

**21st Meeting of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee
held at 2:15 pm on 10 June 2008
at 15/F, North Point Government Offices, 333 Java Road, Hong Kong**

Minutes of Meeting

Present

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Prof Lee Chack-fan | Chairman |
| Dr Andrew Thomson | Representing Business Environment Council |
| Dr Sujata Govada | Representing Citizen Envisioning@Harbour |
| Dr Alvin Kwok | Representing Conservancy Association (CE@H) |
| Mr Vincent Ng | Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects |
| Mr Kim Chan | Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners |
| Mr Yu Kam-hung | Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors |
| Ir Dr Greg Wong | Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers |
| Ms Priscilla Poon | Representing Hong Kong Tourism Board |
| Mr Paul Zimmerman | Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour Limited (SPH) |
| Mr Jimmy Kwok | |
| Mr Raymond Young | Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands) |
| Ms Sharon Ho | Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport)5, Transport and Housing Bureau (THB) |
| Mrs Ava Ng | Director of Planning |
| Mr Herbert Leung | Deputy Director of Lands (General) |
| Mr C K Hon | Project Manager/Hong Kong Island and Islands, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) |
| Miss Amy Yuen | Secretary |

In Attendance

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| Mrs Susan Mak | Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, Development Bureau (DEVB) |
| Ms Lydia Lam | Assistant Secretary (Planning)3, DEVB |
| Mr Raymond Wong | Assistant Director of Planning/Territorial |
| Mr Peter Mok | Senior Engineer(2)/Kowloon, CEDD |

For Item 1A

| | |
|------------------|------------------------------|
| Mr Fred Brown | Harbour Business Forum (HBF) |
| Mr Chapman Lam | HBF |
| Dr Sujata Govada | HBF |

Mr Ian Brownlee HBF
Mr Mike Bains HBF
Ms Ciara Shannon HBF

For Item 1B

Mr Albert Lai The Professional Commons (TPC)
Mr Jeffrey Au TPC

For Item 5

Mr Eric Yue District Planning Officer/Kowloon
Miss Helen So Senior Town Planner(5)/Kowloon, Planning
Department (PlanD)

For Item 6

Mr P Y Tam Assistant Director of Planning/Technical
Services
Mr Kevin Li Senior Architect, Architectural Services
Department (ArchSD)
Ms Doris Wu Project Manager, ArchSD

Absent with Apologies

Prof Wong Sze-chun Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics
and Transport in Hong Kong
Prof Carlos Lo Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Leslie Chen Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape
Architects
Mr Louis Loong Representing Real Estate Developers
Association of Hong Kong
Mr Nicholas Brooke
Dr Anissa Chan
Mr David Ho
Mr Michael Hui
Mr Patrick Lau
Mr Samuel Mok
Mr Derrick Pang
Ms Margaret Hsia Assistant Director(2), Home Affairs
Department

Action

Welcoming message

The Chairman welcomed all attending the twenty-first meeting of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC).

Item 1 HEC briefing

1.1 **The Chairman** said that the purpose of the briefing was to provide Members with an opportunity to hear the submissions. Like previous briefings, there was no need for the HEC to form a consensus view on the presentations.

A. Briefings by HBF

I. Sustainable Transport Opportunities for the Harbourfront

II. Harbourfront Connectivity Study

1.2 **The Chairman** welcomed Mr Fred Brown, Mr Chapman Lam, Dr Sujata Govada, Mr Ian Brownlee, Mr Mike Bains and Ms Ciara Shannon of HBF. He noted that Dr Govada was an alternate member of the HEC representing CE@H. **Mr Brown** presented a PowerPoint on the first item and **Dr Govada, Mr Bains and Mr Brownlee** presented another on the second.

1.3 **Ir Dr Greg Wong** suggested that HBF could consider a presentation in future on both conservation and development of the harbourfront. **Mr Jimmy Kwok** said that areas fenced-off by Lands Department (LandsD) should be opened up to the public whenever possible and that connectivity from Tai Kok Tsui to Sham Shui Po could be improved in the long term. He also stressed the importance of sustainable development of the harbourfront for economic activities.

1.4 On the recommendations on the six areas presented by HBF, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the Government departments involved should consider a concreted approach when implementing the proposal. He was pleased to see that HBF had not suggested to take away the Yau Ma Tei Typhoon Shelter (YMTTS) but suggested that more activities should be arranged there. He enquired about the possibility of providing tram service as a mode of transport along the waterfront to take people around the Central Piers, Tamar and Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre, the way to implement the harbour hopper idea, and how to improve pedestrian connectivity between the different

modes of transport in Kowloon, Central and Tamar. He also asked what HBF would consider as missing from the pedestrian network in Hong Kong and asked which Government departments were looking at the problems.

1.5 In reply to Ir Dr Wong, **Mr Brownlee** said that there were ways to accommodate facilities which were required to be located on the waterfront. In reply to Mr Kwok, **Mr Brownlee** said that if there were business activities along the harbourfront, they could attract people to the harbourfront in a sustainable way.

1.6 Instead of removing activities, **Dr Govada** suggested introducing more activities, including the creation of more job opportunities along the waterfront. She suggested that open space along the harbourfront should be implemented progressively. She agreed that Sham Shui Po could be considered as the next area for connectivity enhancement other than the six areas selected in the Harbourfront Connectivity Study. **Ms Shannon** said that the vision behind the Harbourfront Connectivity Study was to provide a continuous cycle track and promenade along both waterfronts in Hong Kong and Kowloon. In response to Mr Zimmerman, **Mr Brown** said that whilst technically it was feasible to include a tramway network in the reclamation area, connection with the existing tramway and integration with the planning of the reclamation area would not be easy. The proposed harbour hopper could take many forms including a single ticket system enabling multiple rides on different Star Ferry routes or services provided by other ferry operators. Some of the existing public piers/landing steps would also need to be enhanced. It should be noted that cross-harbour ferry services had become less important because of cross-harbour bus and train services.

1.7 **Mr Raymond Young** expressed appreciation for HBF's presentations. He said that PlanD had completed the Hung Hom District Study, was undertaking the Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (UDS) and would soon launch the Hong Kong Island East Harbour-front Study (HKIEHS). Given the proposed relocation of a number of operators in the Kwun Tong public cargo working area, opportunity would be taken to provide a promenade in the area. DEVB was working on some well-considered, technically feasible and practicable harbourfront enhancement initiatives and would work with other Government

departments to identify both longer-term and quick-win projects to enhance the harbourfront for discussion with the Harbour Plan Review Sub-committee (HPR Sub-com). He remarked that the harbour-hopper plan would depend on whether potential operators saw a business case for such services. The proposed tramway should be very carefully designed in order not to conflict with pedestrian movement and what had been recommended in the UDS was an environmentally-friendly mode of transport for sight-seeing purpose. The recommendations in HBF's report on Sustainable Transport Opportunities for the Harbourfront had to be considered in the context of transport policies in Hong Kong, which were under THB's jurisdiction. As regards the second study, i.e., the Harbourfront Connectivity Study, **Mr Young** welcomed the suggestion of a boardwalk under the Island Eastern Corridor which would be further considered under the HKIEHS, having regard to the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance. Cycle tracks along the typhoon shelter in West Kowloon and the Heng Fa Chuen elevated walkway were attractive propositions, but their feasibility and the implementation details would need to be examined further. He said that LandsD had to fence off areas against vandalism before any long-term or short-term uses were identified. Incompatible uses along the harbourfront could be considered for removal as long as alternative sites were identified. He welcomed the proposals and looked forward to working closely together with HEC and other organizations to facilitate implementation.

1.8 **The Chairman** thanked the representatives of HBF for their presentations and exchange of views with Members.

B. Briefings by TPC

- I. "A West Kowloon for the People" Research Report on the West Kowloon Cultural District Development**
- II. Reconstructing Urbanscape Development Strategies of the HK "Secondary City Centre" and the HK Section of the Hi-speed National Rail Network in the context of harbourfront enhancement**

1.9 **The Chairman** welcomed Messrs Albert Lai and Jeffrey Au of TPC. **Mr Lai** presented both items with PowerPoint.

1.10 On TPC's first item related to West Kowloon, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** supported TPC's ideas that pedestrian and promenade activities, including cycling, should be at ground level. In respect of the second item, he supported the idea of decentralizing commercial development.

1.11 **Mr Yu Kam-hung** was concerned about the practicality of establishing a "Secondary City Centre" in Hong Kong, having regard to the demand for such and the need for ancillary facilities to support it. On the proposed cycle track in West Kowloon, he enquired how it would be operated in the context of cycle links with other districts and the provision of bicycle parking. **Mr Lai** said that TPC was not proposing to remove the city centre to the New Territories, but to establish a "Secondary City Centre", the concept of which was to provide a framework for further thought on developing a commercial hub connecting to and serving cities of the Mainland. On the proposed West Kowloon cycle track, TPC was of the view that it could be extended to Jordan and Tai Kok Tsui, whilst a free bicycle parking area could be provided in Kowloon Park or near the golf club in West Kowloon.

1.12 **Dr Andrew Thomson** said that continuous integration with the Mainland might influence the development pattern in Hong Kong, which in turn could provide further harbourfront enhancement opportunities. The WKCD project also had development issues which were related to the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines, like green buildings on the waterfront. For the proposed cycle track, there was a need to look beyond the confines of the site itself so as to link it with other activities in Hong Kong.

1.13 **Mr Jimmy Kwok** said that the main issue of TPC's second item did not fall within the terms of reference of the HEC. For the first item, he enquired whether people travelling on the proposed moving walkways in WKCD could enjoy the scenery of the harbour during inclement weather, and how the walkway system would be repaired and maintained.

1.14 In response to Mr Kowk's concern about noise pollution and energy cost of goods transportation, **Mrs Ava Ng** said that the Hong Kong section of the Express Rail Link was designed for passenger transport and would be built underground. It would

link with the national and regional railway systems in the Mainland and provide centre-to-centre transport service for business travel. The alternative location of the terminus at a distance from the city centre, thus requiring a further connection to the business centre, would undermine the purpose of the hi-speed passenger rail. It would be unattractive to business travellers.

1.15 In response to Mrs Ng, **Mr Albert Lai** said that the new railway terminus in Guangzhou would be in Shibi which was situated 20km away from the existing city centre. The purpose of locating the new terminus there was to promote Shibi as a new development zone. TPC's proposal to relocate the Hong Kong terminus to Kam Sheung Road could have the same advantage of maximizing the development potential of the surrounding areas of the new terminus. In reply to Dr Thomson's question on the revenue implications, **Mr Lai** said that TPC had provided some assessments which showed that even with the reduction in the gross floor area for residential use, the model could still be viable.

1.16 **The Chairman** thanked the representatives of TPC for their presentation and discussion with Members.

Item 2 Confirmation of minutes of the 20th meeting

2.1 **The Chairman** said that the Secretariat circulated the draft minutes of the 20th meeting to Members on 5 June and received Mr Paul Zimmerman's comments on 6 June 2008. **Mr Zimmerman** considered that Members should be provided with at least a week to comment on the draft minutes and agenda. **The Chairman** said that the draft minutes should be amended for clarity and factual accuracy. For items without any action decided at the meeting, it would not be appropriate to add it into the minutes. **The Chairman** suggested that Mr Zimmerman could propose amendments to the draft minutes after the meeting. Matters that had not been dealt with or discussed at the meeting could be followed up through other means. **The Secretary** explained that para. 1.2 of the draft minutes was under the HEC briefing and record of a briefing normally was left as such. Nonetheless, the Secretariat had conveyed in this case the suggestion to Tourism Commission (TC) and Highways Department (HyD) and would report their response in due course. If Members had specific issues to raise on the Kai Tak

Development or Wan Chai Development Phase II Review, these could be included in the agenda of subsequent meetings. For other suggestions, the Secretariat would go over the audio record and revise the minutes if appropriate. **The Chairman** suggested that **the Secretariat** should consult Mr Zimmerman on the amendments before confirming the minutes at the next meeting.

Secretariat

Item 3 Progress reports from the three Sub-committee/Task Groups (Paper Nos. 10-12/2008)

A. HPR Sub-com (Paper No. 10/2008)

3.1 **Mr Vincent Ng** presented the progress report.

3.1.1 **Mr Ng** reported that the HPR Sub-com had been briefed on a proposed gas station on the To Kwa Wan waterfront. The Sub-committee suggested that the proponent should explore the possibility of further setback to allow for a wider waterfront promenade. Moreover, an integrated design for the proposed gas station and the adjoining harbourfront area, with more greening and landscape treatment, should be considered.

3.1.2 The HPR Sub-com had also discussed and raised no objection to the proposed outfall of Tsuen Wan Drainage Tunnel. It suggested that the proponent should consider pedestrian connectivity to and along the waterfront, and ensure satisfactory implementation of the landscape plan to minimize visual impacts of the proposed outfall.

3.1.3 **Mr Ng** further reported that the HPR Sub-com had been briefed on the proposed redevelopment of the Victoria Park Swimming Pool Complex. Members raised concern about the height and massing of the proposed redevelopment in a park setting and considered that more greenery should be provided. They also suggested that the roof of the proposed swimming pool complex be provided with a viewing platform/observation deck with sitting out area, landscape plantings and catering facilities.

3.1.4 The HPR Sub-com also discussed the Hong

Kong Cyclo-cross Challenge 2008 and generally supported the event as it would bring vibrancy to the West Kowloon waterfront.

3.1.5 PlanD briefed the HPR Sub-com on the building height restrictions incorporated into the draft Tsim Sha Tsui OZP. The Sub-committee supported the stepped height design but considered that urban design issues were multi-faceted which could not be fully dealt with by building height control alone. There were specific discussions on the need for 3D illustrative materials to demonstrate the visual impact, the gross floor area assumptions in the fully developed scenario, and the need for setback requirement for sites abutting narrow streets, etc.

3.1.6 PlanD also briefed the HPR Sub-com on the proposed study framework of HKIEHS, which was expected to commence in late 2008, as part of the overall Harbour Plan Review. The proposed study framework was supported by the Sub-committee. Suggestions on public engagement and scope of the study (such as cycling facilities, quick-win projects, study boundary and connectivity and integration with other districts) were discussed.

3.2 **Dr Andrew Thomson** suggested that the Inventory on Known (Planned and Proposed) Projects at Harbourfront could be made available to Sub-committee Members well before the meeting or uploaded onto the website. **Mrs Ava Ng** agreed to consider the suggestion.

PlanD

B. Task Group on Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (TGUDS) (Paper No. 11/2008)

3.3 **The Chairman** noted at that point that the meeting no longer had its quorum. Members could carry on the discussion without making any decision. **Ir Dr Greg Wong** presented the progress report. He reported that while no Task Group meeting had been held during the reporting period, Members had been consulted by circulation on the draft phone poll questionnaire. A Focus Group Workshop (FGW) and a Community Engagement Forum (CEF) were held on 26 April and 24 May 2008. He

presided as chairman of the FGW and CEF. Five members of the Task Group served as Group Leaders in the group discussions during the two events. The FGW was attended by about 50 participants from the relevant professional institutes and academic institutions. The CEF was attended by about 140 participants including those from the relevant stakeholders, professional institutes, academic institutions, public bodies, and members of the public. He was of the view that the atmosphere in the two events was good and public engagement organized in the past had been fruitful.

3.4 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that according to para. 3.6 of the draft minutes of the last meeting, it had been clarified that the delay of Road P2 was only an issue if Queen's Pier would be re-assembled as soon as possible. He pointed out that the claim that Road P2 would be delayed had not been clearly explained at the CEF. The case as had been presented by the Administration would lead to a pre-determined outcome of the discussion. He objected to that process.

3.5 **Dr Sujata Govada** said that she was present at the FWG. Some participants had asked why they had been given limited choices. There had also been questions as to whether Road P2 could be changed and the response was that this matter was beyond the scope of the Study.

3.6 **Dr Andrew Thomson** said that while there was much consensus, there was a need to get down to the specifics and focus on the differences objectively. **Mr Vincent Ng**, who was a facilitator at both the FGW and CEF, said that there had not been enough time for participants to exchange views and that the consultants could have provided more input in facilitating the discussions. **Ir Dr Wong** shared the view that the schedules were tight and considered that more time could be given to each session. **Mrs Ava Ng** thanked Members for their assistance at the FGW and CEF. Unlike the Kai Tak Planning Review which had been conducted for a green field site and where greater opportunities were allowed for envisioning, the UDS was to focus on the urban design issues within a planning framework. **Ir Dr Wong** supplemented that, compared with professional facilitators in public engagement activities, HEC Members would have the advantage of being familiar with the background of the development.

3.7 **Mr Zimmerman** said that the options relating to Queen's Pier put forward to the public had been limited. The option of delaying the re-assembly of Queen's Pier had been excluded. SPH was supporting a public forum on the Central waterfront to be held on 21 June 2008 and Members were invited to attend. On Road P2, **Mr C K Hon** said that as he had already explained at the last meeting, the two concepts related to Queen's Pier on pages 28 and 29 of the consultation digest were made on the same premise that Queen's Pier would be re-assembled as soon as possible. To clarify any possible doubt, the same message had been clearly spelt out at the FGW and also during the consultation with the Central & Western DC. As regards the proposal of constructing Road P2 as designed and abandoning it after a few years when a new Road P2 was built for the re-assembly of Queen's Pier at its original location, there would be abortive and additional costs together with environmental considerations.

C. Task Group on Management Model for the Harbourfront (TGMMH) (Paper No. 12/2008)

3.8 In his capacity as Chairman of the TGMMH, **Prof Lee Chack-fan** presented the progress report.

3.8.1 **Prof Lee** reported that Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) had briefed the Task Group on the management mode of the Avenue of Stars, West Kowloon Waterfront Promenade, Wan Chai Waterfront Promenade and Tsing Yi Promenade. LCSD agreed to share its experience in managing waterfront promenades with the HPR Sub-com to facilitate the Sub-committee's consideration of quick-win projects in future if required.

3.8.2 **Prof Lee** informed the meeting that the Task Group had discussed suggestions from Members on places and harbour authorities/agents to be visited. PlanD and some Members would further consider the matter and suggest to the Task Group a short list of places and harbour authorities/agents that could be visited.

3.8.3 **Prof Lee** reported that the Task Group had also

discussed a paper on current harbourfront management issues submitted by Mr Zimmerman. The Task Group noted that management issues had been discussed at the HPR Sub-com and major issues could be discussed at the main Committee. The Task Group noted that DEVB would brief the HPR Sub-com on progress of possible quick-win projects at the next Sub-committee meeting.

3.8.4 For the next Task Group meeting, the relevant Bureau/Department or management agents would be invited to brief the Task Group on the management mode of local non-harbourfront public-private partnership of the Jockey Club Creative Arts Centre (賽馬會創意藝術中心) and the Chi Lin Nunnery Nan Lian Garden (志蓮淨苑南蓮園池).

3.9 **Mr Zimmerman** said that given the restrictions, i.e., the Pleasure Grounds Regulations which LCSD had to comply with, the HEC and its Sub-committee/Task Groups should be careful with zoning any waterfront areas as “Open Space”.

Item 4 Matters arising

A. Directional signage (para. 1.2 of the draft minutes of the twentieth meeting)

4.1 **The Chairman** said that the Secretariat had referred the suggestion to improve directional signage to the harbourfront to TC and HyD for consideration.

B. Quick-win projects (para. 1.4 of the draft minutes of the twentieth meeting)

4.2 **The Chairman** noted that DEVB would liaise with relevant departments to brief the HPR Sub-com on possible quick-win projects at the next Sub-committee meeting.

C. Environment Bureau’s (ENB) views on Members’ comments (para. 3.2 of the draft minutes of the twentieth meeting)

4.3 Upon the Chairman’s invitation, **the Secretary** reported

Environmental Protection Department's (EPD) response as follows -

- an important objective of protecting people from noise impacts was to enable quality sleep and maintain effective communication for activities such as teaching as well as sustain a quiet environment for places used for a specific purpose, e.g., auditorium. Therefore, pedestrians were not normally classified as sensitive receivers in noise impact assessments. This was the common practice in all places and authorities known to ENB/EPD; and
- for projects with potential environmental impacts, the concerned project proponents would assess the environmental impacts with the support of relevant environmental professionals. The project proponent should be able to help the HPR Sub-com understand and consider the environmental issues. However, for projects with major environmental concerns and if the HEC considered necessary, representatives from EPD could attend the discussions.

Item 5 Amendments to the Draft Cha Kwo Ling, Yau Tong, Lei Yue Mun OZP No. S/K15/15 (Paper No. 13/2008)

5.1 **The Chairman** said that the amendments to the subject draft OZP were published on 23 May 2008 and the plan exhibition would expire on 13 June 2008. Normally, cases like this would be considered by the HPR Sub-com. Since no HPR Sub-com meeting was scheduled before 13 June 2008, PlanD proposed, as a special arrangement, that this item be discussed by the HEC.

5.2 **The Chairman** welcomed Mr Eric Yue and Miss Helen So of PlanD. **Mr Yue** presented his PowerPoint.

5.3 **Mr Vincent Ng** asked why height restrictions for "G/IC" sites had not been relaxed. **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that a couple of sites along the waterfront were obstacles to connectivity, including a ventilation building site, and a "G/IC" site along the waterfront in the Yau Tong Industrial Area. He suggested the height restrictions be reviewed with reference to site coverage, plot ratio and increase of open space at street level. For the Yau Tong Industrial Area, **Mr Zimmerman** asked whether setback for

developments was considered.

5.4 **Dr Alvin Kwok** enquired about the rationale for the height restriction of 120mPD and whether 149mPD was the reference point. **Dr Sujata Govada** asked whether 3D modeling with the plot ratio kept constant had been done, and if so, what the resultant urban form was. She noted that the width of the Yau Tong Bay promenade was 15m, and considered it more appropriate to extend it to 30m in areas with future development. It would be difficult to agree to some height bands without corresponding changes in plot ratios or for an area where there were no height restrictions for some parts.

5.5 In response to Mr Ng, **Mr Yue** said that “G/IC” sites were planned for the provision of “G/IC” facilities which were usually low-rise and could serve as visual relief and breathing space among other private developments. Hence, building height restrictions for “G/IC” sites were imposed mainly to reflect the existing building height of the specific use. For redevelopment of “G/IC” sites, according to the notes of the relevant OZPs, the applicant could submit a planning application for a minor relaxation of the height restriction to the Town Planning Board (TPB). If the relaxation was not minor in nature, a section 12A application for amendment to the plan could be submitted to the TPB for consideration. In reply to Mr Zimmerman, **Mr Yue** said that the site had been occupied by an existing ventilation building and was zoned “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Eastern Harbour Crossing Ventilation Building”. Setback requirements for individual sites had been incorporated into the relevant Outline Development Plan. In reply to Dr Kwok, **Mr Yue** said that the height restriction of 120mPD was set having regard to the existing building heights ranging from 132mPD to 160mPD of the residential blocks in Yau Tong Estate behind the site. As the site was zoned “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”), a planning brief would be prepared to guide future development. Requirements of a stepped building height profile and a public waterfront promenade would be included in the planning brief. The developer would be required to submit a Master Layout Plan (MLP) in respect of the “CDA” to the TPB for approval. The developer would also need to submit the air ventilation and visual impact assessments and other technical assessments for the consideration of the TPB. The public could provide their views on the proposed

development when the section 16 application for the MLP submission was published in the newspaper inviting for public comments. Currently the building height in the area would decrease from 140mPD down to 80mPD along the waterfront with a stepped height interval of 20mPD. In response to Dr Govada, **Mr Yue** said that PlanD had undertaken a planning assessment which included photomontages showing the proposed building height profile for the consideration of the TPB. As regards the public waterfront promenade, a width of 20m was planned. In view of site constraints and to allow design flexibility, a minimum width of 15m was considered acceptable, but the total area should not be less than 24,700m². A width of 30m was not the norm and the width of the proposed promenade in the adjacent Kai Tak area was also 20m as shown on the Kai Tak OZP.

5.6 **Mr Jimmy Kwok** suggested that the promenade should be extended to the Sam Ka Tsuen Typhoon Shelter (SKTTS), which would benefit tourism. He proposed that the height restrictions for the “G/IC” zones should be relaxed. **Mr Yue** said that the area along the waterfront of the Yau Tong Industrial Area was zoned “CDA”, the development of which would require submission of an MLP to the TPB for approval. The requirement of a promenade would be included in the planning brief to guide the future development of the “CDA” and the preparation of the MLP. The extended promenade to the SKTTS had not been included in the current round of amendments but could be incorporated in future. He added that it might be difficult to specify a height restriction catering for future redevelopments of the “G/IC” sites which were not anticipated or had no known/definite redevelopment programme at the moment.

5.7 **Mr Ng** said that there appeared to be different criteria in imposing height restrictions between “G/IC” sites and private developments. **Dr Kwok** said that the increase in population in an area would increase the demand for “G/IC” facilities. The height restriction of “G/IC” sites should be relaxed to accommodate additional facilities when needed in the future. **Mrs Ava Ng** said that sufficient land had already been reserved to cater for expansion of “G/IC” facilities due to population change. Sites reserved for the provision of “G/IC” facilities also served the function of visual relief and breathing space. Redevelopments of these “G/IC” facilities could be effected through a section 16 or a section 12A application. She noted Mr Ng’s comments and said

that flexibility was allowed for “G/IC” redevelopment as and when necessary.

5.8 **The Chairman** thanked the representatives of PlanD for their presentation and discussion with the HEC.

Item 6 A Permanent Planning and Infrastructure Exhibition Gallery at the City Hall Annex (Paper No. 14/2008)

6.1 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested to defer this item to the TGUDS for deliberation, given that the location of the Gallery fell within the UDS. He said that he had received an email from an architect who had participated in the design of the City Hall Complex saying there was demand for more space for such a Gallery. He recommended looking for another site along the Central harbourfront. **The Chairman** said that the representatives of PlanD and ArchSD had been ready for the presentation. He considered it appropriate for the item to be discussed as scheduled.

6.2 **The Chairman** welcomed Mr P Y Tam of PlanD and Mr Kevin Li and Ms Doris Wu of ArchSD. With the aid of PowerPoint, **Mr Tam** proceeded with his presentation on the planning context and **Mr Li** on the architectural design.

6.3 **Dr Andrew Thomson** said that planning galleries overseas were relatively large and asked if there was a need for the Gallery to be located on the waterfront. **Mr Vincent Ng** agreed to the location of the Gallery. Given the historical value of City Hall and its good design, he considered that the design of the new Gallery should match with that of City Hall and harmony with the surroundings should be maintained.

6.4 In reply to Dr Thomson, **Mr Tam** said that the size of the new Gallery, which was basically a renovation of the Annex structure, was about 4,000m², which was comparable with those in Singapore (4,000m²), Manchester (4,500m²) and Sydney (1,000m²). He remarked that the City Hall Annex was situated at a convenient location and easily accessible by public transport. The permanent Gallery would be connected to the new harbourfront to its north by a pedestrian footbridge network.

6.5 In response to Mr Ng’s comment on the design of the

Gallery, **Mr Li** said that the original architect of the City Hall Annex had been consulted on the new approach to renovating the Gallery. The City Hall Annex was built to the same height as the City Hall Low Block. The materials used for the new Gallery would match with those of City Hall. ArchSD would try to enhance the original features of the building through a new design, which would incorporate up-to-date sustainable development concepts.

6.6 **The Chairman** thanked representatives of PlanD and ArchSD for their presentations and exchange of views with Members.

Item 7 Any other business

Date of next meeting

7.1 **The Chairman** said that the next meeting would be held on 20 August 2008 in the afternoon.

(Post-meeting note: In light of the schedule of the Chairman, the next meeting has been advanced to 18 August 2008 afternoon.)

7.2 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:45 pm.

**Harbour-front Enhancement Committee Secretariat
August 2008**