

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

### **Minutes of Twenty-fifth Meeting**

Date : 19 November 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
Dr Sujata Govada	Representing Citizen Envisioning @ Harbour
Dr Alvin Kwok	Representing Conservancy Association
Mr Kim Chan	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Dr Chan Fuk-cheung	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Mason Hung	Representing Hong Kong Tourism Board
Mr Paul Zimmerman	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour Ltd.
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 Lee	Assistant Director/Territorial (Acting), Planning Department (PlanD)
Mr Yau Ka-tai	Chief Engineer/Transport Planning (Acting), Transport Department (TD)
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**

Miss Cheung Hoi Shan            Assistant Secretary (Planning) 5, DEVB

**Absent with Apologies**

Mrs Mei Ng                        Representing Friends of the Earth

Mr Yu Kam-hung                Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors

**Action**

**Item 1    Confirmation of Minutes of the 24<sup>th</sup> Meeting**

1.1    The draft minutes of the 24<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 24 September 2008 were circulated to Members on 12 November 2008. The meeting confirmed the draft minutes without amendment.

**Item 2    Matters Arising**

Views of the Sub-committee on various proposals presented at the 24<sup>th</sup> meeting (paras. 2.13, 3.11, 4.4, 6.6 and 7.9 of the minutes of the 24<sup>th</sup> meeting)

2.1    The meeting noted that the relevant parts of the confirmed minutes of meeting would be forwarded to the concerned parties/approving authorities for reference after the meeting.

[Post-meeting note: The relevant parts of the confirmed minutes of meeting were forwarded to the concerned parties/approving authorities for reference on 24 November 2008.]

Inventory on Known (Planned and Proposed) Projects at Harbourfront (para. 7.10 of the minutes of the 24<sup>th</sup> meeting)

2.2    The meeting noted that a discussion session on the Inventory was held on 2 October 2008 and, in light of the suggestions received, the Inventory was revised and sent to Members before the meeting. The Sub-committee agreed to discuss the revised Inventory at the next meeting.

**Sub-  
committee**

**Action**

Route 4 (para. 7.16 of the minutes of the 24<sup>th</sup> meeting)

- 2.3 **Mr Yau Ka-tai** reported that the Route 4 would be reviewed to take account of the latest traffic demand, environmental concern, etc. The general public and relevant stakeholders would be consulted before submission to the Town Planning Board (TPB) for consideration of amendments to the relevant Outline Zoning Plan (OZP).
- 2.4 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the proposed alignment of Route 4 would diminish the value of the Victoria Harbour. It was not in line with the Harbour Planning Principles (HPPs) and did not comply with the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (PHO). Future developments on Hong Kong Island like the Mega Tower in Wan Chai and the proposed hotels at Ocean Park would have bearing on the need and time frame for a north-south transport corridor. The timing of the review was crucial for considering any future development on the northern and southern sides of Hong Kong Island.
- 2.5 In response, **Mr Yau Ka-tai** said that the review would commence in 2009. All factors including committed developments, the latest population distribution patterns and the implications on PHO would be taken into account for considering/revising the alignment and design options of Route 4.
- 2.6 **The Chairman** said that more information should be submitted to the Sub-committee for reference. The meeting agreed to further discuss the matter at the next meeting.

**THB/TD**

[Post-meeting note: THB advised that the review of the need of Route 4 would be completed by the third quarter of 2009. Relevant stakeholders, including the Sub-committee, would be consulted then.]

Information and review sought on Short Term Tenancies (para. 7.17 of the minutes of the 24<sup>th</sup> meeting)

- 2.7 The meeting noted that LandsD would present a paper on the "Short Term Tenancies in the Harbour-front Areas" under Item 6.

**Item 3 S16 Application for Office, Eating Place, Shops & Services in "CDA(1)" Zone, 14-30 King Wah Road, North Point (Paper No. 22/2008)**

3.1 **Mr Kim Chan** declared an interest in this item as he had current business dealings with the Project Team. The meeting agreed that Mr Chan could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion of this item.

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

Mr Augustine Wong ) Glory United Development Ltd.,  
Mr Shuki Leung ) a subsidiary of Henderson Land  
Mr Richard Chong ) Development Company Ltd.  
Mr Denis Ma )

Mr Phill Black ) Pro Plan Asia Ltd.  
Ms Veronica Luk )

Ms Phoebe To ) Dennis Lau & Ng Chun Man  
Architects & Engineers (HK) Ltd.

Mr Kim Chin ) CKM Asia Ltd.  
Mr Damon Wong )

Dr Rumin Yin ) ARUP

Mr Christ Foot ) ADI Ltd.

3.3 **The Chairman** drew Members' attention to a letter dated 18 November 2008, which was tabled at the meeting. The letter was submitted by "A Coalition Against the Proposed Development on King Wah Road", representing a group of local residents.

3.4 **The Project Team** presented the proposal with the aid of powerpoint slides. The proposal was the subject of a s.16 planning application being processed by TPB.

3.5 Members had the following comments/questions:

(a) the proposed development with no podium structure was considered an improvement compared with the previous proposals for the site;

**Action**

- (b) given the location of the site and the surrounding high density developments, the concern of local residents on the proposed development and its traffic impact was understandable;
- (c) whilst the Project Team's effort to reduce the building height to below the statutory height limit was noted, a higher building height with less site coverage might also be considered so as to alleviate the visual impact of the proposed development and to improve air ventilation;
- (d) whilst efforts had been made to improve the streetscape along the southern site boundary, the interface of the proposed development with the future waterfront park to its north should not be overlooked;
- (e) the ground level design should be reviewed to allow better integration with the surrounding area. The loading/unloading activities at the northern part and circulation of vehicles along the eastern side would be visually intrusive to visitors of the future waterfront park and were contrary to harbour-front enhancement. Consideration could be given to accommodate the loading/unloading bays in basement. The ground level environment could be enhanced if some utilities could be rearranged to create more space for public use and to promote vibrancy. Consideration could also be given to make better use of the space underneath the Island Eastern Corridor (IEC) for public enjoyment; and
- (f) the comments raised by the Sub-committee on the previous application at the last meeting, as summarised in the local residents' letter, should be conveyed to TPB for reference.

3.6 **The Project Team** responded as follows:

- (a) in drawing up the development proposal for the site, efforts had been made to satisfy various requirements, including the development restrictions stipulated under the OZP, commercial considerations, community aspirations and the views of HEC;

**Action**

- (b) there was flexibility to adjust the height and width of the proposed development if there was a strong guidance from HEC to reduce the width of the development despite a higher building height;
- (c) loading/unloading bays were an operational requirement to be complied with. On cost consideration, the option of accommodating the loading/unloading facilities in basement was not preferred. As it was considered unsuitable to locate the loading/unloading facilities in both the southern part of the ground level where the main entrance was located and the western part directly abutting on the proposed public passageway, they were therefore proposed at the northern part of the building alongside with the emergency vehicular access (EVA). This arrangement had taken into account the requirements for the EVA locating at the eastern and northern sides of the building and that a 10m wide non-building area to the south of IEC should be reserved as maintenance access for the highway structure. Visitors to the future waterfront park would probably make use of the proposed public passageway in the west. The proposed staircase between the loading/unloading bays and the public passageway might provide some screening effect;
- (d) it was a common design to place the lifts and related electrical and mechanical facilities in the central part of the building. The proposed shops and cafés on the southern and western frontages would increase the transparency of the building. While it might be possible to add more shop space along the public passageway by trimming part of the transformer room, such space might not be commercially viable given its long and narrow configuration;
- (e) whilst the design of the future waterfront park was not yet known, the Project Team could suggest measures to deal with the interface with the future park and submit them, as supplementary information to the s.16 application, for consideration by TPB and the relevant departments;
- (f) regarding point (3) in the local residents' letter, the current proposal had given due regard to the HPPs and

**Action**

HPGs. The Project Team had demonstrated the related design features in the submission; and

- (g) to address the concerns of the local residents on the congested environment along King Wah Road, the proposed development had included a 14.5m wide setback to widen King Wah Road to alleviate any canyon effect. Members' suggestions on the ground floor design could be further explored to increase visibility and permeability.

3.7 As a separate issue, Members raised the following comments:

- (a) there was a need to reduce the overall development density in North Point and improve the traffic condition in the area. The Government should consider imposing a lower density for the ex-Government Supplies Depot site which was the remaining Government site pending redevelopment in this locality; and
- (b) the Government should make every endeavour to enhance the harbour-front. To alleviate the environmental and visual impacts of high-density developments along the harbour-front, incentives or compensatory measures, e.g. a reduced land premium, might be considered to reduce development densities.

3.8 In relation to para. 3.5(f) above, **the Chairman** pointed out that, as an established practice, the confirmed minutes of the last Sub-committee meeting would be forwarded to the relevant approving authority for reference. Members' views at this meeting, as summarised below, would also be conveyed to the relevant parties and approving authority:

**Secretariat**

- (a) integration of the proposed development with the waterfront and the surrounding area was important. The ground level design of the proposed development, including the location of the loading/unloading bays and utility facilities, should be reviewed to improve its interface with the future waterfront park, increase public space, promote vibrancy, enhance public accessibility to the harbour-front and increase permeability;
- (b) the proposed 9m wide setback for a public passageway could improve accessibility to the waterfront;

**Action**

- (c) further reduction of the width of the building to improve air circulation, though this might increase the building height, might be considered; and
- (d) the overall density in North Point should be reduced and traffic condition in the district should be improved.

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

**Item 4 Proposal to Allow Commercial Helicopter Operators to Use the Wan Chai Temporary Helipad (Paper No. 24/2008)**

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

Mr Francis Cheng ) Transport and Housing Bureau (THB)

Ms Alison Wong ) Civil Aviation Department (CAD)

Mr Bosco Chan ) CEDD

Mr CK Lam )

Captain West Wu ) Government Flying Service (GFS)

Mr Fredrick Leong )

Mr David Tong ) Hong Kong Regional Heliport

Mr Andrew Cheung ) Working Group

4.2 **The Project Team** briefed Members on the proposal.

4.3 **The Chairman** drew the attention of Members and the Project Team to the comments/questions raised in an email from Mrs Mei Ng dated 19 November 2008, which was tabled at the meeting. Members had the following comments/questions:

- (a) noise impact was a major concern. Without double glazing windows, the noise level generated by helicopters of 84.9dB(A) exceeded the general acceptable noise level of 70dB(A). The noise impact on sensitive receivers within a distance of 300m from the helipad should be assessed;



**Action**

- (b) there should be an assurance from the Government that the temporary helipad should cease operation once the permanent helipad at the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre (HKCEC) commenced operation. The Government should expedite implementation of the permanent helipad;
- (c) with Hong Kong as an international city, a diversity of harbour-front uses should be encouraged. Like other commercial activities, the proposed commercial operation of helicopters flights could contribute to a vibrant harbour-front. However, visitors in the nearby areas including the Wan Chai Waterfront Promenade (WCWP), which was a harbour-front enhancement initiative, and patrons of the Royal Hong Kong Yacht Club would inevitably be affected if landing/taking off of helicopters was too frequent;
- (d) with the closure of the Central Helipad at Lung Wui Road in 2004, helicopter tours were no longer available. The proposal, though temporary in nature, would positively contribute to the tourism industry;
- (e) information on the operating hours, flight paths, previous noise complaints, and the frequency of helicopters landing/taking off at the site in the past and anticipated in the future should be provided for reference;
- (f) the cumulative impacts of the proposed intensification of the use of the helipad on the nearby pedestrian network and traffic flow should be assessed;
- (g) whether cross-boundary flying service would be accommodated at the site;
- (h) essential helicopter services should not be interfered with;
- (i) the public benefits brought about by the proposal appeared to be minimal. In view of the economic downturn, the demand for private helicopter service should be re-assessed; and

Action

- (j) consideration should be given to integrate commercial helicopter service alongside the proposed cruise terminal at Kai Tak.

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

- (a) cross-boundary helicopter flying services would not be accommodated at the subject site;
- (b) since the relocation of the GFS operation to the Wan Chai Temporary Helipad in January 2004, a total of 26 noise complaints had been received, with the majority (24 complaints) relating to the emergency services during night time. This suggested that comparatively speaking, daytime helicopter operations at the subject helipad were more tolerable to nearby residents;
- (c) the landing/taking off of commercial flights at the site, as governed by the safety regulations of CAD, would be confined to daytime hours, roughly from 8:00am to 6:00pm;
- (d) test flights of both single and twin-engine commercial helicopters at the site had been conducted recently. Noise measurements had been taken at 3 locations, viz. (i) the roof of Elizabeth House, the nearest noise sensitive receiver in the adjacent residential area, which was located more than 300m away from the helipad, (ii) a site at about 260m away in the western part of WCWP, and (iii) a site at about 170m away in the eastern part of WCWP immediately outside the gate of the Royal Hong Kong Yacht Club. The test results indicated that the landing/taking off of small commercial helicopters at the subject helipad would not generate significant noise impact when checked against the ambient noise in Wan Chai area;
- (e) approval of the draft Wan Chai North OZP was currently held up by judicial review. Once the OZP was approved, the permanent helipad could come into operation in about 2 years after obtaining funding approval from LegCo. The Wan Chai Temporary Helipad would then be vacated to facilitate construction of the Central-Wan Chai Bypass and all helicopter operations would be relocated to the permanent helipad;

**Action**

- (f) the proposal would contribute positively to the helicopter industry and help foster tourism; and
  - (g) as for the landing/taking off frequency, generally there should not be more than 2 flights per hour on average. Given the low passenger capacity (3-4 persons) per flight, the proposal would attract less than 100 visitors on a daily basis. The traffic impact on the surrounding area would be minimal. In fact, it was demonstrated in the Wan Chai Development Phase II Review that no significant traffic impact would be brought about by the permanent helipad at HKCEC.
- 4.5 Some Members considered that there was insufficient information in the Paper and they had the following further views:
- (a) instead of using daytime hours, specific operating hours should be stipulated to minimise noise nuisance during early morning. The frequency of commercial flights should also be specified;
  - (b) the engine of helicopters should be switched off after landing;
  - (c) appropriate measures should be taken to minimise the impact on the users of the WCWP and patrons to the adjacent Yacht Club;
  - (d) remedial action and noise mitigation measures should be taken to address the noise problem arising from the helicopter operation. The local community might not be receptive to the proposal to allow non-essential commercial flying services at the site which would aggravate the noise problem in the area; and
  - (e) a cost-benefit analysis should be conducted, taking into account such factors as the public revenue for leasing out the helipad, the benefits to the tourism industry, the value and cost to the society and the associated opportunity cost foregone, etc. More information on the environmental impact assessment and the provision of ancillary facilities like shelters and toilets should be provided for reference. Landscaping or other measures

Action

to enhance the harbour-front should also be considered.

4.6 A Member however pointed out that providing too complicated information might not be useful. As the site was already used by GFS, the issue at stake was to accommodate additional commercial helicopter flights during daytime. The proposal would certainly enhance Hong Kong as a world city.

4.7 **The Chairman** concluded that whilst the Sub-committee was not objecting to the proposal, more information should be provided to justify the proposal. **The Project Team** undertook to revert to the Sub-committee with more information.

**THB**

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

**Item 5 Amendments to the Approved Shau Kei Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H9/14 (Paper No. 23/2008)**

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

Ms Brenda Au            ) Hong Kong District Planning Office  
Ms Amy Cheung         )

5.2 **Ms Amy Cheung** gave a presentation with the aid of powerpoint slides and a 3D simulation showing the planned height profile of the Shau Kei Wan area.

5.3 Members had the following views/questions:

(a) the existing gross floor area (GFA) and the total GFA of the area covered by the Shau Kei Wan OZP upon full development should be provided for reference;

**PlanD**

[Post-meeting note: The GFA figures were sent to Members for reference on 19 January 2009.]

(b) the boat building/repair yards in the eastern part of the area should be preserved in the long term and its connectivity with the adjacent waterfront should be considered;

**Action**

- (c) the existing low-rise, village-type and mixed use character of the inner part of Shau Kei Wan should be preserved. Instead of promoting large-scale redevelopment which might create canyon effect along Shau Kei Wan Road and Sai Wan Ho Street, renovation/redevelopment based on the existing plot sizes and building heights should be encouraged;
- (d) it appeared that the current OZP amendments focused primarily on building height and plot ratio controls, and little emphasis was put on marine/land interface or measures to enhance the harbour-front. There was also not much emphasis on the HPPs;
- (e) allowing redevelopment to a higher density would put more pressure on transport infrastructure. The impacts of future developments on the road network and pedestrian environment in the harbour-front areas should be fully assessed;
- (f) the existing developments along the Shau Kei Wan harbour-front were typical “wall-type” developments. A vision should be formulated to guide future developments in the area;
- (g) although the harbour-front area had been developed for high-rise buildings which would unlikely be redeveloped in the near future, appropriate control should be imposed to reduce their building heights upon redevelopment in the long term;
- (h) there was a need to improve the environment and streetscape and provide more open space in the inner part of Shau Kei Wan to encourage redevelopment of the old built-up areas;
- (i) the current layout and disposition of Ming Wah Da Ha were well arranged to preserve views to the ridgelines. It was not sure whether the proposal to increase the existing plot ratio of the site from 3.8 to 6 would bring about any improvement to the area; and
- (j) the connectivity along the harbour-front should be improved. The Marine Police Station and Regional Headquarters off Grand Promenade had physically

separated the Quarry Bay Park from the Aldrich Bay Promenade. One suggestion considered by the Eastern District Council was to link up the Aldrich Bay Promenade with Lei Yue Mun Park and Heng Fa Cheun by a walkway round the hill slopes. The eastern part of the Shau Kei Wan Typhoon Shelter waterfront could also be enhanced by converting some old shipyards to museums and revitalising the wholesale fish market through appropriate means.

5.4 In response, **Ms Brenda Au** explained as follows:

- (a) the concerned OZP amendments were to take on board an initiative in the 2007-08 Policy Address to review and progressively stipulate in all OZPs clear development restrictions to improve the living environment where appropriate. Building height restrictions were imposed on all development sites within the Shau Kei Wan area. Opportunity was also taken to review the plot ratio control for some specific sites;
- (b) HPPs and HPGs had been taken into account in this OZP review. The existing open space/promenade along the waterfront would provide direct access to the harbour-front. In the west, the proposed Aldrich Bay Park near Les Saisons would soon commence construction. In the east near Aldrich Garden, another site was reserved for open space development. The view corridor along Oi Yin Street was preserved. The existing building heights of other low-rise developments along the waterfront were also maintained and reflected on the OZP. The intention was to ensure both physical and visual access to the Harbour;
- (c) the use of existing boat building/repair yards in the eastern part of the typhoon shelter had been maintained on the OZP. A height restriction of 2 storeys was stipulated to ensure their compatibility with the waterfront setting;
- (d) a clear planning intention for preservation of the features of historical significance within the graded historic Lyemum Barrack Compound, which was in line with the HPGs on preserving cultural heritage, had been incorporated into the respective OZP Notes;

Action

- (e) a stepped height profile was generally adopted with lower building height restrictions stipulated for waterfront sites and higher ones for inland developments. While the existing heights of some high-rise buildings were maintained, the building height for future redevelopment of Les Saisons had been tightened. Besides, a plot ratio restriction of 6 was imposed to reduce the density of the public housing sites within the "Residential (Group A) 1" zones upon redevelopment;
- (f) the plot ratio restriction of 6 imposed on Ming Wah Dai Ha was substantially lower than the permissible plot ratio of 9 or 10 under its previous "Residential (Group A)" zoning. The new "Comprehensive Development Area" zoning could ensure that the impacts of future redevelopment of the site on environmental, visual, traffic and other aspects would be properly addressed;
- (g) the OZP amendments would not lead to a significant increase in population density;
- (h) to preserve the low-rise character of the inland area along Shau Kei Wan Road and Sai Wan Ho Street as far as possible, a 2-tier building height control was adopted such that smaller sites (with area less than 400m<sup>2</sup>) would be subject to a lower building height restriction;
- (i) the walkway suggested by Members, as recorded in paragraph 5.3 (j) above, could be examined under the Hong Kong Island East Harbour-front Study to be undertaken by PlanD; and
- (j) in addition to the review of building height control, relevant Government departments were pursuing a harbour-front enhancement proposal to extend the Aldrich Bay Promenade eastward upon relocation of an existing car park for rehabus and termination of the tenancy of a temporary car park in June 2009.

5.5 **The Chairman** noted that the main objective of the OZP amendments was to incorporate building height restrictions for the area and review the plot ratio control for specific sites. The forthcoming Hong Kong Island East Harbour-front Study

**Action**

would focus more on connectivity improvement and harbour-front enhancement.

- 5.6 He thanked the representatives of PlanD for attending the meeting.

**Item 6 Short Term Tenancies in the Harbour-front Areas (Paper No. 25/2008)**

- 6.1 **The Chairman** said that the paper was submitted by LandsD in response to a request raised at the HEC meeting on 18 August 2008, which was referred to the Sub-committee for follow up.
- 6.2 **Mr Edwin Chan** of LandsD was invited to the meeting, who then briefed Members on the paper and showed the locations of the short term tenancies (STTs) sites with the aid of powerpoint slides.
- 6.3 In response to a Member's question, **Mr Edwin Chan** said that the paper only covered the harbour-front sites let on STTs for non-government uses, but excluded the land allocated to various Government departments for operational and other specific uses.
- 6.4 Members noted that the paper covered a lot of information and there was insufficient time to go through the details at the meeting. Location plans showing the STTs sites in relation to their surrounding areas should also be provided for reference.
- 6.5 The Sub-committee agreed to further discuss the paper at the next meeting and that LandsD should provide the relevant location plans for Members' reference.

**LandsD**

[Post-meeting note: The locations plans were uploaded onto the website for Members' reference on 10 December 2008.]

- 6.6 **The Chairman** thanked LandsD's representative for attending the meeting.

**Item 7 Any Other Business**



Proposed temporary waiver for erection of signage on roof of MegaBox

7.1 **The Chairman** said that a proposed temporary waiver for erection of signage on the roof of MegaBox at the Remaining Portion of NKIL No. 5927 was circulated to the Subcommittee for consideration on 30 October 2008. The following representatives of LandsD were invited to explain the proposal and related land administrative policies and practices:

Ms Money Ho       ) District Lands Office/Kowloon East  
Mr Bryan Mak       )

7.2 **Mr Bryan Mak** explained the case as follows:

- (a) to ensure efficient use of land resources, LandsD would process applications for lease modifications taking into account the provisions on the respective OZPs and comments of relevant Government departments;
- (b) according to the lease, a height limit of 170mPD was stipulated for the building on the site in question except certain rooftop structures, like machine rooms, water tanks, stairhoods , etc.; and
- (c) an application was received by LandsD to waive the height restriction stipulated in the lease to allow the erection of a LED signage (with a width of 33.12m and a height of 6.72m) on the roof of the subject building (MegaBox). The highest spot level of the signage was 180.72mPD. Currently, some rooftop structures including a 8-m high aluminium louver and a lift machine room (about 179.115mPD) had been erected on the building. The proposed signage was 1.6m above the highest structure currently on the roof. Building plans submission for the proposed signage was approved by the Building Authority in March 2008.

7.3 Members had the following comments/queries:

- (a) from harbour planning point of view, the key consideration was to maximise the visual access to the Harbour by minimising the building height;

Action

- (b) the building height restriction should be respected and there was no point for the Government to exercise discretion over the building height restrictions stipulated in the lease and OZP. Essential rooftop structures should also be kept within the existing restrictions;
- (c) the height of the signage should be reduced by 1.6m i.e. the same height as the highest existing rooftop structure. Alternatively, the proposed signage could be placed on the building façade;
- (d) the width of the signage might also affect visual access to the Harbour;
- (e) there were concerns on glare impact and energy consumption;
- (f) if the proposed waiver was approved, whether the same height would apply to both towers of MegaBox;
- (g) the Sub-committee had considered some signage proposals before. A clear and consistent stance of the Sub-committee was necessary; and
- (h) for signage proposals which did not fall within the harbour-front areas and that building plans had been approved, consultation with the Sub-committee appeared to be unnecessary.

7.4 In response, **Mr Bryan Mak** made the following points:

- (a) the height restriction of 170mPD in the lease was the same as the maximum permissible height stipulated in the OZP;
- (b) the current application was to waive the height restriction for Tower 1 of MegaBox. The owner had to apply for another waiver if relaxation of height restriction for Tower 2 was required;
- (c) as shown in the photomontage circulated to Members on 30 October 2008, the width of the proposed signage was narrower than that of the subject building; and

**Action**

- (d) even if the signage height was reduced by 1.6m, the lot owner would still need to apply to LandsD for waiving the height restriction in the lease.

7.5 **The Chairman** remarked that:

- (a) although the proposed signage was located away from the harbour-front, it would still be visible from the Harbour; and
- (b) from harbour planning point of view, the design of the signage and its implications on building height should not be considered in isolation. In this connection, the Sub-committee had not raised objection to the erection of the Olympic Rings on the façade of Hong Kong Cultural Centre which would not lead to an increase in building height.

7.6 Members considered that visual access to the Harbour should be safeguarded. While noting that some existing rooftop structures had been erected on the subject building, the meeting did not support the proposal which would result in a further increase in building height.

7.7 **The Chairman** thanked the representatives of LandsD for attending the meeting.

7.8 There being no other business, the meeting closed at 6:10pm.