYSMP Phase II which also covered the temporary park area (Phase I) would commence in April 2008 for completion in early 2011;
- (d) apart from the area between the Ex-gala point and SYSMP, which involved some technical issues to be resolved, the remaining area along this stretch of waterfront would be made available for open space use by 2011; and
- (e) to facilitate access, a comprehensive walkway system linking up the SYSMP (Phase II) with the Central District through an elevated walkway between Shun Tak Centre and the existing Wilmer Street footbridge was being examined.

5.3 With the Chairman's permission, a member of the public asked about the width of the promenade. **Ms Lily Yam** responded that the width of the promenade varied among different sections, ranging from 11m to 20m with some sections as wide as 40m.

5.4 As Members had no further comments to make, **the Chairman** thanked Ms Christine Tse and Ms Lily Yam for attending the meeting.

## **Item 6 Any Other Business**

### Progress Update

6.1 **The Secretary** reported the key tasks of the Sub-committee since the last meeting which included:

- (a) the Task Group on Harbour Planning Principles (HPP) was in the process of preparing the Harbour Planning Guidelines. The draft guidelines were circulated to concerned Government bureaux/departments for comment on 9 August 2006. Two Task Group meetings were held on 10 July 2006 and 21 September 2006 to discuss the draft guidelines. The draft harbour planning guidelines were tentatively scheduled for submission to the Sub-committee for consideration by

end 2006/early 2007; and

- (b) there were a total of 950 entries for the Central Waterfront Hoarding Beautification Drawing Competition. Selection by the judging panels was held on 7 and 9 August. Finalists and winners were announced in mid August and mid September 2006 respectively. A Task Group meeting was held on 21 September 2006 to discuss on the detailed arrangement of the prize presentation ceremony to be held at the City Hall Theatre on 22 October 2006.

#### Proposed Temporary Use at West Kowloon Reclamation Area

- 6.2 The meeting considered a proposal submitted by Sony Computer Entertainment Hong Kong Limited (Sony) for erection of temporary structures for product promotion at the West Kowloon Reclamation Area. A location plan showing the proposed site and the adjacent temporary waterfront park was tabled at the meeting. **The Chairman** said that Sony was not available to present the proposal. The information on the proposal was sent out for Members' comment by circulation.
- 6.3 **The Secretary** reported that in response to the circulation of the proposal for Members' comment, Mr Alvin Kwok raised some queries/questions in relation to noise, lighting and traffic impacts caused by the proposed use. Sony's response was sought in this regard and was tabled at meeting for Members' reference.
- 6.5 Noting that the site for the proposed temporary use did not encroach upon the adjacent temporary waterfront park, Members had no comment on the proposal.

#### Temporary Car park at Former Public Filling Barging Point in Sheung Wan

- 6.6 **Mr Kim O Chan** asked whether the proposed temporary car park at the former public filling barging point in Sheung Wan had been implemented. **The Secretary** undertook to check with Lands Department (LandsD) and would inform Members of the latest position of the temporary car park.

**Secretariat**

[Post Meeting Note: According to LandsD, the short term tenancy for the temporary car park at the subject site commenced on 25 July 2006. The tenant's landscaping proposal along the waterfront had been submitted to LandsD for consideration.]

7.4 There being no other business, the meeting closed at 12:30 pm.

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