

HEC Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review

Minutes of Twenty-sixth Meeting

Date : 21 January 2009
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 Roger Nissim	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
Mr Yu Kam-hung	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Dr Chan Fuk-cheung	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Paul Zimmerman	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour Ltd.
Mr 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 W.M. Wong	Assistant Director/Territorial, Planning Department (PlanD)
Ms Ying Fun-fong	Chief Engineer/Transport Planning, 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
Mr Raymond Lee Chief Town Planner/Studies & Research, PlanD

Absent with Apologies

Mrs Mei Ng Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Mason Hung Representing Hong Kong Tourism Board

Action

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 25th Meeting

- 1.1 The draft minutes of the 25th meeting held on 19 November 2008 were circulated for Members' comment on 14 January 2009. A revised draft incorporating comments received was issued to Members on 20 January 2009. The meeting confirmed the revised draft minutes without amendment.

Item 2 Matters Arising

Route 4 (para. 2.6 of the minutes of the 25th meeting)

- 2.1 The meeting noted 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 by then.

Proposal to Allow Commercial Helicopter Operators to Use the Wan Chai Temporary Helipad (para. 4.7 of the minutes of the 25th meeting)

- 2.2 The Transport and Housing Bureau (THB) had provided supplementary information on the proposal, which would be discussed under Item 3.

Amendments to the Approved Shau Kei Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H9/14 (para. 5.3(a) of the minutes of the 25th meeting)

- 2.3 The requested gross floor area figures were sent to Members on 19 January 2009.

Action

Short Term Tenancies in the Harbour-front Areas (para. 6.5 of the minutes of the 25th meeting)

- 2.4 Paper No. 25/2008 on the subject would be further discussed under Item 4 below.

Views of the Sub-committee on various proposals presented at the 25th meeting (Items 3, 4, 5 and 7 of the minutes of the 25th meeting)

- 2.5 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 meeting minutes were forwarded to the concerned parties/approving authorities on 23 January 2009.]

- 2.6 Noting that the s.16 application for redevelopment of the Victoria Park Swimming Pool complex, which was presented to the Sub-committee in May 2008, was approved by the Town Planning Board (TPB) in January 2009, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** enquired whether the comments raised by the Sub-committee had been addressed or the project proponent should revert to the Sub-committee in this regard. Similarly, the Sub-committee also needed to be informed on how its comments on the Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park Phase II Project raised at its meeting in September 2006 had been taken on board.

- 2.7 Bearing in mind the advisory role of the Sub-committee, **the Chairman** pointed out that the Sub-committee had on some occasions requested the project proponents to revert to the Sub-committee on their revised proposals after Members' views had been conveyed to them. But the Sub-committee would not be able to handle all proposals in the same way. For proposals which were the subject of s.16 planning applications, the current practice was to convey the Sub-committee's views to TPB for consideration. In future, if considered necessary, Members could request the project proponents of specific development proposals to inform the Sub-committee on how Members' comments were taken on board in the final design of the projects.

- 2.8 **Mr Raymond Wong** pointed out that such an approach was a

Action

pragmatic one taking account of the role and operation of the Sub-committee and the circumstances of individual development proposals.

- 2.9 The meeting noted that the Secretariat would liaise with the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) on the updated information on the 2 projects mentioned in para. 2.6 above.

Secretariat

[Post-meeting note: Updated information provided by LCSD on the above projects was sent to Members on 3 March 2009.]

Design Competition for Waterfront Development at ex-North Point Estate Site

- 2.10 **The Chairman** thanked Dr Alvin Kwok in accepting the Sub-committee's nomination to represent HEC in the working group for the design competition organised by the Eastern District Council (EDC).

- 2.11 **Dr Alvin Kwok** reported that HEC was one of the co-organisers of the design competition. The working group had agreed to group the entries of the design competition into open, professional and student categories. A press conference on the competition would be held on 23 February 2009.

Inventory on Known (Planned and Proposed) Projects at Harbourfront

- 2.12 **Messrs Roger Nissim and Paul Zimmerman** appreciated the effort in revising and compiling the revised Inventory list with clear location plans.

- 2.13 **The Secretary** highlighted 3 new planning applications (No. A/K9/230, A/K22/7 and A/K15/86) incorporated in Sites No. HH18, KT19 and YT6.

- 2.14 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** suggested, and the meeting agreed, to invite the applicant of the proposed residential development in Yau Tong Industrial Area (Application No. A/K15/86) to brief the Sub-committee on the development proposal.

Secretariat

[Post-meeting note: On 13 February 2009, TPB decided to defer the consideration of Application No. A/K15/86. In response to the Sub-committee's request, the applicant advised that it was

Action

considered not appropriate to present the proposal to the Sub-committee at this stage as departmental comments on some of the crucial aspects of the proposal had not yet been received. The position would be reviewed upon receipt of such departmental comments.]

2.15 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested to arrange a separate working meeting to review the baseline information of all Inventory sites.

2.16 **Mr Kim Chan** considered that the current Inventory list already provided adequate information for the Sub-committee's reference. If there was any specific issue, Members could raise it for discussion at the regular meetings of the Sub-committee.

2.17 **The Chairman** pointed out that the meeting agenda of the Sub-committee was always too full to allow in-depth discussion on the Inventory. To expedite the Sub-committee's work, a separate working meeting with the presence of relevant Government bureaux/departments could be arranged to review the Inventory and the list of temporary uses prepared by LandsD in a comprehensive manner. Members were welcome to join the working meeting if interested.

Secretariat

[Post-meeting note: A working meeting was held on 4 March 2009 at which representatives from DEVB, CEDD, LandsD, LCSD and PlanD attended.]

Item 3 Supplementary Information on Proposal to allow Commercial Helicopter Operators to use Wan Chai Temporary Helipad (Paper No. 2/2009)

3.1 **The Chairman** invited the following representatives of the Project Proponents (the Project Proponents) to the meeting:

Mr Esmond Lee) THB
Mr Francis Cheng)

Captain West Wu) Government Flying Service (GFS)

Ms Alison Wong) Civil Aviation Department

Mr Bosco Chan) CEDD

Action

Mr David Tong) Hong Kong Regional Heliport
Mr Benson Luk) Working Group (HKRHWG)

3.2 **The Project Proponents** briefed Members on the Paper with the aid of powerpoint slides.

3.3 **The Chairman** said that Mrs Mei Ng, though could not attend this meeting, had emailed her comments on the proposal to the Secretariat. Her email dated 16 January 2009 was tabled at the meeting.

3.4 Members had the following comments/questions:

- (a) how long it would take for a GFS helicopter to fly from Chap Lap Kok to Wan Chai and for a commercial helicopter to start up the engine;
- (b) whether the commercial flights could shut down their engines after landing;
- (c) whether it was possible for GFS to direct all emergency flights to land at the helipad at Pamela Youde Nethersole Eastern Hospital (Eastern Hospital) during night time;
- (d) the site was close to the Wan Chai Waterfront Promenade and the Royal Hong Kong Yacht Club. The noise impact of the proposal on the nearby area could not be totally reflected by the noise levels measured at a fixed building or a place some 260m away from the helipad;
- (e) when HEC would be consulted on the design of the permanent helipad off the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre (HKCEC); and
- (f) whether the commercial flight operators could offer charity flights to nearby residents.

3.5 In response, **the Project Proponents** made the following points:

- (a) the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) had always been used as a guide in assessing the noise impact of the subject proposal. For planning purpose, a helipad should not be so located such that the daytime maximum noise levels at noise sensitive uses (including domestic premises, hotels, hostels,

Action

educational institutions, hospitals, etc.) as set out in the HKPSG would be exceeded;

- (b) waterfront users were not regarded as noise sensitive receivers under the HKPSG and the Technical Memorandum of the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (EIAO);
- (c) whilst no noise sensitive receivers were identified within 300m from the subject site for the purpose of carrying out an environmental impact assessment under EIAO, the former Territory Development Department (TDD) had conducted a helicopter noise level assessment before the commissioning of the Wan Chai Temporary Helipad in January 2004. The suitability of the site for helipad use was established at that time, rather than the recent flight test;
- (d) the purpose of conducting the flight test in November 2008 was to give an idea of how the noise levels of commercial helicopter operations were when compared with those of GFS operations. The measurements taken at 3 sites located at (i) 260m away from the subject helipad; (ii) immediately outside the Royal Hong Kong Yacht Club; and (iii) the roof of the Elizabeth House demonstrated that the noise levels generated by commercial helicopters were much lower than those by GFS helicopters;
- (e) the proposal was not intended to be a trial for the permanent helipad off HKCEC. In the light of the comments received, a gradual approach was intended to be adopted in allowing commercial helicopter flights. As for the permanent helipad, CEDD was now working on the exterior design and HEC would be consulted in due course;
- (f) regarding the suggestion of combining all helipads in the Harbour, it should be noted that the subject proposal was to provide domestic flights while the helicopter services at the Hong Kong - Macau Ferry Terminal were cross-boundary in nature. The helipad site reserved at Kai Tak was for longer term development;
- (g) on average, the response time for a GFS helicopter from

Action

Chek Lap Kok to Wan Chai was about 20 minutes. For emergency missions, the GFS might also divert an in-flight helicopter to respond which further shortened the time to Wan Chai;

- (h) it took about 30 seconds to one minute to restart the engine of a commercial helicopter after shutting down;
- (i) the suggestion of shutting down the engine of the commercial helicopters might hinder emergency flight services. Given the configuration of the site with 2 helipads aligned along the breakwater, the presence of a helicopter on one helipad might pose risk to the landing helicopter at the adjacent helipad;
- (j) the helipad at the Eastern Hospital was situated at the high ground and close to residential area. To minimise the risk of landing helicopters under inclement weather and to reduce disturbance to nearby residents, the Hospital Authority and EDC had agreed that this helipad should only be used in life threatening or other imminent cases to provide the shortest route for transferring patients to the hospital. Moreover, the Wan Chai Temporary Helipad would also serve as an alternative landing site for GFS emergency flights when the visibility was too poor for safe landing at the helipad of the Eastern Hospital. For less imminent cases, the Wan Chai Temporary Helipad should be used to facilitate onward transfer of patients to the Eastern Hospital or Queen Mary Hospital by ambulance. To reduce nuisance to nearby areas, without compromising the medical service, the emergency crew would expedite the process of patients transfer from GFS helicopters to ambulances;
- (k) since its establishment, HKRHWG had conducted 5 noise tests at the Golden Bauhinia Square, near the Yacht Club and the Wan Chai Waterfront Promenade. The industry would ensure a neighbour-friendly operation by keeping noise nuisance of commercial helicopters to the minimum; and
- (l) in the past, the helicopter industry had donated free flights to charitable organisations from time to time. The industry would continue this practice in future.

3.6 Members had the following further views/questions:

- (a) while the proposal was worth supporting from an economic perspective, the Project Proponents should also take into account the interests and feelings of other harbour-front users;
- (b) HKPSG should not be applied rigidly and specific circumstances should be taken into consideration;
- (c) how long would a commercial flight take to complete the passenger loading/unloading process? If the helicopter engine kept running throughout the process, nearby users would be exposed to unnecessary and prolonged noise nuisance;
- (d) the gradual approach was only intended to increase the frequency of commercial flights. Would it be possible to reduce the frequency of flights after the proposal was implemented?
- (e) consideration could be given to separating the 2 helipads at the site further apart such that shutting down a helicopter on one helipad would not affect the landing of another flight;
- (f) whether quieter helicopter models could be used for GFS operations; and
- (g) the Government should expedite implementation of the permanent helipad at HKCEC as it was shielded by the surrounding commercial developments and located further away from residential areas.

3.7 In response, **the Project Proponents** explained the following points:

- (a) HKPSG and the EIAO Technical Memorandum had stipulated the noise criteria for various uses, which had been followed. Whether the criteria should be reviewed to include waterfront users as noise sensitive receivers was a separate issue;
- (b) the proposed gradual approach to increase the average number of commercial flights per day from 15 in the first

Action

3 months to 20 in the next 3 months was to allow scope for growth in demand. This arrangement would be reviewed after 6 months of operation. Depending on market demand and the impact on nearby users, the frequency of commercial flights could be reduced if necessary;

- (c) shutting down the engine of commercial helicopters at the helipad was not advisable in view of safety concern. To reduce the noise impact of commercial flights, GFS would co-ordinate closely with the operators to reduce the time required for ground operation such as boarding procedures. Given its low passenger capacity with the existing helicopter models, it would only take a few minutes for each commercial flight to complete the ground operation;
- (d) to ensure a safe and effective shared-use at the Wan Chai Temporary Helipad, the commercial operators would need to observe the operational conditions set by GFS; and
- (e) GFS provided a wide range of helicopter services, such as fire fighting, air ambulance and other rescue operations and therefore, it required specific helicopter models in its fleet.

3.8 Whilst generally not objecting to the proposal, Members considered that the noise impact generated by the proposal had yet to be addressed. They had the following views:

- (a) given that the objective of harbour-front enhancement was to promote public use and enjoyment of the harbour-front, the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines (HPPs/HPGs) should be taken into account by including transient users along the harbour-front as noise sensitive receivers in applying the HKPSG or carrying out noise assessments under the EIAO Technical Memorandum;
- (b) while the subject proposal would enhance public enjoyment of Victoria Harbour through helicopter tours, users of nearby facilities should also be respected. There appeared to be no practical solution to eliminate the noise nuisance and compromises would need to be

Action

made. Specific suggestions included:

- (i) a maximum number of commercial flights per day should be imposed;
- (ii) save in declared emergency situation, commercial helicopters should be allowed to shut down the engine after landing;
- (iii) whilst helicopter operations might not cause intolerable noise problem on weekdays given the ambient traffic noise of the area, commercial flights should not be allowed on Sundays as they were rest days when the Yacht Club and Wan Chai Waterfront Promenade were highly patronised; and
- (iv) the Project Proponents should report the implementation of the proposal including feedbacks from nearby users to the Sub-committee after a certain period of time.

3.9 **The Project Proponents** assured the Sub-committee that:

THB

- (a) Members' comments would be considered carefully before a decision was made on the proposal;
- (b) the suggestion of no commercial flights on Sundays would be too restrictive;
- (c) the operational arrangements and procedures would be reviewed to minimise the noise impact as far as practicable;
- (d) implementation of the proposal, including the number of commercial flights per day, would be reviewed after 6 months of operation. If major problems were encountered during the intervening period, the Government did not preclude the possibility of terminating the licence agreements with the commercial operators; and
- (e) the Project Proponents would brief Members on the operation of the proposal, including any complaints received, in 4 or 5 months after operation.

Action

3.10 **The Chairman** said that, as an advisory body, the Sub-committee would only provided advice to the Government and count on them to protect the interest of the community. The meeting agreed to write to the relevant bureaux/departments on the Sub-committee's concerns and suggestions as recorded in para. 3.8 above.

Secretariat

[Post-meeting note: A letter from THB on the subject matter was received on 11 February 2009 and further comments of Members on the proposal were conveyed to THB on 20 February 2009. On 24 February 2009, a follow-up letter was received from THB and Members' views were conveyed to THB on 5 March 2009.]

Item 4 Short Term Tenancies in the Harbour-front Areas (Paper No. 25/2008)

4.1 The following representatives of LandsD were invited to the meeting:

Mr Edwin Chan
Mr Victor Cheung

4.2 **Mr Edwin Chan** then briefly recapped the subject which was first discussed at the last Sub-committee meeting.

4.3 Members had the following comments/questions:

- (a) some temporary works areas like the works site for the West Island Line (WIL) project at the former incinerator and abattoir site in Kennedy Town were not included in the Annex to the Paper;
- (b) how to address the demand for parking spaces if the STTs for the existing public car and lorry parks along the harbour-front were to be terminated;
- (c) some STT uses like swimming pavilion, boat/bus kiosks, and activity centre for domestic helpers did not appear to be of short term nature;
- (d) car parking should not be included as one of the permissible uses in the STT sites along the harbour-front; and

Action

- (e) the current STT policy appeared to be revenue-oriented. In granting STTs, intangible benefits to the community should also be considered.

4.4 In response, **Mr Edwin Chan** made the following points:

- (a) as an established land administration practice, LandsD could exercise control on the use of private developments through lease whilst on temporary land use through STT. STT covered a wide variety of uses. For example, some STTs were granted for reprovisioning of the uses on the sites that had been cleared for implementation of planned projects/developments; and some STTs were for special use like the servicemen's leave centre for the US Navy;
- (b) the Paper only included STT information available as at November 2008. LandsD would update the list whenever necessary;
- (c) parking problems varied from one district to another. A solution to the parking problems in one district might not be applicable to the other. In the light of Government's commitment on harbour-front enhancement, a balanced approach would be adopted in tackling parking problems; and
- (d) while many STTs produced rental income to Government, LandsD had also let sites for community or non-profit making uses at nominal rent.

LandsD

4.5 Members had the following further views:

- (a) STT offered flexibility in implementing enhancement initiatives and improving connectivity. LandsD could contribute, for example, by requesting the STT tenants to set back the site for the provision of waterfront promenade. This could be introduced as a matter of policy rather than on an ad hoc basis;
- (b) a separate meeting should be arranged to review the process of STT application and renewal and to identify STT sites for enhancement; and

Action

- (c) in considering temporary uses along the harbour-front, HPPs/HPGs and the Urban Design Guidelines should be followed and priority should be given to the provision of waterfront promenade for public enjoyment.

4.6 Regarding a Member's query on the amount of revenue generated from the STTs per annum, such information could be provided to Members if required.

LandsD

4.7 **The Chairman** said that the STT information would assist in identifying potential sites for harbour-front enhancement, and concluded that a separate meeting be arranged to further discuss the matter.

[Post-meeting note: A working meeting was held on 4 March 2009.]

Item 5 An Overview of Temporary Land Uses at Kai Tak (Paper No. 1/2009)

5.1 The following representatives of the District Lands Office/ Kowloon East (DLO/KE) were invited to the meeting:

Ms Money Ho
Ms Elaine Kwan

5.2 **Ms Elaine Kwan** briefed Members on the existing and proposed temporary uses at Kai Tak.

5.3 Members had the following views/questions:

- (a) the policy of re-tendering STTs sites for uses similar to existing ones where no development was envisaged in the next 3 years should be reviewed;
- (b) most of the temporary uses within the site were unsightly and not for public enjoyment. More efforts should be made to enhance the area and introduce more variety of uses; and
- (c) a large area of Kai Tak would be used as construction sites, storage, etc. in the next 10 years. A co-ordinated approach to allow community uses in the interim was necessary. In this regard, a dedicated office was required to oversee the overall usage/development of the Kai Tak

Action

site, identify the implementation/management agent and ascertain funding for the enhancement proposals.

5.4 In response, **Ms Lydia Lam** pointed out the following:

- (a) the subject Paper only focused on the temporary uses at Kai Tak. With the completion of a number of projects within Kai Tak in the coming years, a considerable amount of land would be made available for public enjoyment; and
- (b) according to the latest programme, the Runway Park and the first berth of the Cruise Terminal would be completed by 2013. In the interim, construction of the proposed 200m temporary promenade at the Kwun Tong Public Cargo Working Area (PCWA) would soon commence. The temporary promenade could be extended to the rest of the PCWA pending removal of the PCWA operation upon expiry of the related berth licences in 2011.

5.5 **Mr Peter Mok** added that in view of the commencement of construction of the Shatin to Central Link in 2010 and the imminent cruise terminal project at end 2009, it might be more practical to identify some areas such as sites near Sung Wong Toi Road for enhancement in the interim. Upon completion of the access roads to the ex-runway area, more sites along the waterfront might be made available for public enjoyment. Any other quick-win sites identified by the Sub-committee could also be considered.

5.6 Members had the following further views:

- (a) given the short tenancy period, it was hard for tenants to invest in temporary sites. Some basic facilities like mobile public toilets could be provided to reduce investment cost;
- (b) harbour-front land should not be used for car parking. Priority should be given to the provision of promenade along the waterfront;
- (c) in addition to road access, the provision of water taxi as suggested in the "Harbourfront Connectivity Study" undertaken by Harbour Business Forum (HBF) could

also enhance accessibility to the Kai Tak waterfront; and

- (d) a strong commitment of the Government was necessary. CEDD could act as the implementation and management agent for the enhancement works in Kai Tak.

5.7 **Ms Elaine Kwan** made the following points:

- (a) ample open space and a diversity of uses would be provided in Kai Tak for public enjoyment in the long term. Any proposal for temporary enhancement should not affect the availability of the land for implementing the Kai Tak development in a timely manner;
- (b) in re-tendering the existing car park sites, LandsD would take into account the car parking demand in consultation with TD. Other community or recreational uses (such as carnival, cricket ground, model plane flying) had also been considered by LandsD. However, the short tenure, lack of road access and other operational requirements of the uses could restrict viability of such uses on a temporary basis; and
- (c) at present, the sites in the inland area (mostly in the North Apron area) were generally used for temporary uses such as open storage, car parking, etc., whereas the waterfront sites were mainly allocated to various works departments for implementing the Kai Tak development. Updated information on the existing and proposed temporary uses in Kai Tak would be provided for the Sub-committee's reference every 6 months.

5.8 **The Chairman** reiterated that while the Sub-committee was aware of the plan for Kai Tak and the construction works to take place in the coming years, it was necessary to have a co-ordinated works programme to allow public use of the harbour-front in the interim. He suggested, and the meeting agreed, that the subject matter would be further discussed in a separate working meeting to be arranged with the participation of relevant Government bureaux/ departments.

[Post-meeting note: A working meeting was held on 4 March 2009.]

Item 6 Draft Planning Brief for the Proposed Developments at Ex-North Point Estate Site (Paper No. 3/2009)

6.1 The following representatives of PlanD and its air ventilation consultants were invited to the meeting:

Ms Brenda Au) District Planning Office/Hong Kong
Mr Tom Yip)

Dr Peter A. Hitchcok) CLP Power Wind/Wave Tunnel Facility
Mr Martin Ko)

6.2 **Dr Chan Fuk-cheung**, being an employee of CLP Group, declared an interest in this item. The meeting agreed that Dr Chan could stay at the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion of this item.

6.3 **Mr Tom Yip** drew Members' attention to a replacement page 3 of the Paper, which was tabled at the meeting. He then presented the Paper with the aid of powerpoint slides.

6.4 Members had the following comments/questions:

- (a) the proposed public transport terminus (PTT) might be incompatible with the proposed residential development and public open space, and not in line with the HPPs that the land required for and the impact from infrastructure developments, utility installations and incompatible land uses should be minimised. Consideration should be given to relocate the PTT to the "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") site south of the North Point Dangerous Goods Vehicular Ferry Pier. Alternatively, TD should consider reducing the scale of the PTT and accommodating some facilities at basement level;
- (b) mixed uses should be promoted;
- (c) "wall-like" buildings should be avoided. Podium structures should be minimised to increase permeability at street level;
- (d) in view of the public concern on the recent renewal of the tenancy of the Sunbeam Theatre for Cantonese Opera use, consideration could be given to provide a permanent performance venue at the subject site for such use;

Action

- (e) opportunity should be taken to upgrade the North Point Ferry Piers by integrating them into the comprehensive development at the subject site, as the piers were the only site bringing people nearer to the Harbour beyond the Island Eastern Corridor;
- (f) it was appreciated that lower building height and plot ratio were proposed in the planning brief to guide future development at the site; and
- (g) EDC wished to develop the site into a landmark for the Eastern District, and hence would launch a design competition to collect design ideas on its future development. Members' comments could be incorporated into the design brief of the competition. The results of the design competition should be taken into account in the finalisation of the planning brief.

6.5 In response, **Ms Brenda Au** explained the following points:

- (a) the "G/IC" site proposed by Members as an alternative for the PTT was now occupied by the toll gate and access ramps to the adjoining North Point Dangerous Goods Vehicular Ferry Pier, which would remain in use in the long term. Its size and configuration also posed constraints for PTT use. As TPB had also raised concern on the scale of the podium structure incorporating the proposed PTT, PlanD was reviewing the matter in conjunction with relevant departments including TD with a view to minimising the scale;
- (b) the draft planning brief would envisage mixed use development at the site, including hotel development at Site A and residential, commercial and GIC uses at Site B, which would be zoned "Comprehensive Development Area" ("CDA"), to encourage a diversity of uses and to enhance vibrancy;
- (c) specific design requirements including wind corridor, building gaps, etc. had been incorporated in the planning brief to prevent massive development and excessive podium structures and to minimise wall effect. In view of Members' comments, the maximum site coverage in the draft planning brief (i.e. 65%) would be reviewed and tightened, if feasible, and would also be stipulated in the

Action

leases. The proposed developments on both Sites A and B required planning permission from TPB. Specifically, the overall design of the “CDA” development on Site B could be controlled through the submission of Master Layout Plan;

- (d) in response to the earlier comments of TPB, the planning brief had stipulated the requirement for provision of a community hall at Site B with upgraded facilities for cultural performances, which could also include Cantonese Opera;
- (e) the forthcoming Hong Kong Island East Harbour-front Study would examine and identify possible enhancement measures for the piers; and
- (f) EDC only decided to launch a design competition recently. The preparation of the planning brief had started much earlier. In January 2008, the proposed uses, development parameters and design requirements for the site were agreed by TPB as the basis for the Air Ventilation Assessment study. The study findings were subsequently incorporated into the draft planning brief, which was agreed by TPB in January 2009 as suitable for consultation with HEC and EDC. Views received would need to be reported back to TPB. If the results of the design competition were not yet available by then, it would still be possible that any design merits identified from the competition could be integrated into the design of the future developments at the site in the planning application process for TPB’s consideration.

6.6 **Mr Raymond Wong** clarified that the PTT concept would not be construed as contradicting the HPGs of encouraging integrated planning of an efficient public transport infrastructure with marine transport facilities (like ferry piers) at suitable locations to enhance accessibility and connectivity of the harbour-front areas. The question was to ensure a design compatible with the waterfront setting.

6.7 **Ms Ying Fun-fong** pointed out that 2 additional bus routes and 2 minibus routes would be accommodated in the future PTT. Unlike the open air design of the existing PTT, a larger site would be required for the future covered PTT to accommodate the supporting columns of the podium structure.

Action

Notwithstanding, TD was now working with PlanD and relevant departments to review the scale of the PTT.

6.8 **The Chairman** remarked that the Sub-committee appreciated that lower building height and plot ratio were adopted for the site and considered it important to promote a vibrant development through better urban design and integration with the surroundings. Whether with podium or not, the key was to create an interesting streetscape to enrich the pedestrian environment whilst not hindering air ventilation.

6.9 The meeting agreed to convey Members' views to TPB for reference, in particular the following points:

Secretariat

(a) the scale of the proposed PTT should be suitably reduced;

(b) the North Point Ferry Piers should be upgraded and included as part of the development package at the subject site; and

(c) the results of the design competition organised by EDC for the site should be taken into account, where appropriate, in the finalisation of the planning brief.

6.10 Since the Chairman had other commitment and could not attend the remaining part of the meeting, Dr Alvin Kwok was elected by Members to preside the rest of the meeting. **Dr Alvin Kwok** then took over the chairmanship.

Item 7 Proposed Temporary Uses for Eastern Lot of Ex-North Point Estate (Paper No. 4/2009)

7.1 The following representatives of the District Lands Office/Hong Kong East (DLO/HKE) were invited to the meeting:

Ms Joyce Ng
Mr Edmond Chan

7.2 **Mr Edmond Chan** briefed Members on the proposed temporary uses for the Eastern Lot of the ex-North Point Estate site with the aid of powerpoint slides.

7.3 Members had the following comments/questions:

Action

- (a) in addition to the proposed temporary open space in the north, soft landscaping should be provided along the southern and western boundaries of the Eastern Lot and the entire Central Lot;
- (b) car parking should only be ancillary to exhibition or other vibrant uses, not the sole use, on the Lot; and
- (c) due to inadequate funding, EDC only agreed to develop the 20m wide waterfront promenade. Other ideas considered by EDC such as organic farm with educational purpose and flea market had also not been pursued because of funding and management problems. Consideration should be given to include such uses in the tender document and invite prospective bidders to submit proposals.

7.4 **Mr Edmond Chan** responded as follow:

- (a) similar to the funding problem encountered in the Eastern Lot, Members' suggestion to develop the Central Lot for greening purpose might not be acceptable to EDC in view of the size of the site, short duration for the temporary use and resources constraint;
- (b) as the Eastern and Central Lots had been let out by the Hong Kong Housing Authority as public car parks since 2004, demand for parking spaces in the area had been established over the past few years. This could be evidenced by the fact that written requests had been received from the public for retaining the site for temporary car park purposes pending its long-term development. If the Western Lot, which was already included in the Application List for land disposal, was disposed of, there could be a need to allow the Eastern Lot for temporary car park purpose pending its long term development so as to avoid sudden drop in the supply of car parks;
- (c) the proposed use could be expanded to include temporary markets, etc. as suggested by Members.

7.5 Members had the following further views:

- (a) LandsD should no longer lease harbour-front sites for car

Action

parking so as to avoid creating local parking demand and expectations which would make it difficult to convert the car parks to more compatible uses afterwards;

- (b) as the existing temporary car parks would eventually be vacated to facilitate permanent development, to vacate such car parks for other community uses now might be a better transitional arrangement; and
- (c) a longer tenancy period should be considered so as to provide more incentive to the tenants for investment.

7.6 **The Chairman** remarked that the Sub-committee would convey its views to LandsD for consideration, in particular, to stop granting harbour-front land for car parking.

Secretariat

[Post-meeting note : Having considered the comments from Members that car parking should be ancillary only, LandsD agreed to delete car parking from the list of permitted user for the proposed short term tenancy in respect of the Eastern Lot.]

Item 8 Any Other Business

8.1 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** raised the following matters:

- (a) he suggested the Sub-committee to discuss a proposal to improve waterfront connectivity in Tsuen Wan at the next meeting. The proposal was outlined in his email dated 20 January 2009 which was tabled at the meeting;
- (b) renewal dates of the berth licences for the public cargo working areas should be provided to the Sub-committee for reference; and

Sub-committee

[Post-meeting note: the renewal dates of the berth licences of the PCWAs within the Harbour had been incorporated in Sites No. WHK9 and SW1 (relating to the Western District PCWA), KC1 (relating to Rambler Channel PCWA), SC2 (Stonecutters Island PCWA), WK8 (New Yau Ma Tei PCWA), and KT14 (Kwun Tong and Cha Kwo Ling PCWAs) of the "Inventory on Known (Planned and Proposed) Projects at Harbourfront (January 2009)".]

- (c) whilst supporting the Central Kowloon Route project, he noted that the proposed tunnel exits of the Central Kowloon Route would render part of the waterfront along the Kai Tak Nullah inaccessible to the public, which was contrary to the provision of a continuous promenade. CEDD and TD were requested to provide more information to HEC for reference in this regard.

Action
CEDD/TD

8.2 There being no other business, the meeting closed at 6:30 pm.

**HEC Sub-committee on
Harbour Plan Review
March 2009**