

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

**Minutes of Twenty-first Meeting**

Date : 19 March 2008  
Time : 10:00 am  
Venue : Conference Room  
15/F, North Point Government Offices  
333 Java Road, North Point

**Present**

Mr Vincent Ng (Chairman)	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Roger Nissim	Representing Business Environment Council (BEC)
Mr Joseph Francis Wong	Representing Citizen Envisioning @ Harbour
Dr Alvin Kwok	Representing Conservancy Association
Mr Paul Zimmerman	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour Limited
Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke	
Mr Patrick Lau	
Ms Lydia Lam	Assistant Secretary (Planning) 3, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Jeff Lam	Assistant Director (Headquarters), 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
Mrs Ann Ho	Chief Executive Officer (2) 1, Home Affairs Department
Ms Sally Fong (Secretary)	Senior Town Planner/Studies & Research 3, PlanD

**In Attendance**

Mr Raymond Lee	Chief Town Planner/Studies & Research, PlanD
----------------	--

**Absent with Apologies**

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

**Action**

**Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 20<sup>th</sup> meeting**

- 1.1 The draft minutes of the 20<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 23 January 2008 were circulated to Members on 25 February 2008. The meeting confirmed the minutes without amendments.

**Item 2 Matters Arising**

Views of the Sub-committee on various proposals presented at the 20<sup>th</sup> meeting (paras. 3.10, 4.6, 5.5 and 6.8 of the minutes of the 20<sup>th</sup> meeting)

- 2.1 **The Secretary** said the Sub-committee had considered some development proposals at the last meeting. The relevant parts of the meeting minutes confirmed under Item 1 would be forwarded to concerned approving authorities for reference after the meeting.

[Post-meeting note: Sub-committee's views on the proposals were forwarded to relevant approving authorities for reference on 20 March 2008.]

Proposed Open Space at Ex-North Point Estate (para. 9 of the minutes of the 20<sup>th</sup> meeting)

- 2.2 **Mr Patrick Lau** said that at its recent meeting, the Eastern District Council (EDC) had discussed funding the proposed open space at the Ex-North Point Estate. It considered that the annual funding allocated to EDC was insufficient to cover the capital cost of constructing the proposed open space, as there were other local public works needed to be carried out for the whole district. It was also uncertain that the subsequent maintenance cost of the proposed open space could be absorbed by EDC. Agreement with relevant departments including the Leisure and Cultural Services Department had yet to be reached for implementing the proposed open space. He asked whether alternative funding could be made available, noting that other harbour-front open spaces were not funded by DCs.

**Action**

- 2.3 **Mrs Ann Ho** said that some \$15 million for maintenance and management of works projects under the District Minor Works Programme would be available in 2008/09 and would be apportioned among the 18 DCs, which would also determine the new works' priorities.
- 2.4 **The Chairman** reiterated the importance of financial support for harbour-front enhancement.
- 2.5 In response, **Ms Lydia Lam** made the following points:
- (a) DEVB had reserved \$5 million for HEC activities on an annual basis;
  - (b) the \$5 million reserved for HEC activities would not be sufficient to implement the planned 20m wide waterfront promenade in North Point. Other funding sources, say under normal government works projects like the West Kowloon Waterfront Promenade and Wan Chai Waterfront Promenade, should be explored; and
  - (c) as government works projects were governed by established procedures and regulations, the Sub-committee might not be a proper venue to consider the funding issue.
- 2.6 **Mr Raymond Wong** said that the funding earmarked for HEC was primarily for public engagement activities. The funding requirement of engineering or construction works was of a very different order. The scale of the required works and work priority of the relevant departments should also be considered.
- 2.7 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** considered that the Sub-committee should not assume the responsibility of resolving the general problem of lacking funding for harbour-front enhancement. He urged the Government to explain how enhancement proposals would be funded.
- 2.8 **Mr Patrick Lau** suggested that HEC be allocated with more funding to prioritise and implement harbour-front enhancement proposals. **The Chairman** undertook to raise the issue at the next HEC meeting.

[Post-meeting note: The Chairman raised the issue at the HEC meeting on 29 April 2008.]

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

- 2.9 An updated inventory list of known projects was tabled at the

**Action**

meeting.

- 2.10 **The Secretary** highlighted that 2 new items (No. KT1 and KT2) had been included in the inventory list.

*Inventory No. HH1*

- 2.11 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** urged LandsD to remove the existing fence to enable public access to the waterfront.

**LandsD**

*Inventory No. NP5*

- 2.12 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the proposed hotel and its development parameters had not been incorporated in the inventory list. He wondered why the Sub-committee had not been consulted before Town Planning Board (TPB) adopted the development parameters for the site.

- 2.13 **Mr Raymond Lee** explained that the development parameters and design requirements for the site were adopted by TPB only for the purpose of carrying out an air ventilation assessment (AVA) study. They would be refined to take account of the study findings. According to the current schedule, PlanD would consult the Sub-committee on the proposed use and development of the site after completion of the AVA study in mid 2008.

- 2.14 **The Chairman** appreciated Mr Zimmerman's concern and said that while the Hung Hom District Study was undertaken with inputs from the Sub-committee before formulation of proposals for key development sites on the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP), it might not always be possible to complete district review studies first before proceeding with the detailed planning of all other harbour-front projects. Mr Zimmerman's concern could be further discussed under the Sub-committee's work plan (Item 3).

**Item 3 Work Plan of the Sub-committee (Paper No. 7/2008)**

- 3.1 **Mr Raymond Lee** presented the work plan with the aid of powerpoint.

Harbour Plan Review

- 3.2 Members had the following views:

- (a) given the heavy workload of the Sub-committee, good progress had actually been made on the overall Harbour Plan Review in the past few years;

**Action**

- (b) the assistance provided by PlanD in implementing various tasks of the Sub-committee including formulation of Harbour Planning Principles/Guidelines (HPPs/HPGs), monitoring harbour-front land uses, etc. was commendable;
- (c) at strategic level, instead of taking government proposals like multi-purpose stadium, cruise terminal, etc. as given, the Sub-committee should be actively involved in the decision making process of strategic proposals. At district level, plan implementation was important, and continuous monitoring was required to ensure that enhancement proposals would be materialised;
- (d) infrastructure developments had not been featured in the overall Harbour Plan Review. Projects like the Sha Tin to Central Link and West Island Line would have great impact on our harbour-front. The Sub-committee should be consulted on such proposals;
- (e) the connectivity between the West Kowloon Cultural District and the areas in Kowloon West and Yau Ma Tei should be properly considered;
- (f) as district review studies would be carried out one by one, it was inevitable that some major developments might proceed before completion of the review studies. It might be helpful to carry out a quick preliminary review of each district to identify the broad principles, development parameters and relevant issues to be focused on before carrying out detailed district review studies;
- (g) the preparation of an integrated harbour planning framework should be accorded a high priority. Resources should be made available for the task;
- (h) the proposal of commencing the Hong Kong Island East Harbour-front Study (HKIEHS) was supported. Local concern was expected to focus on the provision of a continuous waterfront promenade for the district. Whilst there might be difficulties to provide a promenade at some parts of the waterfront, an incremental approach could be considered by first providing the promenade at those parts of the waterfront with less physical constraints for public enjoyment. A suitable PR strategy should be worked out to highlight that the Government was taking positive steps to provide a waterfront promenade in the Eastern District for public enjoyment; and

**Action**

- (i) BEC/HBF had done a lot of work relating to harbour-front issues including those on Hong Kong Island East. BEC/HBF would pass their findings, which would be available later this year, to PlanD for reference.

3.3 In response, **Messrs Raymond Wong and Raymond Lee** explained the following:

- (a) owing to limited resources, it was impossible to carry out review studies for all harbour districts at the same time. Yet, there might be an urgent need to impose planning control in certain areas (e.g. building height restrictions in the North Point area) to prevent undesirable developments before completion of the district review studies;
- (b) the 2-tier approach of the Harbour Plan Review would facilitate an iterative planning process. Given the rapid development pace of Hong Kong, it was unrealistic to put the development process on hold pending the completion of the district review studies. Yet, HPPs/HPGs were prepared as a non-spatial planning tool to provide immediate guidance for individual developments prior to the completion of these review studies. At the stage of district review, study proposals would be formulated having regard to the HPPs/HPGs;
- (c) briefings on strategic development proposals could be arranged for the Sub-committee if necessary, as already a current practice to HEC on such proposals as HATS and the proposed cruise terminal;
- (d) the Secretariat would start working out a revised integrated harbour planning framework taking into account the findings of completed planning studies. Key harbour plan elements such as broad planned land and marine uses, connectivity and major transport links, etc. could be incorporated into the proposed framework;
- (e) the preparatory work for the HKIEHS was at an advanced stage and the Sub-committee would be briefed on the progress in due course; and
- (f) the feasibility of providing a continuous waterfront promenade for the Eastern District would be examined under the HKIEHS. The public and EDC would be consulted on the study. Inputs from BEC/HBF were welcome.

**Secretariat**

**Action**

**Inputs to Development Proposals along Harbour-front**

- 3.4 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that in addition to the current practice of notifying HEC Members of planning applications processed by TPB, HEC Members should also be informed of other harbour-front proposals gazetted under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (EIAO), Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance and Foreshore and Sea-bed (Reclamations) Ordinance and the deadlines of providing comments on such proposals under the relevant ordinances.

[Post-meeting note: Mr Zimmerman's suggestion had been conveyed to the HEC Secretariat for consideration.]

**Identification of Harbour-front Enhancement Opportunities**

- 3.5 **Mr Roger Nissim** supported Mr Zimmerman's suggestion to remove the existing fence along the Hung Hom waterfront and pointed out that a waterfront promenade could be easily implemented there to improve connectivity between the bus terminus near the ferry pier and the Tsim Sha Tsui Waterfront Promenade without incurring a high cost.

- 3.6 Pointing out that the waterfront promenade in North Point was another enhancement opportunity already identified by Members, **the Chairman** enquired about the next course of action.

- 3.7 In response, **Mr Jeff Lam** said that LandsD would consult relevant departments on the possibility of early implementation of the open space at the waterfront as shown on the Hung Hom OZP.

**LandsD**

- 3.8 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that majority of the land at the harbour-front was Government land and suggested that relevant departments be invited to brief the Sub-committee on their work for harbour-front enhancement and the related funding resource.

[Post-meeting note: At the HEC meeting on 29 April 2008, the Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning & Lands) said that DEVB had been exploring with relevant departments possible quick-wins on Government land for harbour-front enhancement and would discuss with the Sub-committee when ready.]

**Promotion of Public Engagement Activities**

- 3.9 Members had the following suggestions on future public engagement activities:

**Action**

- (a) in addition to broad land use proposals, the public could be engaged to give views on the detailed design requirements for harbour-front open spaces or other enhancement sites; and
- (b) more attention should be given to implementation and management issues in soliciting local support.

3.10 **Mr Raymond Wong** said that the forms and scale of public engagement had evolved in the past few years, and were suitably applied to suit individual circumstances. Members' suggestions would be considered if there were suitable cases.

**General**

3.11 **Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke** proposed to set up a harbour-front enhancement fund for application by both the Government and private sector for implementing enhancement projects.

3.12 **The Chairman** concluded the discussion by remarking that Members' views and comments should be taken into account, where appropriate, in the planning studies and enhancement works.

**Item 4 Heliport A&A Works at Hong Kong-Macau Ferry Terminal**

4.1 **Mr Joseph Francis Wong** declared an interest in this item as he was involved in the early design of the proposed development. The meeting agreed that Mr Wong could stay at the meeting as an observer.

4.2 **The Chairman** invited the following representatives of the Project Team to the meeting:

Mr Harris Ho – Heli Express Limited  
Mr David Ho – Mott Connell Limited  
Mr Chris Lee – Integrated Design Associates Limited

4.3 With the aid of powerpoint slides, **the Project Team** presented the proposal which was to expand the heliport facilities on the rooftop of the inner pier of the Hong Kong-Macau Ferry Terminal (MFT) from one helipad to 2 helipads with an arrival lobby, VIP lounge, departure lounge, flight operation control centre, and other aviation related facilities and support plant rooms at various levels of MFT. Building plan approval had been obtained and site works was underway. Photomontages of the proposed heliport expansion during the day and night time were shown at the meeting.

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



**Action**

- (a) instead of building more heliports around the Harbour, it would be desirable to expand the existing heliport facilities. The questions were whether the proposed heliport was for exclusive use of the project proponent and whether it would cater for flights to destinations other than Macau;
- (b) the harbour view of the stakeholders behind the expanded heliport might be affected; and
- (c) noise impact was a concern. As it appeared that the landing platform for helicopters would be raised, the neighbourhood might be exposed to more noise. The noise level would also increase with an additional helipad came into operation. The condition could be worsened if there were 2 helicopters landing/taking off simultaneously. A related question was whether there was any control on the landing/taking off frequency. Suitable noise mitigation measures were necessary.

4.5 In response, **the Project Team** made the following points:

- (a) the proposed heliport facilities could also be used by other helicopter operators. At present, cross-boundary helicopter service was only available from Hong Kong to Macau;
- (b) there would be minimal visual impact. The view from the inland area towards the Harbour was already largely shielded by the car park portion of Shun Tak Centre. Apart from the car park users, the views of nearby stakeholders would unlikely be affected;
- (c) the proposed helipads were at the same height as the existing helipad, which could not be lower than the height of the water tank tower serving the inner and outer piers; and
- (d) the proposed heliport was a Designated Project under EIAO and its construction and operation were subject to the conditions of the Environmental Permit (EP) issued by the Environmental Protection Department. According to the EP, the noise condition during the operational stage of the proposed heliport should not be worse than the existing condition, a 6-year noise monitoring programme should be conducted, and the frequency of helicopters landing/taking off during night time should be reduced comparing to the current situation. To comply with the EP conditions, 6 new helicopters of a model generating less noise had also been bought to replace the existing fleet.

**Action**

4.6 **The Chairman** concluded that the Sub-committee had no objection to the proposed development, but its noise impact was a concern. The views of the Sub-committee would be conveyed to relevant authorities for reference. He thanked the Project Team for attending the meeting. **Secretariat**

**Item 5 Amendments to the Approved Hung Hom Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K9/20 (Paper No. 8/2008)**

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

Mr Eric Yue – District Planning Officer/Kowloon  
Mr C C Lau – Senior Town Planner/Kowloon 2

5.2 **Mr Eric Yue** presented the Paper with the aid of powerpoint slides.

5.3 Members had the following views:

- (a) the issue of high development density could not be addressed by reducing the building height in isolation. Without a corresponding reduction in plot ratio, developments would result in a large site coverage, thus affecting air ventilation at lower levels;
- (b) to make our city more liveable, plot ratio and site coverage should be reduced. Consideration should be given to increasing building setback at lower floors for circulation and publicly accessible open space at street level. Large development sites should be broken up into smaller sites and podium structures should be discouraged;
- (c) while taller buildings with a maximum height of 80mPD were allowed on the small “Residential (Group A) 4” (“R(A)4”) sites in the inner part of Hung Hom, the proposal of keeping the existing height of Whampoa Garden required further thought as it might result in a similar form of compact development when the site was redeveloped in future. If the building heights of some parts of Whampoa Garden could be relaxed, more opportunities could be allowed for green features such as sky gardens and improving air ventilation at ground level;
- (d) the proposed plot ratio of 12 and building height of 100mPD for the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” (“OU(B)”) sites near Hok Cheung Street might result in

**Action**

developments not commensurate with the waterfront setting. A “Residential (Group E)” (“R(E)”) zoning with a maximum building height of 80mPD could be considered to facilitate redevelopment of the old industrial buildings within the “OU(B)” sites;

- (e) the imposition of building height restrictions should not take away the existing building rights under the lease;
- (f) there was a need to explain to the public the community gain of introducing building height control and how public aspirations were taken account of in the exercise of OZP review; and
- (g) greening should be maximised as it was an effective means to regulate micro-climate and enhance air ventilation.

5.4 In response, **Mr Eric Yue** explained the following points:

- (a) the review of OZPs was a 2-stage exercise. After completion of the building height review, a plot ratio review would be carried out taking account of the latest planning circumstances;
- (b) site coverage restrictions had already been imposed for certain sites on the OZP. Further control on site coverage or setback requirements for individual sites would be considered and incorporated into the departmental plans and future revisions of OZP where appropriate;
- (c) taller buildings were allowed at the “R(A)4” sites around Wuhu Street to provide a smooth transition of the height profile from Whampoa Garden to the inner part of Hung Hom. Besides, there was a need to respect the existing building rights. The height restriction of 80mPD was derived having regard to the minimum height required to accommodate a domestic plot ratio of 7.5 and a non-domestic plot ratio of 1.5, which were generally allowed under the “R(A)4” zone on the OZP;
- (d) Whampoa Garden was zoned “Comprehensive Development Area” and any redevelopment was subject to planning approval by TPB. As it was already an existing development, the intention was to reflect the existing building height on the OZP. Given its location at the wind corridor of the annual prevailing wind from the east, keeping the existing height profile would enable penetration of sea breeze into the inland

**Action**

area;

- (e) according to Architectural Services Department, 90m was a reasonable height for a commercial development with a plot ratio of 12. Taking account of the actual site level, a restriction of 100mPD was imposed for the “OU(B)” sites at the waterfront;
- (f) the nearby old industrial areas near Yuk Yat Street in To Kwa Wan were already rezoned to “R(E)”. There was no pressing need for rezoning the “OU(B)” sites around Hok Cheung Street where commercial activities were still active, but the situation would be closely monitored; and
- (g) regarding the benefits of the OZP building height review, it could provide certainty, transparency and clear guidance for future development/redevelopment. To meet public concerns and aspirations, one of the main design considerations was to ensure that air ventilation of the area would not be adversely affected by future developments/redevelopments and that excessively tall buildings incongruous with the surroundings could be avoided.

5.5 **The Chairman** concluded that building height was only one factor affecting the living environment. Related factors like development density, building setback, size of development site, etc. should be considered together. Members’ views would be conveyed to the relevant authority for reference. **Secretariat**

5.6 He thanked PlanD’s representatives for attending the meeting.

**Item 6 Any Other Business**

Issues raised by Mr Paul Zimmerman

6.1 **The Chairman** recapped that at the last HEC meeting held on 20 February 2008, the HEC Chairman had requested the Sub-committee to consider how to follow up the various issues raised by Mr Zimmerman.

(i) *Measures to improve access to the harbour-front currently impeded by existing road infrastructures*

6.2 **Mr Raymond Lee** said that measures to improve harbour-front accessibility had been and would continue to be considered in the on-going/future studies and the overall Harbour Plan Review.

**Action**

*(ii) Provision of food outlets, toilets and seats along the harbour-front within Government land*

6.3 **The Chairman** said that provision of food outlets, toilets and seats along the harbour-front was a management issue and should be considered by the Task Group on Management Model for the Harbourfront.

6.4 **Mr Raymond Lee** said that promoting harbour vibrancy was one of the key objectives of on-going studies. The views of local community on the facilities to be provided at a particular locality could be considered during the course of these studies.

*(iii) Continual monitoring of Kai Tak and Tamar development*

6.5 **Mr Raymond Wong** recapped that at the beginning of the current term, HEC agreed to follow up issues relating to Kai Tak and the Wan Chai Development Phase II (WDII) Review by the full Committee after dissolution of the former Sub-committees on South East Kowloon Development Review and WDII Review.

6.6 **The Chairman** pointed out that both the Kai Tak and Tamar projects were strategic developments. He suggested and the meeting agreed that the issue should be referred to HEC for follow up.

[Post-meeting note: The suggestion was reported to and agreed by HEC on 29 April 2008.]

*(iv) Status of Harbour Planning Principles*

6.7 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** noted that while TPB had already considered and noted the HPPs and made reference to the HPPs in considering proposals for developments on the harbour-front, TPB had yet to adopt the HPPs by updating its harbour vision. He considered it necessary for TPB to formally adopt the HPPs.

6.8 **The Chairman** said that whether the HPPs were formally adopted by TPB was not important because they were already widely applied by both the Government and the private sector. Some project proponents had also taken initiative to consult the Sub-committee on their proposals. A more flexible and pragmatic approach was for HEC to act as a “guardian” promoting and monitoring the applicability of HPPs.

6.9 **Mr Raymond Wong** supplemented that in discharging its statutory function, TPB was obliged to make reference to all relevant documents/guidelines like the Hong Kong Planning Standards and

**Action**

Guidelines, even though it was only a set of administrative documents prepared by the Government.

**Application for Lighting Fixture on Rooftop of the City Hall Car Park**

- 6.10 As the application had been withdrawn, there was no need for the Sub-committee to discuss the item.
- 6.11 There being no other business, the meeting closed at 12:50pm.

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