

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

Minutes of Twentieth Meeting

Date : 23 January 2008
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
Mr Joseph Francis Wong	Representing Citizen Envisioning @ Harbour
Dr Alvin Kwok	Representing Conservancy Association
Mrs Mei Ng	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Kim Chan	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Mr Peter Wong	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Mason Hung	Representing Hong Kong Tourism Board
Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke	
Mr Patrick Lau	
Miss Amy Yuen	Principal Assistant Secretary (Planning and Lands) 2, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Herbert Leung	Deputy Director (General), Lands Department (LandsD)
Mr Raymond WM Wong	Assistant Director/Territorial, Planning Department (PlanD)
Ms Ying Fun-fong	Chief Engineer/Transport Planning, Transport Department
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

Ms Lydia Lam Assistant Secretary (Planning) 3, DEVB
Mr Raymond Lee Chief Town Planner/Sub-regional, PlanD

Absent with Apologies

Mr Yu Kam-hung Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr Hardy Lok Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour Limited

Action

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 19th meeting

1.1 The draft minutes of the 19th meeting held on 28 November 2007 were circulated to Members on 27 December 2007. The meeting confirmed the minutes without amendments.

Item 2 Matters Arising

Greening Initiatives in respect of Hung Hom waterfront promenade
(para. 3.9 of the minutes of the 19th meeting)

2.1 **The Secretary** reported that detailed design of the greening works under the Greening Master Plan in respect of the Hung Hom harbour-front areas was underway and CEDD would brief the Sub-committee on the greening initiatives in respect of the Hung Hom waterfront promenade at the next meeting.

Hung Hom District Study (para. 6.11 of the minutes of the 19th meeting)

2.2 **The Secretary** said that PlanD would brief the Sub-committee on the findings and recommendations of the Study under agenda Item 10.

Inventory of Known Projects at Harbour-front

2.3 An updated inventory list of known projects was tabled at the meeting.

2.4 **The Secretary** highlighted that a new item (No. WHK2) had been included in the inventory list. The project proponents of Items No. WC5 and NP2 would present their proposals to the Sub-committee at this meeting.

Action

Declaration of Interest

- 2.5 **The Chairman** noted that some proposals which were being processed by the Town Planning Board (TPB) under the Town Planning Ordinance (TPO) would be considered by the Sub-committee at this meeting. He reminded Members to declare any direct personal or pecuniary interest prior to the discussion of the items. Members should decide whether to declare interest based on available information and their own knowledge.
- 2.6 He recapped the House Rules of HEC that the Chairman (or the Sub-committee) should decide whether a member declaring interest might speak or vote on the matter, might remain in the meeting as an observer, or should withdraw from the meeting. If the Chairman could not attend a meeting or part of a meeting, Members should elect among themselves a Member (who should not be an alternate member nor a regular member who had declared interest in the relevant agenda item) to preside at the meeting.
- 2.7 The meeting agreed that a member declaring interest on a particular item should be allowed to stay at the meeting but refrain from participating in the discussion of the item.

**Members
to note**

Item 3 Proposed Minor Relaxation of the Statutory Height Restriction for a Proposed Grade A Office Building at 863-865 King's Road, Quarry Bay (Paper No. 1/2008)

- 3.1 **The Chairman** declared an interest in this item as he had current business dealings with Kerry Group, the project proponent of the subject item. **Dr Alvin Kwok** proposed and the meeting agreed that this item be chaired by Dr Andrew Thomson while Mr Vincent Ng would stay at the meeting as an observer. **Dr Andrew Thomson** took over the chairmanship.
- 3.2 The following representatives of the project proponent (the Project Team) were invited to the meeting:
- | | |
|-----------------|--------------------------------|
| Mr David Hui |) Kerry Properties Limited |
| Mr Albert Yeung |) |
| Mr Julian Liu |) |
| Mr Bryan Szeto |) |
| Mr Paul Wong |) |
| Ms Keren Seddon |) Townland Consultants Limited |
| Ms Cindy Tsang |) |

Mr Philip Liao) Philip Liao & Partners Limited

3.3 With the aid of powerpoint slides, **the Project Team** presented the proposal which was related to a s16 application to be considered by TPB for minor relaxation of the building height restriction on the Quarry Bay Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) for a proposed Grade A office building.

3.4 Members had the following views/questions:

- (a) a high headroom would lead to a larger space volume, which would in turn increase energy consumption;
- (b) the proposal would not increase the floor area of the development. A higher floor-to-floor height would facilitate better design of the ventilation and lighting systems;
- (c) the subject site was 160m away from the harbour-front. The proposed height of 143mPD was compatible with the height profile of the surrounding developments. The proposed development would unlikely cause significant adverse impact on the harbour-front setting;
- (d) the proposal, with such features as podium setback and provision of landscaped podium, demonstrated a reasonable response to the Harbour Planning Principles (HPPs) / Harbour Planning Guidelines (HPGs);
- (e) the 3.8m wide setback along Java Road Playground was rather narrow for pedestrian circulation and it might not be convenient to access the landscaped garden at podium level;
- (f) the proposed relaxation would set a bad precedent for similar proposals; and
- (g) whether the building design could be revised to conform with the building height restriction on the OZP and the need for the proposed relaxation was questionable.

3.5 In response, **the Project Team** pointed out the following:

- (a) a lower floor-to-floor height might not necessarily be more energy efficient. Energy consumption could be minimised by environmentally friendly installations/facilities. A higher headroom would allow better penetration of sunlight, thus reducing reliance on artificial lighting;

Action

- (b) some IT and office facilities could not be accommodated without a higher headroom. The headroom for some new Grade A office buildings reached 4.5m and even 4.8m. The current proposed headroom was only 4m;
 - (c) due to the height limitation, the current building design had already given up a number of green building features such as natural ventilated above ground car park. If the building height of 130mPD under the OZP was adopted, other proposed innovative green building design features would become impossible;
 - (d) if the intention was to control development intensity, a lower plot ratio should be stipulated rather than restricting merely the building height;
 - (e) the proposal would not result in an excessively tall building and would not block the ridgelines; and
 - (f) the proposal was not to amend the OZP. There was provision in the OZP for minor relaxation of the building height restriction.
- 3.6 **The Chairman** said that the Sub-committee should consider the trade-off between a slightly higher building and better building design, and whether the proposal was in line with the HPPs/HPGs.
- 3.7 **Mrs Mei Ng** wondered whether the Sub-committee should make a judgement on the application, and whether the views of the Sub-committee on this particular case would set a precedent for future consideration of similar cases. **The Chairman** pointed out that the views of the Sub-committee were advisory in nature and **Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke** said that the Sub-committee should consider each case based on its own merits.
- 3.8 **Mr Raymond Lee** made the following points:
- (a) minor relaxation of the building height restriction might be considered by TPB on application under s16 of TPO. “Minor relaxation” was a matter of fact and degree, depending on individual circumstances which would vary from case to case; and
 - (b) consideration of the subject application had been deferred by TPB. The final decision on the application rested with TPB,

Action

which would take into account all relevant factors, including the views of the Sub-committee.

3.9 In general, there was support from some Members in respect of its environmentally friendly building design, measures to enhance pedestrian circulation and provision of landscaped garden at podium. Concern was raised on its environmental impact in terms of increase in energy consumption due to higher floor-to-floor height. Some Members queried the need for the proposed relaxation and were worried that accepting this proposal might set a precedent for similar proposals for minor relaxation of building height restrictions.

3.10 **The Chairman** concluded that the Sub-committee had a mixed view on the proposal. He added that Members' views would be passed to the TPB for reference. He thanked the Project Team for attending the meeting.

Secretariat

3.11 **Mr Vincent Ng** then resumed the chairmanship.

Item 4 Proposed Hotel, Place of Recreation, Sports and Culture (Art Venue) and Exhibition and Convention Hall at Ex A-King Slipway Site and Adjoining Government Land, Causeway Bay

4.1 **The Chairman** invited the following representatives of the project proponent (the Project Team) to the meeting:

Mr M Y Wan) Wharf Estates Development Limited

Ms Mabel Lam)

Ms Doreen Lee) Wharf (Holdings) Limited

Mr Steve Kleinschmidt) Marco Polo Hotels

Mr Ting Wah)

Ms Corinia Chan) Hong Kong Arts Centre

Mr Benny Chia) Hong Kong Festival Fringe Limited

Ms Michele Chui)

Mr Kenneth To) Kenneth To & Associates Limited

Mr David Fok)

Ms Kitty Wong)

4.2 With the aid of powerpoint slides, **the Project Team** presented their proposal, known as "Victoria Point", which was the subject of a s16

planning application to be considered by the TPB. A physical model was placed at the meeting for Members' reference.

4.3 Members had the following views/questions on the proposal:

- (a) the proposal was a creative attempt to overcome the limitation of the site at the corner of the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter (CBTS) and the physical constraints of the Island Eastern Corridor (IEC);
- (b) the development concept of integrating arts, cultural and commercial (hotel and retail) uses along the waterfront was appreciated and was supported from a tourism perspective as the site might be developed as a destination of its own;
- (c) the Victoria Point proposal had been discussed by the Eastern District Council previously but failed to gain its support. The huge scale and massing of the proposed development was not compatible with the waterfront setting. The "wall-like" building at the end of the elevated walkway would block the visual access from the Victoria Park to the waterfront. The proposal also failed to integrate the Victoria Park as a waterfront park. It was against the community aspiration for the provision of a continuous waterfront promenade with an open, greenery and comfortable environment;
- (d) art and cultural facilities only accounted for a very small portion (11%) of the total gross floor area and did not integrate well with the proposed hotel. The dominance of the hotel component made the proposal appear to be a commercial pursuit;
- (e) whether the proposed development would be viable without the hotel portion;
- (f) the Executive Summary submitted by the Project Team was too simple;
- (g) the open space on the hotel roof could hardly be considered as public open space. Whether there was any mechanism to ensure that the public could access the so-called "public" spaces;
- (h) aspects relating to sustainable development, integrated planning and accessibility to the waterfront should be further explained;

- (i) whether the impacts of the proposed development on traffic, environment, energy consumption and operation of the nearby fire station had been assessed;
- (j) whether the harbour view of the surrounding stakeholders would be affected;
- (k) the design of the terraced open spaces fronting IEC might not create a sustainable and comfortable environment for visitors; and
- (l) the land/water interface should be improved.

4.4 **The Project Team** made the following responses:

- (a) the arts and cultural components would bring vibrancy to the area while the proposed hotel and retail spaces would help fund the arts and cultural activities at no cost to the Government;
- (b) the proposal would not be financially viable without the hotel. The proportion of arts and cultural components was optimised having regard to the viability of the proposal as a whole;
- (c) studio theatre or special venues requiring a huge column-free space would be provided at the side block. Art and cultural venues would also be provided at the lower levels of the main building. In addition, the public spaces at different levels of the main building would be designed with adequate width to accommodate open exhibitions or performances without affecting pedestrian circulation;
- (d) the public could use the hotel lifts to access the open space on the hotel roof. The proposed development would increase the open space provision in the area by more than a double, even if the proposed open space on the hotel roof was excluded;
- (e) the subject site was located at the corner of CBTS with the Tin Hau area, Victoria Park and the waterfront of CBTS to its east, south and west respectively. A landscaped deck would be provided to connect the site with Victoria Park and a pedestrian footbridge across Hing Fat Street was proposed to link up the development with Whitfield Road and the Tin Hau area. The proposed development would enhance the site as an activity node in the area;

Action

- (f) assessment of the impacts of the proposed development on traffic, environment, pedestrian safety, the operation of the nearby fire station, etc. had been carried out and included in the TPB submission;
- (g) while the views of some existing residents in the inland area might be compromised, the proposed development would become an iconic building of quality design;
- (h) the unsightly view of the IEC structures on ground level would be avoided as the proposed pedestrian deck from Victoria Park would direct visitors to a level which was above the IEC, with a view of the Harbour from Central and Wan Chai on the left to Tsim Sha Tsui on the right. The open space on the hotel roof would provide another platform for viewing the Harbour at a different angle; and
- (i) landing steps would be provided at various locations along the water edge providing land points for the floating Tin Hau Temple, the boat community and the public. A public bathroom and public toilet would also be provided for use of the boat community and the public.

4.5 In response to Members' questions on the provisions of the draft Wan Chai North OZP, **Messrs Raymond Wong and Raymond Lee** explained as follows:

- (a) the application was submitted under the "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Leisure and Entertainment Complex and Elevated Walkway" zoning on the original OZP where the proposed development might be permitted on application to TPB; and
- (b) the OZP was subsequently amended by TPB after consideration of the objections and further objections relating to the OZP in early January. The site was rezoned to "Government, Institution or Community (3)" and "Open Space" where 'Hotel' was no longer a permissible use.

4.6 **The Chairman** concluded the Sub-committee's views as follows, which would be conveyed to TPB for consideration:

Secretariat

- (a) there were no strong views against the proposal in terms of its development concept of integrating art, cultural and commercial (hotel and retail) uses at the waterfront;

Action

- (b) some members had reservation on the scale and massing of the proposed development, particularly the hotel portion. There was concern on the lack of integration between the proposed hotel and the art/cultural facilities;
- (c) the impacts of the proposed development on traffic, environment, harbour view of surrounding stakeholders and operation of the nearby fire station should be fully assessed; and
- (d) special emphasis should be put on the need for a continuous waterfront promenade, maximising greenery, mechanisms to ensure unrestricted access to the proposed public open space, and improving the land/water interface.

4.7 **Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke** added that to improve waterfront connectivity and accessibility, it would be worthwhile to consider reclamation to reshape this part of the waterfront.

4.8 **The Chairman** thanked the Project Team for attending the meeting.

Item 5 Proposed Erection of Ground Standing Signboards at Austin Road West, West Kowloon Reclamation Area (Paper No. 2/2008)

5.1 **The Chairman** invited the following representatives of the project proponents to the meeting:

Mr Kenneth To) Kenneth To & Associates Limited
Ms Kitty Wong)

5.2 **Mr Kenneth To** presented the proposal with the aid of powerpoint slides.

5.3 Members had the following views/questions:

- (a) given the temporary nature of the signboards and their transparent design using wire mesh, the overall environment of this part of the waterfront, which comprised mainly construction sites, would not be adversely affected;
- (b) the signboards should be switched off at late hours;
- (c) the Government should consider the glare impact on the overall environment before granting approval to such

Action

proposals. To avoid glare impact on nearby residents, the landward side of the signboards should not be lit up;

- (d) the traffic and environmental impacts of the entertainment events to be carried out at the site should be fully assessed;
- (e) the current size of the proposed signboards should be considered as the maximum acceptable; and
- (f) whether additional rent would be charged by the Government and whether revenue would be generated from the proposed signboards.

5.4 **Mr Kenneth To** responded as follows:

- (a) only the seaward side of the signboards would be lit up. The signboards would be switched off as early as possible subject to further discussion with the project proponents. LED would be used for the signboards, which would be dimmer than ordinary advertising signs; and
- (b) the purpose of erecting the signboards was to indicate the location of this recreational and entertainment venue. No revenue would be generated from the signboards.

5.5 In response to Mr Joseph Francis Wong's question, **the Chairman** said that Members' views would be consolidated and forwarded to the relevant approval authority for consideration. **Secretariat**

5.6 In response to a few Members' enquires, **Mr Herbert Leung** advised as follows:

- (a) the sites are held under short term tenancy agreements for use in connection with recreational and entertainment activities and the rent currently payable would have reflected the permitted use of these tenancies and all other terms of the agreements. The tenancy agreements contained provisions whereby the use, design, height and location of the structure or structures erected or to be erected shall be subject to the prior approval of the District Lands Officer; and
- (b) the Sub-committee's view would be taken into account by LandsD in processing the application to be submitted by the tenants for erection of the proposed signboards.

Action

5.7 **The Chairman** concluded that the proposed signboards would unlikely affect the overall setting of this part of the waterfront, but the concern on glare impact should be addressed. He thanked the representatives of the project proponents for attending the meeting.

Item 6 Proposed Residential Development at 14-30 King Wah Road, North Point (Paper No. 3/2008)

6.1 **Mr Kim Chan** declared an interest in this item as he had current business dealings with the project proponent. The meeting agreed that Mr Chan could stay at the meeting as an observer.

6.2 The following representatives of the project proponent were invited to the meeting:

- | | | |
|------------------|---|---|
| Mr Shuki Leung |) | Glory United Development Limited, |
| Mr K K Sun |) | which was a subsidiary of Henderson |
| Mr Richard Chong |) | Land Development Company Limited |
| Ms Susanna Lee |) | |
| Mr Jackson Pang |) | Dennis Lau & Ng Chun Man Architects
& Engineers (HK) Limited |
| Dr Westwood Hong |) | Westwood Hong & Associates Limited |
| Mr Phill Black |) | Pro Plan Asia Limited |

6.3 **Mr Phill Black** presented the proposal with the aid of powerpoint slides. The proposal was related to a s16 application being processed by the TPB.

6.4 Members had the following comments on the proposal:

- (a) the proposal would create a continuous wall parallel to the waterfront and air flow could not penetrate in between the buildings;
- (b) the ridgelines were almost blocked by the proposed development;
- (c) more details on the air ventilation assessment should be provided;
- (d) staggering the residential towers apart might enhance air ventilation and add visual interest to the built form;

Action

- (e) openable windows should be used for public corridors to enhance air circulation within the residential towers; and
- (f) the proposed podium setback to allow better air ventilation and facilitate public access to the waterfront was commendable.

6.5 **Mr Phill Black** had the following responses:

- (a) under the Urban Design Guidelines, this part of the North Point area was not sensitive to ridgelines protection. While a maximum building height of 165mPD was permissible on the OZP, a height of 138mPD was proposed for the site to enable a lower building height towards the Harbour;
- (b) the site had a limited sea frontage of less than 100m. Air ventilation assessment was therefore not required. Notwithstanding, the current design had placed the proposed residential towers at the farthest distance away from the proposed hotel in the northeast and Harbour Heights in the southwest to achieve a permeable scheme. Street level air ventilation would also be enhanced by the podium setback;
- (c) if one of the towers was staggered away from the waterfront, the views of the existing residents on the other side of King Wah Road would be compromised; and
- (d) to mitigate the traffic noise impact from the IEC, a curtain wall type design was proposed for the tower façade facing the IEC with openable windows used for the tower wings facing King Wah Road. If the residential towers were staggered apart, more future residents would be exposed to traffic noise. The overall living environment would be affected if more non-openable windows were to be used to screen off traffic noise.

6.6 In response to Members' follow up question on the visual impact assessment, **Mr Raymond Lee** explained the followings:

- (a) under the Urban Design Guidelines, certain vantage points were identified to facilitate assessment of development impact on the views to ridgelines. This part of the North Point area was not within the view corridors which warranted specific control for the purpose of preserving the ridgelines; and

Action

- (b) in assessing the visual impact of a particular development, factors including protection of ridgelines, its relative location to the waterfront, conformity and compatibility of surrounding built form, etc. should be considered as a whole.

6.7 **The Chairman** concluded the discussion as follows:

- (a) the Sub-committee had no strong views against the proposed development and appreciated the proposed podium setback to facilitate public access to the waterfront and enhance air circulation, which were in line with the HPPs/HPGs; and
- (b) the design, layout and disposition of the residential towers should be improved to further enhance air ventilation.

6.8 **The Chairman** added that the Sub-committee's views would be conveyed to TPB for consideration and thanked the representatives of the project proponent for attending the meeting.

Secretariat

Item 7 Development of a Piazza in Tsim Sha Tsui (Paper No. 4/2008)

7.1 The following representatives of the project proponent were invited to the meeting:

Mrs Winifred Chung) Tourism Commission
Ms Anita SW Tsui)
Miss Wylie Ho)

Mr Albert Su) Transport Department
Mr Lam Hon)
Mr Kwong Ka-yin)

7.2 **Mrs Winifred Chung** made a presentation. The purpose was to solicit Members' views on the possible uses and development and management modes of the proposed piazza.

7.3 **The Chairman** said that the Sub-committee would focus on the use and design aspects. He suggested the project proponent to consult the HEC Task Group on Management Model for the Harbourfront on issues relating to the management aspect of the proposed piazza. **Ms Lydia Lam** said that the next Task Group meeting would be held in early February.

7.4 Members had the following views/suggestions:

Action

- (a) the public should be fully engaged throughout the design and development process of the proposed piazza. An appropriate scale of public engagement should be worked out having regard to the prime location of the site. Design competition could be organised to solicit public ideas;
- (b) there was a piazza in front of the Hong Kong Cultural Centre. The need for another piazza in its proximity and how to differentiate the proposed piazza from the existing one should be thoroughly discussed during the public engagement;
- (c) rather than a unitary theme, a diversity of themes/uses should be considered for the piazza to reflect local characteristics. Some suggestions included:
 - a harbour related theme for strengthening the role of the Tsim Sha Tsui waterfront as a major tourist attraction;
 - a romantic theme for holding wedding ceremonies;
 - a public space to nurture local cultures and allow them to evolve on their own;
 - a space for innovative/creative ideas; and
 - a performance venue for both well-established and small-scale arts/cultural groups.
- (d) design of the proposed use should also cater for the needs of the aged and children;
- (e) the future landmark might not necessarily be a built structure, like Trafalgar Square in London;
- (f) as existing activities/users would be affected, the possible social impacts should be taken into account;
- (g) integration with the nearby features (Hong Kong Cultural Centre, Tsim Sha Tsui Clock Tower, etc.), connection with West Kowloon Cultural District, overall accessibility to the waterfront and greenery opportunities should be considered in a comprehensive manner;
- (h) with the relocation of the public transport interchange outside Star Ferry Pier, the change in the visitor profile should be considered in determining the use of the proposed piazza; and

- (i) while fostering tourism, the needs and aspirations of the local community should not be disregarded.

7.5 **Mrs Winifred Chung** said that the Government had no pre-determined view on the theme/use of the proposed piazza. Public engagement activities would be carried out throughout the entire planning and development process. She assured Members that the piazza would be developed to cater for the needs of both the locals and tourists as a public space without local activities was unable to attract tourists.

7.6 **The Chairman** concluded that the development of the piazza should not be confined to a unitary theme, but should encourage a diversity of activities in a dynamic way. It was important to observe the HPPs/HPGs in designing the proposed piazza and to promote public engagement throughout the planning and development process. He thanked the representatives of the project proponent for attending the meeting.

Item 8 Proposed Olympic Rings at Central Waterfront

8.1 **Mr Mason Hung** of the Hong Kong Tourism Board (HKTB), accompanied by Mrs Winifred Chung of Tourism Commission, presented the proposal. The objective of the proposal was to create a signature icon by constructing and lighting up a set of Olympic Rings at a harbour-front location to showcase Hong Kong as a co-host city for the Beijing 2008 Olympic.

8.2 In response to Members' comments/questions on the alternative locations, size of the proposed Olympic Rings and glare impact, **Mr Mason Hung** and **Mrs Winifred Chung** explained the followings:

- (a) as imposed by the International Olympic Committee, any form of promotion of the Olympic should not be for commercial purposes. As such, the façades of commercial buildings facing the Harbour were not appropriate for the proposed Olympic Rings;
- (b) sites on Hong Kong Island with Victoria Peak as a backdrop, being an iconic feature to overseas press and tourists, were preferred to sites in Kowloon;
- (c) displaying the Olympic Rings in mobile locations, such as air balloons or boats, might consume more energy and cause pollution;

Action

- (d) the dimensions of the proposed Olympic Rings would be determined by the physical conditions, public safety and other technical aspects of the site selected;
- (e) glare impact would be considered in working out the details of the proposal; and
- (f) in addition to the construction of the Olympic Rings at the harbour-front, there were other activities to promote Olympism in Hong Kong for the public and tourists to enjoy.

8.3 **The Chairman** concluded that the Sub-committee had no in-principle objection to the proposed construction of the Olympic Rings as a temporary structure. HKTB should finalise the proposal taking account of Members' concern about glare impact.

8.4 **The Chairman** thanked Mr Mason Hung and Mrs Winifred Chung for briefing the Sub-committee on the proposal.

Item 9 Proposed Temporary Uses for the Ex-North Point Estate, North Point (Paper No. 5/2008)

9.1 **The Chairman** invited Ms Sophia Chiang and Mr Edmond Chan of the District Lands Office/Hong Kong East (DLO/HKE) to the meeting.

9.2 **Ms Sophia Chiang** briefed Members on the Paper.

9.3 In response to a Member's suggestion on landscaping requirement within the site and enquiry on the implementation programme of the proposed temporary open space, **Ms Sophia Chiang** said that commercial viability should be taken into account in considering any planting requirement under the short term tenancy. Development of the temporary public open space at the Eastern Lot was subject to funding availability from the Eastern District Council (EDC) and the agreements of the concerned departments.

9.4 Members generally welcomed the proposal of developing the Eastern Lot into a temporary public open space. Some Members however did not support the proposed car parks and they had the following views:

- (a) the HPGs emphasised on maximising opportunities for using temporary sites pending permanent development for public enjoyment. Car parks were not compatible with this intention;

Action

- (b) the site was a prime site in the Eastern District where the public could enjoy the harbour view. The locals should be engaged in considering the temporary use of the land and working out the means for early implementation of any enhancement proposals;
- (c) according to the latest development concept for the site as agreed by TPB, a 20m wide waterfront promenade would be provided. Hence, the northern part of the Western Lot should be set aside for early provision of the planned promenade. Attempts should be made to obtain funding from EDC to develop the promenade together with the proposed temporary open space at the Eastern Lot;
- (d) alternative uses, such as flea markets, cycle park, etc., could be considered to activate the area for public enjoyment;
- (e) an open competition could be organised to solicit ideas for innovative use of temporary sites; and
- (f) connectivity amongst the Eastern, Central and Western Lots was important. The uses of the 3 Lots should not be considered in isolation.

9.5 In response, **Ms Sophia Chiang** explained the following points:

- (a) DLO/HKE would convey Members' request for early implementation of the 20m wide waterfront promenade to relevant departments and EDC for consideration;
- (b) the temporary use on the Western Lot only had a short duration. Viability of any proposed temporary use should take this factor into account; and
- (c) the proposed car parks at the Central and Western Lots would help meet the parking demand in the area. Besides, the Central Lot was relatively far away from the waterfront and the existing 5m wide public promenade at the Western Lot would be maintained.

9.6 A few Members considered that, save for the planned 20m wide waterfront promenade, the southern part of the Western Lot might be used for car parking purpose to satisfy local demand in the interim, but open space was still a preferred use.

9.7 **The Chairman** concluded Members' views as follows:

- (a) the proposal of developing the Eastern Lot for open space use was supported;
- (b) a strip of land at the northern part of the Western Lot should be set aside for early provision of the planned 20m wide waterfront promenade; and
- (c) the rest of the site should preferably be developed for open space use.

9.8 **The Chairman** thanked Ms Sophia Chiang and Mr Edmond Chan for attending the meeting.

Item 10 Report on Findings and Recommendations of the Hung Hom District Study (Paper No. 6/2008)

10.1 The following representatives of the Study Consultants were invited to the meeting:

Mr Alan Macdonald) Urbis Limited
Ms Jessica Lam)

10.2 **Mr Alan Macdonald** presented the findings and recommendations of the Hung Hom District Study with the aid of powerpoint slides.

10.3 In response to Mrs Mei Ng's query on the additional amount of green space, **Mr Alan Macdonald** said that the area around the "Comprehensive Development Area" site was zoned "Open Space". With the re-alignment of Kin Wan Street, the area of the waterfront promenade would be increased by about 0.25 ha to 0.5 ha. For the site in front of Hong Kong Coliseum, about 45% of the site area was proposed as publicly accessible open space, which represented a net gain compared with the current OZP provision.

10.4 **The Chairman** remarked that the Study had responded to the community aspirations for better environment by lowering the development intensity and building height towards the harbour-front. The development concepts for the area were formulated having regard to the HPPs/HPGs and the views collected during the public engagement activities.

10.5 As there were no further comments/questions from Members, **the Chairman** thanked the Study Consultants for attending the meeting.

Action

Item 11 Work Plan of the Sub-committee (Paper No. 7/2008)

- 11.1 The meeting agreed to discuss the item at the next meeting. **Mr Raymond Wong** suggested Members forward their comments, if any, on the work plan to the Secretariat for incorporation before discussion at the next meeting.

Item 12 Any Other Business

- 12.1 The meeting agreed to discuss AOB item at the next meeting.
- 12.2 The meeting closed at 7:10pm.

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