

HEC Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review

Minutes of Twenty-second Meeting

Date : 21 May 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
Mr Andrew Thomson	Representing Business Environment Council
Dr Sujata Govada	Representing Citizen Envisioning @ Harbour (CE@H)
Dr Alvin Kwok	Representing Conservancy Association
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 Paul Zimmerman	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour Limited
Mr Nicholas Brooke	
Mr Patrick Lau	
Miss Amy Yuen	Principal Assistant Secretary (Planning and Lands) 2, 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 (CEDD)
Mrs Ann Ho	Chief Executive Officer (2) 1, Home Affairs Department
Ms Sally Fong (Secretary)	Senior Town Planner/Studies & Research 3, PlanD

In Attendance

Ms Lydia Lam Assistant Secretary (Planning) 3, DEVB
Mr Raymond Lee Chief Town Planner/Studies & Research, PlanD

Absent with Apologies

Mrs Mei Ng Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Yu Kam-hung Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors

Action

The Chairman extended a welcome to all Members. He informed the meeting that Dr Sujata Govada had replaced Mr Joseph Francis Wong as the representative of CE@H at the Sub-committee with effect from 5 May 2008.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 21st Meeting

- 1.1 The draft minutes of the 21st meeting held on 19 March 2008 were circulated to Members for comment on 7 May 2008. A revised draft, incorporating comments received, was circulated to Members on 20 May 2008.
- 1.2 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** considered that action parties and, possibly, action dates should be added to paras. 2.11 and 3.3(d) of the revised draft minutes on removal of the existing fence at Hung Hom waterfront and preparation of the revised integrated harbour planning framework respectively. Noting the post-meeting note under para. 3.4 that the suggestion of informing HEC members of harbour-front proposals gazetted under various ordinances had been conveyed to the HEC Secretariat, he enquired the progress of the matter.
- 1.3 Whilst having no strong view on the suggestion to add the action parties to paras. 2.11 and 3.3(d), **Mr Raymond Wong** pointed out that the action party and follow-up relating to the enhancement work of the Hung Hom waterfront were in fact recorded in para. 3.7 of the minutes when the matter was discussed in greater detail under the Sub-committee's work plan.
- 1.4 **Miss Amy Yuen** said that the HEC Secretariat would liaise with the relevant bureaux/departments on the possible ways to notify HEC Members of harbour-front proposals gazetted under

**HEC
Secretariat**

Action

ordinances other than the Town Planning Ordinance as suggested by Members. HEC would be informed of the outcome in due course.

- 1.5 In response to Mr Peter Wong's question, **the Chairman** said that if the meeting had deliberated an action for a specific issue, the deliberation should be reflected in the minutes of meeting and Members could monitor the progress under Matters Arising at subsequent meetings. If a Member who expressed views on a particular matter considered it necessary to specify the relevant follow up action, the Member could raise it for the meeting to deliberate.
- 1.6 **Mr Andrew Thomson** pointed out that the role of the Sub-committee was to assist HEC to provide advice to the Government. Some general comments/observations raised by Sub-committee Members might not be taken forward unless solid recommendations could be put forth to HEC for advising the Government.
- 1.7 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** suggested that the Sub-committee's recommendations on a particular issue could be included in the regular progress reports submitted to HEC.
- 1.8 **The Chairman** said that the Sub-committee could also convey its recommendations to relevant departments for consideration.
- 1.9 The meeting confirmed the revised draft minutes subject to specifying the action parties under paras. 2.11 (i.e. LandsD) and 3.3(d) (i.e. the Secretariat).

Item 2 Matters Arising

Views of the Sub-committee on various proposals presented at the 21st meeting (paras. 4.6 and 5.5 of the minutes of the 21st meeting)

- 2.1 The meeting noted that the relevant parts of the meeting minutes confirmed under Item 1 regarding 2 development proposals would be forwarded to the concerned approving authorities for reference after the meeting.

[Post-meeting note: The relevant parts of the confirmed minutes of meeting were forwarded to concerned approving authorities for reference on 23 May 2008.]

Identification of Harbour-front Enhancement Opportunities
(para. 3.7 of the minutes of the 21st meeting)

- 2.2 **Mr Jeff Lam** reported that, according to the advice from the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD), there was no programme at present to implement the open space at Hung Hom waterfront. However, LCSD was aware that the HEC Task Group on Management Model for the Harbourfront would examine ways to manage harbour-front land and would take into account the Task Group's recommendation when developing the site in future. **Mr Lam** added that the Hung Hom waterfront was a potential quick-win now being considered by DEVB.
- 2.3 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the Hung Hom waterfront area could be easily made available for public enjoyment, either in the form of a public space or a public right of way, if the fences were removed.
- 2.4 **Mr Jeff Lam** explained that the area was zoned "Open Space" ("O") on the relevant Outline Zoning Plan (OZP), and LandsD was not in a position to turn it into a public access road as suggested. Also, issues on public safety would need to be properly addressed before it could be open to the public. Therefore, the area could not be made available for public use before it was properly formed or built.
- 2.5 **Dr Sujata Govada** said that according to the "Harbourfront Connectivity Study" recently completed by the Harbour Business Forum, many "O" zones on waterfront had not been accorded high priority for implementation. To improve harbour-front connectivity, a new approach might need to be identified to implement these proposals.
- 2.6 **The Chairman** appreciated the problems involved and that different sites might have different issues to address. As DEVB had mentioned at the last HEC meeting that it was now exploring possible quick-wins and would further discuss with the Sub-committee when ready, he suggested and the meeting agreed that the Sub-committee should leave the matter on enhancement of the Hung Hom waterfront for discussion by then.

Inventory on Known Projects at Harbour-front

- 2.7 An updated Inventory was tabled at the meeting. **The Secretary** highlighted that 2 new items (No. C7 and NP6) had been added. The project proponent of No. NP6, LCSD, would brief Members on its proposal under Agenda Item 5.

Inventory No. WHK1

- 2.8 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that at a recent meeting of the Town Planning Board (TPB), there was discussion on the removal of 2 piers at the former Kennedy Town Incinerator and Abattoir site. These piers, once removed, could unlikely be reinstated in view of the presumption against reclamation under the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance. He suggested, and **the Chairman** agreed, to discuss the matter under AOB.

Inventory No. C7

- 2.9 **Dr Alvin Kwok** asked whether the application site was a public space and whether the application for proposed exhibition hall would change its nature to a private space. **The Chairman** requested the Secretariat to check the relevant information for reporting under AOB.

General

- 2.10 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** proposed to upload the Inventory onto the website for Members' reference. **Mr Kim Chan** suggested and **the Chairman** agreed to discuss the matter under AOB.

Item 3 Installation of Twin 450mm Submarine Gas Pipelines and Associated Facilities from To Kwa Wan to North Point for Former Kai Tak Airport Development - Proposed Gas Station at To Kwa Wan (Paper No. 9/2008)

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

Mr Sam Shum)	Hong Kong and China Gas
Mr Edmond Fong)	Company Limited
Mr Fung Sun Keng)	
Mr Taj Ishola)	Mott Connell Limited
Mr Tony Tang)	

Action

3.2 **The Project Team** presented the proposal with the aid of powerpoint slides.

3.3 Members had the following views:

- (a) while it was sensible to locate the proposed gas station next to a sewage treatment plant, whether the latter which now looked rather old would remain in its present form in the long term;
- (b) a 5m wide reserve for waterfront promenade was too narrow. The site should be set back further to allow the provision of a 10m wide waterfront promenade;
- (c) the proposed 1m wide planting strip would only serve screening purpose which might not enhance the attractiveness of the waterfront promenade. If certain facilities of the gas station could be built underground, part of the site might be released for a sitting out area with landscape plantings;
- (d) a reduction in the site area of the proposed gas station would make it possible to provide a wider waterfront promenade. In this regard, the minimum land requirement for a typical gas station should be provided for reference;
- (e) instead of proposing a straight edged waterfront promenade, an interesting boundary should be considered for the site to enhance the waterfront setting; and
- (f) the proposed gas station was incompatible with the waterfront environment and not conducive to public enjoyment of the waterfront. Consideration should be given to locating it in the adjacent "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") zone but away from the waterfront.

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

- (a) the proposed site area of 880m² was the minimum land requirement to ensure safe operation and maintenance of the gas pipelines. The site was already smaller than other gas stations, such as those in Quarry Bay (920m²) and Cha

Kwo Ling (1,108m²);

- (b) submerged design was not preferred on safety and operational considerations. There was no precedent of constructing submerged gas station elsewhere in the world; and
- (c) the adjacent "G/IC" zone was planned for educational purpose. The Project Team had tried to accommodate the gas station within the subject site which was originally earmarked for the extension of the sewage treatment plant.

3.5 With regard to the surrounding sites, **Mr Peter Mok** provided the following information for Members' reference:

- (a) the school development at the nearby "G/IC" zone was tentatively scheduled for completion around 2014. Releasing part of the school site for the proposed gas station might not be possible; and
- (b) the chance of relocating the existing sewage treatment plant was rather slim as it served to convey the partially treated sewage to a submerged tunnel for further treatment at Stonecutters Island, and there was an expansion plan for the existing plant. During the course of negotiation, the Environmental Protection Department and Drainage Services Department (DSD) agreed to share part of the expansion area with the Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited for constructing the proposed gas station.

3.6 Members had the following further comments/question:

- (a) whilst the Harbour Planning Guidelines did not preclude the construction of public utility facilities along the harbour-front, efforts should be made to minimise their impacts on the harbour-front through better design, more greening, etc. if a waterfront location was required for operational reasons;
- (b) 3D illustrations showing the detailed design of the gas station would facilitate discussion and assist Members in providing useful comments;

Action

- (c) the waterfront promenade could be widened if the relevant Government departments agreed to further reduce the land area for the expansion of the adjacent sewage treatment plant;
- (d) the possibility of developing the gas station in a park setting for public enjoyment should be considered. Issues on the road access to the gas station should be addressed; and
- (e) whether gas station was regarded as a Potentially Hazardous Installation (PHI).

3.7 On the last point, **the Project Team** said that gas station was not classified as a PHI under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, but risk assessment would need to be carried out as part of the environmental impact assessment.

3.8 **The Chairman** summarised the discussion as below:

- (a) efforts should be made to minimise the impacts of the subject development on the harbour-front environment and maximise opportunities for public enjoyment of the Harbour through design and greening;
- (b) the possibility of further setting back of the site from the waterfront to allow the provision of a wider (at least 10m) waterfront promenade, preferably with variations in widths, should be considered; and
- (c) similar to the Sheung Wan Stormwater Pumping Station, an integrated design of the proposed gas station and the adjoining harbour-front area, with more greening and landscape treatments, should be explored.

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

Item 4 Proposed Outfall of Tsuen Wan Drainage Tunnel (Paper No. 10/2008)

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

Mr Chung Yiu-wing) DSD
Mr Lam Chi-kuen)

Mr Taj Ishola) Mott Connell Limited
Mr Sidney Lui)
Mr Thomas Kane)
Ms Miranda Wong)

4.2 **The Project Team** presented the proposal with the aid of powerpoint slides.

4.3 Members had the following comments/questions:

- (a) whether the proposal would involve reclamation under the Foreshore and Sea-bed (Reclamations) Ordinance;
- (b) the waterfront was currently inaccessible to the public due to the presence of a major road. Consideration should be given to make provision in the design of the proposed outfall to facilitate pedestrian access to the waterfront. The possibility of extending the existing promenade to this part of the waterfront linking up the areas on both sides of the outfall should also be considered in the long run;
- (c) visual impact was of major concern, in particular, the proposed spiral ramp would involve considerable tree felling. More vertical landscape treatment might help mitigate its visual impact. Whether the anticipated greening effect of the proposed landscape plantings would be achieved depended on the size of planters and subsequent maintenance. To achieve satisfactory result, the planters should be at least 1.5m in depth;
- (d) whether the Project Team engaged any qualified landscape architects to ensure an integrated landscape design; and
- (e) what inputs/comments had been gathered during public consultation.

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

- (a) there would not be any offshore structure visible above sea level. However, as dredging works would be involved, gazetting under the Foreshore and Sea-bed (Reclamations) Ordinance was required;

Action

- (b) there was an existing footpath along the Castle Peak Road at the waterfront and this project would not affect this existing footpath. However, apart from the maintenance roads of Highways Department, there was currently no public access to the seawall. While DSD kept an open-mind on allowing public access to the seawall within the project area, providing footpath atop the entire seawall would need to be considered holistically. Public safety was also a key concern, especially during rainy seasons when the amount of water discharged from the outfall could be substantial;
- (c) currently, there were 387 trees within the site. Some of them would be retained while new trees would be planted. Altogether there would be about 800 trees grown at the site in future. Besides, shrubs and other forms of vegetation cover would also be grown. A specialist sub-consultant had been appointed to oversee the landscape aspect of the project. The landscape plan had been circulated and agreed by relevant departments;
- (d) the planters would be maintained by DSD and had a depth of at least 1.3m. DSD would further discuss with its consultants on increasing the depth of the planters; and
- (e) there was no objection from the consultees except the Owners' Committee of Greenview Terrace which was the nearest residential development. While most comments raised by the said Owners' Committee had been incorporated, their specific request for maintenance of a private slope adjacent to the spiral ramp structure was considered not acceptable.

4.5 **The Chairman** concluded that the Sub-committee had no objection to the proposal. The Project Team should ensure satisfactory implementation of the landscape plan to minimise visual impact of the proposed outfall. The design of the outfall should also consider pedestrian connectivity to and along the waterfront.

4.6 He thanked the Project Team for attending the meeting.

Item 5 Redevelopment of Victoria Park Swimming Pool Complex

5.1 The following representatives of the Project Team were invited to the meeting:

Action

Mr Gary Wong) LCSD
Mr Siu Yau-kwong)

Mr Mark Ng) ACLA Limited

Ms Winnie Wu) LD Asia

Mr Joel Chan) P&T Architects and Engineers Limited
Ms Clara Pang)

Mr Kennis Wan) Architectural Services Department

5.2 **The Project Team** presented the proposal with the aid of powerpoint slides.

5.3 Members had the following views/question:

- (a) the proposal had been discussed by the Eastern District Council (EDC). While supporting redevelopment of the existing swimming pool, EDC considered that the existing park atmosphere should be preserved as far as possible and more greening should be introduced;
- (b) the design of the proposed swimming pool complex was not commensurate with the overall park setting. Suitable façade and landscape treatments were necessary to ensure that the proposed building would blend in with the surrounding environment. Efforts should also be made to reinforce the current park setting rather than proposing an iconic building in the park;
- (c) the proposed building was massive and incongruous with the surrounding environment. Visual impact on the park users should be assessed. The proposed building height should be reduced;
- (d) given the large scale of the proposed development at this prominent location, the preference of key stakeholders should be examined. The need for an indoor heated swimming pool was questioned, and the trade-offs between developing an indoor and an outdoor swimming pool should be considered;
- (e) the idea of redeveloping the existing swimming pool area

Action

into open space and locating the swimming pool facilities further away from the waterfront was supported;

- (f) the existing access from the MTR Tin Hau Station to Victoria Park via Hing Fat Street was inadequate to cope with the pedestrian flow when there were special events in the park. The possibility of providing an underground access from Tin Hau Station to Victoria Park should be explored;
- (g) opportunities should be taken to improve the connectivity to the waterfront. The existing access from Victoria Park to the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter (CBTS) area was not convenient to the public;
- (h) consideration should be given to develop the roof of the swimming pool complex for a viewing platform or observation deck, with sitting out area, landscape plantings and catering facilities for public enjoyment. The viewing platform could serve as a public open space to compensate the loss of open space. A new visual corridor at a higher level could also be created for public appreciation of Victoria Park and the Harbour;
- (i) the design of the proposed swimming pool complex should ensure that no unpleasant sunlight would be reflected to the nearby residents; and
- (j) whether there was sufficient demand to justify the substitution of tennis courts by the handball court and skating rinks.

5.4 In response, **the Project Team** explained the following points:

- (a) there was a total of about 19-20 ha of public open space in Victoria Park, excluding the existing swimming pool which was regarded as a Government, institution or community use. The intention was to swap the locations of various sports facilities without affecting the overall provision of open space;
- (b) owing to its popularity, the existing swimming pool would remain operational throughout the redevelopment process. A new complex would be built at the tennis court area. The affected tennis courts would be reprovisioned at

Action

the existing location of the handball court, whereas the handball court would be relocated to the existing swimming pool site after the pool was demolished upon completion of the new complex;

- (c) at present, a footbridge was provided at the northern boundary of Victoria Park to the waterfront. The future handball court at-grade would facilitate pedestrian access through the existing subway to the CBTS area. As for the wider issue of further integrating Victoria Park with the waterfront, it had been considered separately under the WDII review;
- (d) about 45% of the application site would be covered by vegetation. Landscape plantings atop the metal roof decking (about 60-70m in length) of the swimming pool complex was not recommended in light of the additional structural loading and cost considerations; and
- (e) a 4m half-sunken filtration plant room was adopted in the sketch design. The total building height of 27m from the existing ground level was the minimum to accommodate a 10m high diving platform (with the associated headroom and supporting facilities) without affecting the MTR North Island Line and an existing underground stormwater drain. In view of a larger roof structure, the building height would increase if more greenery was to be provided on its roof. To reduce the visual impact, the width of the proposed building had been reduced as far as practicable, a transparent design was proposed and more vertical landscape treatment would be incorporated into the detailed design.

5.5 Members had further comments as follows:

- (a) whether a sky garden was to be provided should not be decided solely on cost considerations; and
- (b) while it was a trend to provide both diving and swimming facilities at the same complex, there was no need to apply the same building height required for the diving facilities to other swimming facilities.

5.6 **The Chairman** pointed out that the fundamental question was whether the swimming pool should be built as an indoor facility.

Action

Members had raised concern on the height and massing of the proposed development in a park setting and considered that more greenery should be provided. Members also made some suggestions on the use and design of the complex roof. The need to improve the accessibility to Victoria Park and the connectivity to the waterfront, though beyond the current project scope, should also be addressed where appropriate.

- 5.7 He urged the Project Team to take into account Members' comments in the detailed design and thanked them for attending the meeting.

Item 6 Hong Kong Cyclo-Cross Challenge 2008

- 6.1 The following representatives of High Five Limited (the Project Team) were invited to the meeting:

Ms Winnie Mok) High Five Limited
Ms Samantha Chan)

- 6.2 **The Project Team** briefed Members on the proposed event with the aid of powerpoint slides.
- 6.3 Members generally supported the event as it was the first of its kind in Hong Kong.
- 6.4 Members enquired about matters relating to site selection, crowd/traffic control, policy support and departmental consultation, reason for choosing cyclo-cross, previous experience on organising similar events by the project proponent, funding and the scale of the event. A Member considered that reinstatement of the site after the event was necessary.
- 6.5 In response, **the Project Team** explained the following points:
- (a) since it was the first time for Hong Kong to hold this international event, the number of participants was conservatively estimated to be around 3,000 to 4,000. Adequate security staff would be deployed to ensure proper crowd control;
 - (b) while the application for temporary occupation of the site was still being processed by LandsD, most Government departments had no objection to the proposal. A separate application had been submitted to LCSD for considering

Action

the portion of the site managed by LCSD. The Western Harbour Tunnel Company Limited also expressed support to the event;

- (c) the event was initiated by High Five Limited which had experience in organising similar events in Europe. The current proposal to focus on cycle-cross had taken into account the fact that it could be held on small sites and was yet to be promoted as a popular sport in Hong Kong; and
- (d) the event would mainly be funded by sponsors. The initial budget was about \$5M to \$6M, which could be increased to \$10M if necessary.

6.6 **The Chairman** summarised that the Sub-committee generally supported the event as it would bring vibrancy to the West Kowloon waterfront. Given its temporary nature, no major concerns were envisaged. He thanked the Project Team for attending the meeting.

Item 7 Amendments to the Approved Tsim Sha Tsui Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K1/22 (Paper No. 11/2008)

7.1 The following representatives of PlanD were invited to the meeting:

Ms Heidi Chan) Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District
Mr C.K. Soh) Planning Office
Ms Kitty Chiu)

Mr T.W. Ng) Urban Design & Landscape Planning Section

7.2 **The Chairman** said that he had received an email from a Mr Tang expressing concern on the building height (BH) restrictions of 2 specific sites in Tsim Sha Tsui area. Mr Tang's email was tabled at the meeting for Members' reference.

7.3 **Ms Heidi Chan** presented the Paper with the aid of powerpoint slides.

7.4 Regarding the concerns raised by Mr Tang, **Ms Chan** pointed out the following:

- (a) Tsim Sha Tsui had been identified as a "high-rise node" under the Study on Urban Design Guidelines for Hong

Action

Kong completed in 2002/03. With good urban design, to allow tall buildings in this high-rise node to create a punctuating effect on the skyline would be compatible; and

- (b) building approval for the redevelopment of Harbour City (Gateway III) was granted in 1999 whereas lease modification for the New World Centre Complex was approved in 2003. The current BH restrictions up to 386.7mPD for the former and 265mPD for the latter were to reflect the respective BHs as per the approved building plans and lease.

7.5 Members had the following comments/questions on the OZP amendments:

- (a) the intention to strengthen planning control for Tsim Sha Tsui area was welcome;
- (b) the BH restrictions for the area were made known to the public only after gazetting of the OZP. This had confined the opportunities for public input to the statutory procedures under the Town Planning Ordinance;
- (c) it was not sure whether the statutory public consultation process would enable the public to fully understand the objectives and community benefits of the BH review, as urban design issues could not be fully addressed by BH control alone;
- (d) taking the current developments as a baseline, how much gross floor area (GFA) would be added to the Tsim Sha Tsui area in future upon full development and the implications on the provisions of recreational/community facilities and public open space;
- (e) whether the proposal would have impacts on the traffic in the area, and whether it would be possible to reinstate the at-grade pedestrian crossings in front of Peninsula Hotel;
- (f) Tsim Sha Tsui was not a sensitive area for BH control as the existing high-rise developments had already caused a considerable intrusion into the skyline;
- (g) the approach to apply a blanket BH restriction for large

Action

areas was arbitrary and inequitable. A more sensitive approach was to consider the control on a site by site basis;

- (h) the current review might freeze development, which would in turn push up the property prices and affect the overall competitiveness of Hong Kong;
- (i) in the absence of information on air quality, the air ventilation assessment (AVA) undertaken for the proposals might not provide sufficient information for decision-makers to fully understand the impacts of the proposals on the neighbourhood environment like roadside air quality, urban heat island effect, etc.;
- (j) while preserving views to ridgelines was a less contentious issue for Kowloon area, the overall density in Kowloon had not been clearly demonstrated. 3D simulations of different combinations of plot ratio and BH should be carried out and presented to the public for deciding the optimal combination. Illustrative materials comparing Kowloon and other world cities would be useful in gauging public response; and
- (k) setback requirement should be stipulated for individual sites abutting narrow streets to improve the environment.

7.6 **Ms Heidi Chan** had the following responses:

- (a) the commencement of public consultation of the BH proposals only upon the gazetting of the amended OZP was considered necessary in order to prevent rushing in of building plan submissions by developers, which might otherwise negate the effectiveness of the control;
- (b) the development density for Kowloon Peninsula was comprehensively reviewed under the Kowloon Density Study (KDS) which provided specific recommendations on domestic and non-domestic plot ratios. The study recommendations had already been incorporated into previous versions of the Tsim Sha Tsui OZP, which had undergone a due process of public consultation and through the gazetting and hearing procedures under the Town Planning Ordinance. The current OZP amendments were just a step further to meet the community aspirations

Action

to prevent excessively tall buildings by stipulating BH control for the Tsim Sha Tsui area;

- (c) the impact assessments undertaken as part of the KDS had confirmed that the recommended plot ratios were sustainable in terms of traffic and infrastructure provisions. In carrying out the current review, the plot ratios recommended under KDS as reflected in the previous OZP were taken on board under the with or without BH restrictions scenarios. No additional GFA would therefore be resulted;
- (d) to further improve pedestrian circulation, a requirement of a 1.5m wide non-building area from lot boundary was imposed on commercial sites abutting narrow public roads in the inner part of Tsim Sha Tsui area. Such requirement was, however, not stipulated for sites fronting Chatham Road South and Nathan Road, which were wider roads;
- (e) air ventilation was only one of the considerations. An AVA by expert evaluation had been undertaken, with assessment focused mainly on the wind environment of the area (excluding air quality) like directions of the prevailing winds, breezeways, seasonal variations, etc. Findings of the AVA were available at PlanD's website; and
- (f) the TPB Paper including photomontages and the minutes of the relevant TPB meeting were available for public inspection.

7.7 **The Chairman** reiterated that urban design issues might not be fully dealt with by BH control alone. Air ventilation might be worsened if there was no corresponding reduction in plot ratio. Similar views had been expressed by Members when BH proposals for other OZPs were discussed by the Sub-committee in the past.

7.8 In response to a Member's request, **Ms Heidi Chan** undertook to provide the Sub-committee with the existing GFA of the area covered by the Tsim Sha Tsui OZP and the total GFA of the area upon full development for reference.

PlanD

[Post-meeting note : The GFA figures were sent to Members by

email via the Secretariat on 15 July 2008.]

7.9 The Chairman thanked PlanD's representatives for attending the meeting.

Item 8 Proposed Study Framework for Hong Kong Island East Harbour-front Study (Paper No. 12/2008)

8.1 **Mr Raymond Lee** presented the Paper with the aid of powerpoint slides.

8.2 Members generally supported the proposed study framework and had the following specific comments:

- (a) there was increasing aspiration of the community for provision of cycling facilities along the harbour-front. EDC and the Southern District Council had recently mooted an idea for the provision of a cycle track from Siu Sai Wan to the Southern District. The possibility of providing a harbour-front cycle track for the Eastern District should be examined in the study;
- (b) although there was a need to look at the provision of cycling facilities, flexibility should be allowed in the Study Brief on the scope and form of cycling facilities to be provided;
- (c) to facilitate public input, the study area could be divided into various sub-areas of individual characters for public engagement;
- (d) more emphasis should be put on the use of place-making as a tool in public engagement. In this regard, breaking up large sites such as the Hoi Yu Street site into smaller plots could achieve more fruitful results in place-making;
- (e) in formulating proposal of the study, a "community-oriented" and "bottom-up" approach should be adopted, whereby the Government should only provide technical supports whilst allowing the public to formulate options themselves;
- (f) the study area should be extended to cover the interface areas with the Central - Wan Chai Bypass (CWB) in the west and the Hong Kong Museum of Coastal Defence in the east. Also, some EDC members had requested

Action

extension of the study boundary to cover Siu Sai Wan and Chai Wan;

- (g) the linkages and integration with adjoining districts should be examined. It was also important to consider the integration between the passenger and vehicular ferry piers and the Ex-North Point Estate site as they were the only access points to the Harbour beyond the Island Eastern Corridor;
- (h) potential quick-wins should be identified to bring about early enhancement prior to implementation of the long-term proposals; and
- (i) in addition to land use, marine use and marine/land interface issues should also be considered under the study.

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

- (a) the study process would be “people-oriented”. Whilst the public would be allowed to freely express their views at the initial stage of the study, the views gathered would likely be diverse. The role of the consultants was to take into account these public views and put together options which could be easily understood by the public to facilitate further gauging of their views;
- (b) the provision of cycling facilities and land/marine interface issues would be examined under the study;
- (c) the study area was drawn up having regard to the Harbour limit in the east and the boundary of the WDII Review (which included the CWB and the adjoining areas) in the west; and
- (d) in addition to long-term land use proposals, the study would also explore possible quick-wins for early implementation.

8.4 **The Chairman** noted that there were different views regarding the proposed study boundary, but considered that the current proposed boundary was in line with the 7 harbour districts identified for carrying out review studies under the overall

Action

Harbour Plan Review, which was previously agreed by the Sub-committee and subsequently endorsed by HEC. Issues outside Victoria Harbour should be considered in other context.

[Post-meeting note: **Mr Paul Zimmerman** sent further comments to Members via email on 22 May 2008. PlanD would take into account all comments received in preparing the Study Brief.]

Item 9 Any Other Business

Demolishment of the Piers at the former Kennedy Town Incinerator and Abattoir

- 9.1 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested that the Sub-committee should request the Government to retain the piers at the former Kennedy Town Incinerator and Abattoir site irrespective of the long-term land use of the site.
- 9.2 **Mr Peter Mok** said that he had no information regarding the demolition works in hand, but would check with the subject officer in his department on the matter. **The Chairman** suggested that the matter be reported at the next meeting.

CEDD

Inventory on Known Project at Harbour-front

- 9.3 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested that, in addition to the hard copies tabled at each Sub-committee meeting, the Inventory be uploaded onto the website.
- 9.4 **Mr Andrew Thomson** supported making the Inventory available on-line. He also suggested that the Inventory be made available to Members in advance to facilitate Members to review the progress of various projects.
- 9.5 **Mr Raymond Wong** stated that:
- (a) the Inventory was to provide Members with an overview of the known projects at harbour-front. The information would become outdated if it was given to Members well in advance; and
 - (b) as there were quite a large number of projects currently included in the Inventory with substantial detail, time and resources would be required for verifying and frequent updating the information of each project if the Inventory was to be released for public viewing on the website.

Action

9.6 While appreciating Mr Wong's concerns, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** considered that once the information on the Inventory list was verified and uploaded onto the website, resources required for updating thereafter would not be too demanding.

9.7 **The Chairman** requested the Secretariat to look into the matter for further discussion by the Sub-committee. **Secretariat**

Inventory No. C7

9.8 Regarding Dr Alvin Kwok's question on the land status of the site, **Mr Raymond Lee** said that the site was Government land and the proposed exhibition hall was within the licensed area of the pier operator.

9.9 There being no other business, the meeting closed at 6:50pm.

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