

**Fourth Briefing of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee
held at 2:30 pm on 11 July 2006
at Conference Room, 12/F, Murray Building,
Garden Road, Central, Hong Kong**

Minutes of Briefing

Present

Mr Leung Kong-yui	Presiding Chairman
Dr Andrew Thomson	Representing Business Environment Council
Dr Ng Mee-kam	Representing Citizen Envisioning @ Harbour (CE@H)
Dr Alvin Kwok	Representing Conservancy Association
Mr Vincent Ng	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Kim Chan	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Ir Dr Greg Wong	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Mason Hung	Representing Hong Kong Tourism Board
Mr Louis Loong	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Hardy Lok	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour Limited
Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke	
Ms Starry Lee	
Mr Thomas Chow	Deputy Secretary (Transport)1, Environment, Transport and Works Bureau (ETWB)
Mr Bosco Fung	Director of Planning
Miss Wong Yuet-wah	Secretary

In Attendance

Mr Robin Ip	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau
Mt George Tsoi	Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport)5 (Acting), ETWB
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 Anthony Loo	Assistant Commissioner/Urban, Transport Department
Mr Raymond Wong	Chief Town Planner/Sub-Regional Planning, Planning Department (PlanD)

For item 1

Mr Raymond Chiu	Assistant Director of Planning/Special Duties
Ms Phyllis Li	Chief Town Planner/Special Duties(1), PlanD
Ms Christine Loh	Representing Designing Hong Kong Harbour District (DHKHD)
Mr Paul Zimmerman	Representing DHKHD
Miss Patsy Cheng	Representing CE@H
Mr Albert Lai	Representing CE@H

For item 2

Mr Paul Zimmerman	Representing DHKHD
Mr Ian Brownlee	Representing DHKHD

Action

Welcoming Message

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

Item 1 Presentation by Planning Department on Illustrative Concept for the New Central Harbourfront, Designing Hong Kong Harbour District on Alternative Vision for Central and Tamar, Citizen Envisioning @ Harbour on From Central to Tamar, Community Planning in Action

1.1 **The Presiding Chairman** said that PlanD and DHKHD displayed at the venue their respective models and display boards on Central harbourfront. He remarked that the current briefing provided an avenue for various parties to express and share with the HEC their own concepts and ideas in respect of the Central harbourfront, instead of asking the HEC to be the adjudicator as to which model was better. Upon his invitation, **Ms Phyllis Li** of PlanD presented on Illustrative Concept for the New Central Harbourfront, **Ms Christine Loh and Mr Paul Zimmerman** of DHKHD on Alternative Vision for Central and Tamar, as well as

Miss Patsy Cheng and Mr Albert Lai of CE@H on From Central to Tamar, Community Planning in Action.

1.2 **Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke** thought that it was time to address the issue of the PLA headquarters. **Mr Kim Chan** asked the possibility of removing the PLA headquarters and providing a park or museum at the site in the long run. On PlanD's pamphlet on the illustrative concept for the new Central harbourfront, **Mr Brooke** considered that Road P2 might form a major barrier to the Central Harbourfront and that connectivity could be enhanced by breaking up the building blocks into smaller scales.

1.3 In response to the presentation by the two non-government organizations, **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 statutory planning process. 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 amended, including the substantial reduction of land for commercial use. The revised OZP was subsequently approved by the Chief Executive in Council in February 2002. Under the approved Central District (Extension) OZP, about half of the reclaimed area was zoned "Open Space" for the enjoyment by the public. The "Other Specified Uses" sites in the CRIII designated for waterfront related commercial and leisure uses including festival markets, cafes, restaurants, and retail shops were to add vibrancy and attraction to the waterfront. There was also a "Comprehensive Development Area" ("CDA") site in the area, which was intended for high quality office/commercial floor space to help maintain the role and competitive status of the Central Business District in meeting the demand for high quality offices at this central and prestigious location. For the long term development of Hong Kong and hence interest of the public, the approved OZP should form the basis for the future development of the area.

1.4 On the future use of the existing Government headquarters site at Lower Albert Road, **Mr Ip** said the premises were constructed around 1954-1959 and they were not declared

statutory monuments or historical buildings. Under the approved Central District OZP, the site was zoned “Government, Institution or Community”. The Government was open-minded regarding the future use of the site, but it was too early to determine its future use at this juncture. If the Government proposed to revise the land use of the site, it would assess the views and aspirations of the public as well as the impact on transport, environment, infrastructure, etc. Any change in land use would need to go through the statutory planning process.

1.5 **Mr Vincent Ng** said that the statutory planning process must be respected. He was concerned about the greening for and the width of Road P2, the possible canyon effect of the groundscraper, the possibility of breaking the site up into smaller land parcels, and the uses and accessibility around Central Ferry Pier numbers 4, 5 and 6. **Mr Bosco Fung** said that under the approved Central District OZP, Central Ferry Pier numbers 4, 5 and 6 together with the adjoining areas were zoned “CDA(2)” and “Commercial”. The sites had not been sold and details of the design of the developments therein would be further examined when PlanD conducted the study on the “Refinement of the Urban Design Framework for the Central Reclamation and Preparation of Planning/Design Briefs for Key Development Sites” (the Study). Opportunity could also be taken in refining the urban design framework to further enhance accessibility around the area. On Road P2, **Mr Fung** clarified that there would be landscaping for the road corridor and it would be a dual 2-lane road (i.e. four lanes in total) instead of eight lanes as suggested by DHKHD.

1.6 In response to Mr Fung’s query about whether the piers in DHKHD’s model could meet the overriding public need test, **Mr Zimmerman** said building piers was the only choice to facilitate the boarding of vessels and use of the harbour by the public. Such land/water interfaces therefore helped maintain, preserve and enhance the value of the harbour as a maritime facility and a safe haven for vessels. As such, he considered that land/water interfaces such as piers could meet the overriding public need test.

(Post-briefing note: Mr Zimmerman provided further views on the overriding public need issue on 28 September 2006, which were circulated to Members on 24 October 2006.)

1.7 **Dr Andrew Thomson** considered that the use of the new Central harbourfront largely for waterfront open space under PlanD's concept was not compatible with the ideal mix of uses. He hoped that measures could be taken to reduce the impact of the road system on bringing people to the harbour. **Mr Chan** hoped that the design of the area could meet people's demand for more public space along the harbourfront and suggested considering the possibility of reserving the groundscraper site for public use until the demand for the proposed commercial development was confirmed. He supported the idea of maintaining the existing Government headquarters as a historical asset. **Mr Hardy Lok** said that connectivity between the new harbourfront and the surroundings should be enhanced. **Dr Ng Mee-kam** reiterated CE@H's suggestion to evaluate the planning and design of the area with sustainability principles.

1.8 On Central Ferry Pier numbers 4 to 6, **Dr Alvin Kwok** said that the earlier Central Harbourfront and Me public participatory programme revealed participants' wish for low-rise development along the waterfront. He hoped that PlanD would involve the HEC as a partner when conducting the Study. **Mr Mason Hung** hoped that the proposed musical fountain near Central Ferry Pier numbers 9 and 10 could be designed in such a way that it could represent Hong Kong and attract the public and tourists. He suggested breaking the proposed groundscraper into smaller scale developments to enhance accessibility.

1.9 **The Presiding Chairman** thanked the representatives of PlanD, DHKHD and CE@H for their presentation.

Item 2 Presentation by Designing Hong Kong Harbour District on the KCRC Pier, Hong Wan Place, Hung Hom, Kowloon

2.1 **The Presiding Chairman** said that this presentation was related to DHKHD's rezoning application concerning the subject site. After declaring to the meeting that he was a member of the TPB, he continued to say that the TPB received the application on 4 May 2006 and published a newspaper notice on 12 May 2006 to inform the public of the receipt of the application and invite public comments. The deadline for making comments on the application was 2 June 2006. The case had been tentatively scheduled for consideration by the TPB on 4 August 2006. The application was being processed under

statutory TPB procedures. The purpose of this briefing was to provide Members with an opportunity to hear the submission and there was no need for the HEC to form a consensus view on it. Subsequent to this briefing, the HEC would neither form, nor submit to the TPB, any views on the application.

2.2 Upon invitation by the Presiding Chairman, **Messrs Paul Zimmerman and Ian Brownlee** of DHKHD presented on this submission.

2.3 After the presentation, **the Presiding Chairman** thanked the representatives of DHKHD for their presentation.

Item 3 Any other business

3.1 There being no other business, the briefing was adjourned at 5:00 pm.

**Harbour-front Enhancement Committee Secretariat
April 2007**