

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

## **Minutes of Nineteenth Meeting**

Date : 28 November 2007  
Time : 2:30 pm  
Venue : Conference Room  
15/F, North Point Government Offices  
333 Java Road, North Point

### **Present**

Mr Vincent Ng (Chairman)	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Dr Andrew Thomson	Representing Business Environment Council
Dr Alvin Kwok	Representing Conservancy Association
Mrs Mei Ng	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Kim Chan	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Mr Yu Kam-hung	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Dr Greg Wong	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Mason Hung	Representing Hong Kong Tourism Board
Mr Dennis Li	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour Limited
Mr Patrick Lau	
Ms Lydia Lam	Assistant Secretary (Planning) 3, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Ms Ava Chiu	Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport) 3, Transport and Housing Bureau
Mr Herbert Leung	Deputy Director (General), Lands Department (LandsD)
Mr Raymond WM Wong	Assistant Director/Territorial, Planning Department (PlanD)
Mr Peter Mok	Senior Engineer/Kowloon 2, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Mrs Ann Ho	Chief Executive Officer (2) 1, Home Affairs Department
Ms Sally Fong (Secretary)	Senior Town Planner/Sub-Regional 3, PlanD

### In Attendance

Miss Amy Yuen Principal Assistant Secretary (Planning and Lands) 2  
(Designate), DEVB

Mr Raymond Lee Chief Town Planner/Sub-regional, PlanD

#### For Item 4

Mr Larry Lee ) DEFI Group Asia Limited

Mr Christophe Thery )

Mr Stephen Ho ) CITIC Pacific Limited

Mr Derek Au )

#### For Item 5

Mr T S Lo Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)

Ms Tisa Ho ) Hong Kong Arts Festival Society

Mr Andy Yau )

Mr David Rule ) Serious Staging

Ms June Cheng )

#### For Item 6

Mr Andy Wong Centre of Architectural Research for Education, Elderly,  
Environment and Excellence Limited (CARE)

### Absent with Apologies

Mr Joseph Francis Wong Representing Citizen Envisioning @ Harbour

Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke

### Action

**Mr Raymond Wong** extended a welcome to all Members for attending the first meeting of the current term of the Sub-committee. He then introduced to Members Miss Amy Yuen, who would take over from Miss Wong Yuet-wah as the representative of DEVB at the Sub-committee and the Secretary of HEC from 3 December 2007 onwards.

#### **Item 1 Election of Chairman**

1.1 **Mr Raymond Wong** invited Members to elect the Chairman of the Sub-committee. **Mr Kim Chan** nominated Mr Vincent Ng to continue his Chairmanship for the current term of the Sub-committee. **Dr Alvin Kwok** seconded. There being no other nomination nor objection, Mr Vincent Ng was elected Chairman of the Sub-committee.

**Action**

- 1.2 **Mr Vincent Ng** thanked Members for their support and took over the Chairmanship.

**Item 2 Membership, Terms of Reference and Meeting Schedule of the Sub-committee (Paper No. 4/2007)**

- 2.1 **The Secretary** briefly introduced the Paper. She highlighted that the Terms of Reference (TOR) of the Sub-committee were proposed to be slightly revised as per Annex C of the Paper to better reflect the scope of the Sub-committee's work. While the Sub-committee would meet on a bi-monthly basis, special meetings could be arranged if necessary.
- 2.2 In response to the Chairman's question, **the Secretary** said that the scope of the proposed TOR was broadened to reflect the Sub-committee's work on providing input to harbour-front development proposals and promoting public engagement in the planning and design of harbour-front areas.
- 2.3 **Dr Alvin Kwok** proposed to revise "public involvement strategy" in specific task (c) to "public engagement strategy" for consistency. For task (d), he suggested to add "improvement" in addition to "planning and design" of the harbour-front areas.
- 2.4 Regarding the suggestion of adding "improvement" in task (d), noting that "enhancement projects" were covered in task (c), **Ms Lydia Lam** considered it not necessary to repeat such item in task (d). **Mr Kim Chan** said that the broad meaning of "planning and design" in task (d) would cover enhancement aspect. **Dr Alvin Kwok** had no objection to retaining the wording of task (d).
- 2.5 The meeting agreed to the proposed TOR at Annex C of the Paper, subject to the revision of "public involvement strategy" in specific task (c) to "public engagement strategy".
- 2.6 **The Chairman** invited Members to note the meeting schedule as set out in paragraph 4 of the Paper.

**Members  
to note**

**Item 3 Report on Progress of On-going Tasks of the Sub-committee (Paper No. 5/2007)**

- 3.1 **The Secretary** briefed Members on the Paper.
- 3.2 In addition to the on-going tasks covered in the Paper, **the Secretary** said that PlanD had presented the building height restrictions as incorporated in the draft North Point Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H8/20 at the last Sub-committee meeting on 27 June 2007. To

**Action**

follow up on the Sub-committee's decision, the Secretariat had conveyed Members' views on the building height restrictions to the Town Planning Board in August 2007.

**Inventory of Known Projects at Harbour-front**

- 3.3 An updated inventory list of known projects was tabled at the meeting. **The Secretary** highlighted the updated progress of 3 items (No. C6, NP2 and HH1) and the inclusion of a new item (No. WK3) in the inventory list.
- 3.4 **Dr Greg Wong** considered it difficult to provide comments on the known projects as sufficient details were not included in the inventory list. He asked how the Sub-committee would follow up on these projects.
- 3.5 **Mr Raymond Wong** said that the Sub-committee had previously agreed that, as part of the Harbour Plan Review, an inventory should be prepared to provide an overview of the on-going projects around the Harbour and to keep Members abreast of their progress. If necessary, individual project proponents could be invited to brief the Sub-committee on their development proposals. Members' views could also be conveyed to the relevant approving authorities for consideration.
- 3.6 **The Chairman** encouraged Members to bring up individual inventory items for discussion if necessary.
- 3.7 **Dr Greg Wong** suggested that, if possible, illustrative drawings of new items on the inventory list be provided to facilitate discussion by the Sub-committee.
- 3.8 **Dr Andrew Thomson** said that the inventory list could be used to identify opportunities for proactive enhancement.
- 3.9 **The Chairman** said that the site under Inventory Item No. HH1 had been zoned "O" for years and a proposal from the private sector to implement temporary landscaping on the site was discussed by the Sub-committee in 2005. However, the planned waterfront promenade had yet to be implemented. He considered it worthwhile for the Sub-committee to follow up on the matter. He proposed and Members agreed to invite CEDD to brief the Sub-committee on the greening initiatives under the Greening Master Plan in respect of the site. **CEDD**
- 3.10 In response to Dr Greg Wong's question, **Mr Raymond Lee** said that, according to the current programme, PlanD would present the

**Action**

District Plan proposals of the Hung Hom District Study to the Sub-committee at the next meeting.

**Item 4 Signage at the Rooftop of the Citic Tower (Paper No. 6/2007)**

- 4.1 **The Chairman** invited the project team to present the proposal.
- 4.2 **Messrs Larry Lee and Christophe Thery** of DEFI Group Asia Limited briefed Members on the proposed signage at the rooftop of Citic Tower as detailed in the Paper. Visual images illustrating the effect of the proposed signage during day and night time, and some outdoor advertising billboards operated by their company in other cities were shown at the meeting for Members' reference.

Specific Comments

- 4.3 **The Chairman** said that the main focus of the Sub-committee was on the impacts of the proposed signage on Victoria Harbour.
- 4.4 Specific comments/questions raised by Members on the proposed signage were as follows:
- (a) whether the proposed signage was a very special one;
  - (b) the type of illumination material, displaying time frame and construction cost of the proposed signage;
  - (c) whether the views to the ridgelines would be affected;
  - (d) the proposed signage consisted of lower and upper sections. This might set a precedent for other project proponents to increase the building height by decking up advertising signs on rooftops;
  - (e) the visual access of the hotel occupants behind the Citic Tower to the Harbour might be affected. Nearby hotel owners should be consulted;
  - (f) although advertising signage would help market the image of our city, the visual quality of the backside of the proposed signage might affect tourists' impression of Hong Kong and should be addressed;
  - (g) while it might not be possible to locate the proposed signage on the building façade as it was made up of glass curtain walls, the proposed signage would increase the height of the building. An appropriate scale of the proposed signage in

**Action**

relation to the subject building should be derived; and

- (h) energy efficiency of the advertising signage was a concern.

4.5 In response, **Messrs Larry Lee and Christophe They** made the following points:

- (a) the proposed signage was an ordinary one which was neither moveable nor having flash lighting;
- (b) the illumination material of the proposed signage had not yet been determined;
- (c) the displaying duration and cost of the proposed signage had yet to be worked out; and
- (d) Members' comments on the scale of the proposed signage, visual impact on the backward side of the signage and energy efficiency aspect would be considered in refining its design.

4.6 **The Chairman** noted from the presentation that the proposed signage would not affect the views to the ridgelines.

**General Issues**

4.7 **Dr Alvin Kwok** made the following points:

- (a) there was a general concern on the visual impact of advertising signs on both sides of the Harbour; and
- (b) the associated energy consumption should not be overlooked. Reducing carbon emission and discouraging activities of low energy efficiency were important in addressing global warming in the long term.

4.8 **Dr Andrew Thomson** had the following views:

- (a) maintaining visual access and stepping building height descending towards the Harbour were key principles to consider; and
- (b) though preferring advertising signage on building façades, he considered that each proposal should be assessed on its individual merits. It might be useful to develop certain criteria for considering such proposals after the Sub-committee gained more experiences.

**Action**

4.9 **Mr Patrick Lau** made the following points:

- (a) he was not comfortable with the existing practice of approving additional advertising signs after a building was developed;
- (b) Buildings Department (BD) should be invited to brief the Sub-committee on the procedure of approving advertising signs which had implications on building height, especially along the waterfront; and
- (c) how HEC would perform its advisory role in the building plan approval process was a concern.

4.10 **Mr Yu Kam-hung** said that building plan submissions were processed under the provisions of the Buildings Ordinance. He questioned the role played by HEC in considering that type of proposals.

4.11 In response to the Chairman's question, **Mr Raymond Lee** explained the current practices as follows:

- (a) unless otherwise specified, the maximum building height stipulated on OZPs generally referred to the height of the main roof of the buildings concerned;
- (c) HPPs and HPGs had been promulgated to relevant Government departments for considering development proposals around the Harbour. While building plans were to be considered in accordance with the provisions and requirements under the Buildings Ordinance, BD would remind project proponents to consult HEC on other possible harbour planning related issues; and
- (d) in the subject case, the project team had followed BD's advice to consult the Sub-committee and assured that Members' views would be taken account of in refining the design of the proposed signage.

4.12 **Mr Raymond Wong** added that the Sub-committee had adopted a consistent approach in dealing with advertising signage proposals from both public and private sectors. The Sub-committee had considered similar proposals on government properties previously such as those atop ferry piers, and Members' views were taken into consideration by the Government Property Agency in processing those proposals.

4.13 **The Chairman** asked Members to consider whether the

**Action**

Sub-committee should convey its views to BD or the project team.

4.14 **Dr Greg Wong** had the following views:

- (a) in the subject case, the project team was fully informed of Members' comments at the meeting and they had undertaken to improve the design of the proposed signage;
- (b) it was more appropriate for the Sub-committee to deal with the general issue of building plan approval separately, bearing in mind that the Buildings Ordinance would primarily focus on safety aspect of the structures concerned; and
- (c) more time would be required for the Sub-committee to develop its criteria for considering advertising signage proposals along the harbour-front which had wider implications for similar proposals.

4.15 **Mr Yu Kam-hung** pointed out that visual quality might not be addressed under the Buildings Ordinance.

4.16 **Dr Andrew Thomson** said that the criteria for considering advertising signage could be examined in the revision of HPGs in future.

4.17 **Mr Herbert Leung** said that the existing lease conditions governing this site contained an absolute restriction on building height and as the proposed signage would exceed this maximum building height restriction specified in the existing lease conditions, relaxation of the restriction in the lease conditions would be required to facilitate erection of the proposed signage. Whilst a number of Government departments might be responsible to give final approval on various aspects of the proposed signage under their respective purview of responsibilities, insofar as the aspect relating to lease conditions was concerned, Members' views relevant to consideration for the proposed relaxation of the building height restriction would be taken into account by LandsD at the lease modification stage when application had been received from the owners concerned.

4.18 **The Chairman** concluded the Sub-committee's views as follows:

- (a) the proposed signage would increase the overall height of the development. Though it would not affect the existing views to the ridgelines, visual access of the stakeholders behind the site to the Harbour might be affected and the concern on energy efficiency should be addressed; and



- (b) the Sub-committee noted that Members' comments would be taken account of by the project team in refining the design of the proposed signage and the Secretariat would convey the Sub-committee's views to all concerned Government departments to be involved in the approval process of the proposed signage, in particular, LandsD for consideration in processing any application received for relaxation of the building height restriction in the existing lease conditions.

[Post-meeting note: On 10 January 2008, the Secretary conveyed the Sub-committee's views to the relevant Government departments for reference.]

4.19 **The Chairman** thanked the project team for attending the meeting.

**Item 5 Proposed Temporary Land Allocation for Outdoor Theatre Performances "Zingaro-Battuta" at the Reclamation Site next to Hung Hom Ferry Pier**

- 5.1 **The Chairman** invited the project team to present the proposal.
- 5.2 **Mr T S Lo** of LCSD said that the project was a lead up event jointly presented by the Hong Kong Arts Festival Society (HKAFS) and the Hong Kong Jockey Club Charities Trust to arouse public interest in the Olympic Equestrian Events to be held in 2008 summer. With the support of the Consul-General of France, the Zingaro Equestrian Theatre was invited to conduct equestrian performances at the reclamation site near Hung Hom Ferry Pier for public enjoyment.
- 5.3 **Ms Tisa Ho** of HKAFS and **Ms June Cheng** of Serious Staging, the technical contractor, briefed Members on the project with the aid of powerpoint slides:
  - (a) the performance presented by Zingaro Equestrian Theatre, consisting of horse shows with music and different characters, would be full of fun and suitable for family enjoyment;
  - (b) to tie in with the programme of the Hong Kong Arts Festival, 32 equestrian performances (5 performances per week) would be conducted from 9 February to 23 March 2008. Tickets would be available for booking from mid December 2007;
  - (c) the site should be handed over to LCSD in late December 2007 for setting up the performance venue. Some tents (including a main tent (about 20m in height), 2 stable tents (about 10m in height) and a concession tent (about 6.4m in height)) would be set up alongside with some small-scale

**Action**

temporary structures within the site; and

- (d) meetings had been held with relevant Government departments. Issues relating to public safety, fire safety, transportation, horse's quarantine, hygiene and environmental aspects had been properly addressed.

5.4 **Mr Mason Hung** supported the proposal for the following reasons:

- (a) it was a world class event attracting tourists to Hong Kong;
- (b) the event could bring vibrancy to the harbour-front and enhance the image of our Harbour; and
- (c) the site had previously been used for the World Carnival and no significant nuisances had been caused to the neighbourhood. The site was suitable for holding similar events.

5.5 **Dr Alvin Kwok** had the following questions/views:

- (a) whether impact assessments on traffic, noise, sewerage, and solid waste treatment had been carried out;
- (b) whether the nearby residents had been consulted;
- (c) whether alternative locations had been considered; and
- (d) an environmentally friendly approach should be adopted, especially in preparing refreshments and souvenirs for the shows. As the event might attract overseas audience, opportunity could be taken to promote sustainable development by requesting compensatory planting for mileage consumption.

5.6 **Dr Andrew Thomson** said that the event would likely attract a huge audience. As the scale of the theatre and circulation area would be constrained by the area and configuration of the site, it might be necessary to meet the demand by extending the performance period or locating the theatre to other larger sites.

5.7 **Mrs Mei Ng** had the following views/question:

- (a) the equestrian performance was conducted within tents. Instead of selecting a harbour-front venue, the event could be held in Tin Shui Wai to boost the local economy there. Other venues of the Hong Kong Jockey Club should also be

considered;

- (b) the height of the main tent was rather high. Whether the tents would be recycled for future use; and
- (c) glare impact would be a concern if there were decorative spot lights during non-show time.

5.8 **Mr Kim Chan** asked the following questions:

- (a) whether public access to the adjacent waterfront promenade would be affected during the Christmas period; and
- (b) whether pier operation would be affected during the occupation period of the site.

5.9 In response, **Ms Tisa Ho** explained that:

- (a) the scale of the activity was much smaller than that of the previous World Carnival. The theatre could only accommodate 1,200 audiences for each show which would last for 90 minutes. Significant impacts on vehicular and pedestrian traffic were not envisaged;
- (b) waste management would be overseen by the Hong Kong Jockey Club;
- (c) sound monitors would be installed to ensure the noise level during show time would not exceed the acceptable standard;
- (d) the event was generally supported by local people including residents of Whampoa Garden;
- (e) alternative sites had been considered. The vacant land in West Kowloon Cultural District was served by limited public transport and other supporting facilities. The presence of an aviation ground for small aircrafts rendered the Kai Tak area not suitable for horse related activities. The subject site was considered the most suitable for the event as it was of an appropriate size at a convenient location served by buses and ferries;
- (f) the same tents were used by the performing company for performances all over the world;
- (g) no souvenirs would be given to the audience. Refreshments would be prepared and packed in an environmentally friendly

**Action**

manner;

- (h) only perimeter security lights would be switched on during non-show period; and
- (i) public access to the waterfront and pier operation would not be affected during the site occupation period. Only minor preparatory works (mainly grass cutting) would be carried out at the site during Christmas period.

5.10 **Dr Andrew Thomson** said that the scale of the event with an audience of 1,200 per show was reasonable. As the event offered a great opportunity to integrate the community, the project team should consider organising some activities during non-show time to let the public visit behind the scene and learn more about horse activities.

5.11 **The Chairman** concluded that the event could bring vibrancy to the Hung Hom waterfront and advised the project team to take account of Members' comments in preparing the event.

5.12 **Ms Tisa Ho** thanked Members for their comments and support to the project, and pointed out that HKAFS would organise other events in different locations during the Arts Festival for more people to enjoy.

**Item 6 Hung Hom District Study – Report on Stage 2 Public Engagement Programme (Paper No. 7/2007)**

6.1 **The Chairman** invited the representative of CARE to brief Members on the Paper.

6.2 With the aid of powerpoint slides, **Mr Andy Wong** gave a brief account of the public engagement activities carried out for the Hung Hom District Study and the outcome of the Stage 2 Public Engagement Programme (PEP) as set out in the Paper.

6.3 **Dr Andrew Thomson** asked the following questions:

- (a) the demographic profile and background of the participants of the PEP; and
- (b) the percentage of respondents who suggested plot ratios of 0 to 4.5 for the “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) and “Residential (Group A) 2” (“R(A)2”) sites.

6.4 **Dr Alvin Kwok** said that many issues raised during the Stage 2 PEP, like reduction of building height and provision of waterfront promenade, were similar to the public comments received before.

**Action**

The question was how to ensure that the PEP findings would be integrated into the Study outcome.

6.5 **Mr Kim Chan** had the following questions:

- (a) in addition to local residents, whether hotel occupants and commercial operators had been consulted; and
- (b) whether street interviews had been carried out.

6.6 **Mrs Mei Ng** enquired the followings:

- (a) whether there were any indications on the preferable types of public space; and
- (b) the ratio between development and greenery areas within the Study area.

6.7 In response, **Mr Andy Wong** made the following points:

- (a) a total of 565 valid feedback forms had been received. As the nature of the Study was a district review, majority of the feedback forms were from local residents. A breakdown of the demographic profile and background of the respondents was included in the Working Paper on the Stage 2 PEP;
- (b) apart from the feedback forms, some local concern groups / District Councillors had conducted their own surveys and passed their findings to CARE for reference. There were also written comments from KCRC and other individuals;
- (c) the general comment of reducing development density was repeatedly made at various public engagement activities, but there was no particular record on the number of respondents opting for a particular plot ratio. According to the findings of the local surveys, some 1,000 respondents were against any development on the “CDA” and “R(A)2” sites; and
- (d) for the preferable types of public space, suggestions including community hall, open space and pets garden were raised at various public engagement activities.

6.8 **Mr Raymond Wong** recapped the study approach and the public engagement arrangement as follows:

- (a) according to the Comprehensive Public Engagement Strategy endorsed by the Sub-committee, a 2-stage PEP would be

**Action**

carried out;

- (b) Stage 1 PEP was carried out before formulation of the draft District Plan proposals to identify the major issues to be addressed in the Study. Draft District Plan proposals were then formulated having regard to the public comments received. The purpose of Stage 2 PEP was to collect public views on the draft proposals for refinement of the District Plan as appropriate; and
- (c) major public views on reducing development intensity and increasing open space provision would be duly considered by the Study consultants.

6.9 **Mr Raymond Lee** pointed out the followings:

- (a) not all the public views received were against development. The crux was to determine a reasonable level of development while meeting the community's aspiration for more public and greenery space; and
- (b) CARE had prepared a Working Paper summarising the findings of the Stage 2 PEP, which would be issued for Members' reference in due course.

[Post-meeting note : The Working Paper on Stage 2 PEP was circulated to Members on 14 December 2007. No comments had been received from Members.]

6.10 **Mr Patrick Lau** said that apart from the local residents in Hung Hom, the visual impacts of the land use proposals on other districts such as Island East should also be considered.

6.11 **The Chairman** said that PlanD intended to brief the Sub-committee on the final District Plan proposals at the next meeting.

**PlanD**

**Item 7 Any Other Business**

7.1 A letter dated 16 October 2007 from 明愛莫張瑞勤社區中心社區大使隊爭取地鐵西移與城市規劃行動組 (the Action Group) regarding the land use planning of the harbour-front areas in Central and Western District was tabled at the meeting.

7.2 **The Chairman** said that, at the HEC meeting on 17 October 2007, the HEC Chairman requested the Sub-committee to consider the letter.

**Action**  
**Secretariat**

7.3 He continued to state that the objective to enhance the harbour-front of the Central and Western District for public enjoyment as advocated by the Action Group was in line with the Sub-committee's vision. He suggested and Members agreed that the Secretariat would reply to the Action Group and forward its letter to relevant Government departments for reference.

[Post-meeting note : On 29 November 2007, the Secretary replied to the Action Group to reflect the Sub-committee's views and forwarded the Action Group's letter to relevant Government departments for reference.]

7.4 In connection with the Action Group's proposal on harbour-front enhancement of the Central and Western District, **Dr Andrew Thomson** raised concerns on the time frame for commencing other district review studies after completion of the Hung Hom District Study. He considered that a work plan of the Sub-committee for this term was required. His view was shared by **Mr Patrick Lau**.

7.5 **Mr Raymond Wong** said that although a comprehensive review of the Western District harbour-front areas had yet to commence, there was active planning in some parts of this harbour-front. This included the latest planning proposals from Shun Tak Centre to the Western Wholesale Food Market, which were presented to the Sub-committee by PlanD in September 2006. As the Hung Hom District Study was expected to complete in early 2008, PlanD was now considering the time frame for other district review studies and the Sub-committee would be briefed on the matter in due course.

7.6 **The Chairman** pointed out that the community would benefit more if some harbour-front sites could be made available for public enjoyment, even on a temporary basis pending review or development of permanent uses.

7.7 **Mr Patrick Lau** echoed that LandsD should consider converting temporary car parks at waterfront into open space for public enjoyment. The Sub-committee could also identify quick-win enhancement projects for discussion.

7.8 **Dr Alvin Kwok** said that a site visit might be useful in identifying quick-win enhancement projects.

7.9 **The Chairman** pointed out that funding support was a pre-requisite for harbour-front enhancement and urged that the Government should provide more funding support for identifying and implementing quick-win harbour-front enhancement projects for public enjoyment.

**Action**

7.10 There being no other business, the meeting closed at 5:30pm.

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