

Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island

Minutes of Ninth Meeting

Date : 10 May 2012
Time : 9:30 a.m.
Venue : Conference Room, 15/F, North Point Government Offices
333 Java Road, North Point

Present

Mr Nicholas Brooke	Chair
Mrs Margaret Brooke	Representing Business Environment Council
Mr Lam Kin-lai	Representing the Conservancy Association
Mr Andy Leung	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Tam Po-yiu	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Dr Paul Ho	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Dr Peter Cookson Smith	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Ir Dr Chan Fuk-cheung	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Louis Loong	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong (REDA)
Mr Paul Zimmerman	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Mr Chan Hok-fung	
Ms Lily Chow	
Mr Eric Fok	
Mr David Chan	
Ms Joanne Chan	
Mr Lam Cheuk-yum	
Ms Patricia Or	
Ms Gracie Foo	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Vincent Fung	Assistant Commissioner 2, Tourism Commission
Mr Anthony Li	Senior Engineer/Housing & Planning, Urban Regional Office, Transport Department (TD)
Mr Mak Chi-biu	Chief Engineer/Hong Kong 1, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Mr Harry Tsang	Chief Executive Officer (Planning) 1, Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)

Ms Ginger Kiang

District Planning Officer/Hong Kong,
Planning Department (PlanD)
Secretary

Mr Chris Fung

In attendance

Mrs Winnie Kang

Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour),
DEVB

Mr Peter Mok

Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB

Absent with Apologies

Mr Leung Kong-yui

Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics
and Transport in Hong Kong

Dr Frederick Lee

Representing Friends of the Earth

Mr Leslie Chen

Representing Hong Kong Institute of
Landscape Architects

Mr Benjamin Cha

Mr Vincent Ng

For Agenda Item 3

Mr Kenneth To

Managing Director, Kenneth To & Asso. Ltd

Mr Kenneth Lo

Director, LWK & Partners (H.K.) Ltd

Mr S L Ng

Director, LLA Consultancy Ltd

Dr Calvin Chiu

Senior Manager, Environ Hong Kong Ltd

Dr Westwood Hong

Managing Director, Westwood Hong & Asso.
Ltd

Mr Paul Chan

Associate, Earthasia Ltd

For Agenda Item 4

Mr Anthony Li

Senior Engineer/Housing & Planning, Urban
Regional Office, TD

Mr Lo Wai-kei

Engineer/Housing & Planning 2, Urban
Regional Office, TD

For Agenda Item 5

Mr Joe Ranger

Chairman, Servicemen's Guides Association
(SGA)

Fr Ronald R. Saucci, M.M.

Chairman, Reconstruction Committee, SGA

Mr Theodore Paul Algire

Executive Director, SGA

For Agenda Item 6

Mr Jose Yam

Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport) 4,
Transport and Housing Bureau

Mr Michael Ng

Principal Transport Officer/Management
Services, TD

Mr Mak Chi-biu

Chief Engineer/Hong Kong 1, CEDD

Mr Peter Tsui

Senior Engineer 11 (Hong Kong Island
Division 1), CEDD

For Agenda Item 7

Mr Eric Yue

Chief Town Planner/Housing & Office Land
Supply, PlanD

Miss Paulina Kwan

Senior Town Planner/Special Duties 2,
PlanD

Action

Welcoming Message

The Chair welcomed all to the meeting. He advised Members that Ms Ginger Kiang had taken over the post of District Planning Officer/Hong Kong from Ms Brenda Au. He thanked Ms Au for her contribution to the work of the Task Force and welcomed Ms Kiang.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 8th Meeting

1.1 **The Chair** said that the Secretariat circulated the draft minutes of the 8th meeting to Members on 3 April 2012 and did not receive any comment from Members. The draft minutes were confirmed at the meeting.

Item 2 Matters Arising

Action Areas Table

2.1 **The Chair** said that the Secretariat circulated the updated action areas table to Members on 9 May 2012. He suggested that some of the action areas be reviewed in the following meetings.

2.2 **Mr Chris Fung** said that the action areas table had adopted a new format. Starting from the next issue, the Secretariat would highlight changes and progress made to facilitate Members' discussion and follow-up.

2.3 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** asked how the new action areas table was compiled. He also suggested that Wan Chai Development Phase II (WDII) as well as the Royal Hong Kong Yacht Club's proposal be discussed at the next meeting.

**the
Secretariat**

Action

(Post-meeting note: At the 10th Harbourfront Commission meeting held on 4 June 2012, the Commission agreed that the Royal Hong Kong Yacht Club be invited to present its proposal at the 11th Commission meeting.)

- 2.4 **Mr Chris Fung** explained that, in compiling the new action areas table, the Secretariat had made reference to the previous action areas table, the inventory list as well as a reference table presented to the Legislative Council's Subcommittee on Harbourfront Planning. The Secretariat would continue to review other related documents to ensure that any new progress and improvements would be reflected accordingly in the updated action areas table.

Proposal by the Hong Kong Cycling Alliance (paragraph 5.11 of the confirmed minutes of the 8th meeting)

- 2.5 **The Chair** informed Members that the Secretariat had reminded the Alliance to provide response to the questions raised by Commission Members at the 8th meeting. The Alliance's reply was pending.

Wan Chai Development Phase II (paragraph 6.2 of the confirmed minutes of the 8th meeting)

- 2.6 **The Chair** said that the Secretariat was working closely with the relevant government departments to provide a background briefing on the previous studies carried out on WDII in the next Task Force meeting.

**the
Secretariat**

Item 3 Proposed Composite Hotel, Residential and Public Open Space Development In "Comprehensive Development Area" at 12 Oil Street, North Point, Hong Kong (Paper No. TFHK/04/2012)

- 3.1 Before discussion, **Mr Louis Loong** declared that the project proponent was one of REDA's members. **The Chair** proposed and the meeting agreed that Mr Loong should refrain from participating in the discussion on the item but might remain in the meeting as an observer.
- 3.2 **The Chair** welcomed the presentation team to the meeting. **Mr Kenneth To** of Kenneth To and Asso. Ltd presented the proposed development scheme, with the aid of a PowerPoint.

Action

- 3.3 **The Chair** asked about the boundaries of the public open space and private space within the site.
- 3.4 **Mr Lam Kin-lai** enquired which government department would be responsible for the management and maintenance of the public open space in future; whether the public open space would be opened to the public round the clock; and whether the public could walk through the private space on the ground level within the site. He opined that the building separation between the proposed development and Electric Centre (EC) to its east seemed to be narrow.
- 3.5 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** asked whether there would be any fence between the future “ArtSpace” managed by LCSD and the public open space of the proposed development. He was also of the view that the public open space should have good interface with the “ArtSpace”. He also questioned why few people used the existing footbridge which the project proponent proposed to be extended into the site.
- 3.6 **Ms Patricia Or** commented that the sloping design of the public open space on the north-west side might not allow people to have a clear harbour view. The level change might also hinder the access of the elderly and kids.
- 3.7 In response to Members’ comments and enquiries, **Mr Kenneth To** said that –
- (a) referring to Annex B of the paper, the area between the blue line and the purple line was the public open space whereas the area inside the purple line was the private space;
 - (b) the public open space would be managed by the developer and opened to the public round the clock until it was surrendered by the developer to the Government. The public open space would then be taken up by LCSD;
 - (c) the public open space was proposed to be extended beyond the blue line (i.e. the CDA site boundary) and it would be designed as a sculpture plaza, which would match the design of the “ArtSpace”. Subject to further liaison with LCSD, the project proponent would explore the possibility for people to walk from the public open space into the “ArtSpace” area;

Action

- (d) there would be fences in certain areas of the site, for example, between the vehicular access inside the development and the public open space for safety reason. Apart from that, there would be no restriction for people to walk through the site in the outdoor area at grade level;
 - (e) the existing footbridge linking with the MTR Fortress Hill Station was unattractive in outlook and that might be the reason why few people used it. The project proponent would improve it by adding escalators landing and extending it into the hotel area of the site for better accessibility by the public. The extended footbridge would not have any gate;
 - (f) the sea view on the north-west side of the public open space would be blocked by the future administration building of the Central-Wan Chai Bypass (CWB) and the diversion of the Island Eastern Corridor, and hence this part of the landscaped area was not designed for high pedestrian flow. Some changes in level was proposed to make the design interesting; and
 - (g) at the east, the proposed development was set back and not abutting on the electric sub-station (ESS) and EC. There would also be a drainage reserve and a refuse collection point (RCP) at the south end.
- 3.8 **Ms Ginger Kiang** informed Members that PlanD was liaising with the project proponent to explore if wider gaps could be provided within the development to improve the overall permeability.
- 3.9 **Mr Lam Kin-lai** asked the number of public parking spaces in the development; and whether any traffic impact assessment (TIA) had been conducted. He considered that the traffic in the area was already congested.
- 3.10 **Mr Chan Hok-fung** and **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** enquired about the locations of the car park entrance and the pick-up and drop-off points respectively. **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** also hoped to have more information on the building profile of the hotel component.

Action

3.11 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** suggested that in future, project proponents should, as far as practicable, prepare physical model for presentation.

3.12 **Ms Joanne Chan** asked whether LCSD would organise any activities in the public open space which was close to the "ArtSpace".

3.13 **Mr Andy Leung** and **Mr Paul Zimmerman** asked LCSD to provide further information regarding the "ArtSpace" project including its purpose, overall layout and its interface with the public open space of the proposed development.

LCSD

(Post-meeting note: Further information regarding the purpose and overall layout of the "ArtSpace" project was circulated to Members on 17 July 2012.)

3.14 **Mr Harry Tsang** informed Members that LCSD was studying the proposed development and would offer its views to PlanD which was coordinating relevant government departments' comments on the planning proposal. He added that the "ArtSpace" would be used by LCSD's Art Promotion Office as a venue for organising art exhibitions and activities for the public. The project had commenced and LCSD would keep an open mind on how to achieve a good interface with the public open space in the proposed development.

3.15 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** enquired about the overall design of the extended footbridge, including its interface with the proposed development.

3.16 In response to Members' further comments, **Mr Kenneth To** said that -

(a) there would be approximately 160 parking spaces in the proposed development, which fulfilled the requirement set out in the Hong Kong Planning Standard and Guidelines as well as the lease requirement. After getting into the site, the traffic to hotel and to residential areas would be diverted into two different directions to avoid congestion. TIA had been conducted and no adverse comment had been received from TD on traffic circulation so far;

(b) the project proponent had held several meetings and would continue to work with LCSD on improving the

Action

future activities and arrangements at the public open space near the “ArtSpace”; and

- (c) lifts and escalators would be constructed at the extended footbridge within the site. The project proponent would also welcome opportunity to improve the other end of the footbridge in future.

3.17 To get more comprehensive information, **Mrs Margaret Brooke** requested for a briefing on the development proposals at the waterfront in the vicinity of the Oil Street site.

(Post-meeting note: PlanD would conduct a briefing on “Planning of North Point” at the 10th meeting of the Task Force.)

3.18 In closing the discussion, **the Chair** concluded that Members were in general supportive of the proposal and agreed that it had responded to the “Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines”, given the constraints and context of the site. The project proponent was advised to take into account Members’ comments in refining its proposal.

**Item 4 Pedestrian Connectivity at Central and Wan Chai Harbourfront
(Paper No. TFHK/05/2012)**

4.1 **Mr Anthony Li** of TD presented the paper, with the aid of a PowerPoint.

4.2 About the connectivity at Sheung Wan area, the **Chair** pointed out that there was no footpath running through Shun Tak Centre at grade level and pedestrians going in the east-west direction had to use the pavement next to Connaught Road West. He suggested that consideration should be given to explore whether a pavement could be created at the grade level of Shun Tak Centre.

4.3 **Mr Eric Fok** declared that his family had holdings of Shun Tak Centre. **The Chair** considered that he could still participate in the discussion as the issue being discussed was a community issue.

4.4 **Mr Lam Kin-lai** supported the proposal of extending the existing footbridges to connect with the Sun Yat Sen Memorial

Action

Park. He also suggested that lifts be installed at the footbridges.

4.5 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** had the following comments -

- (a) the fences and gate at the EVA to the ventilation building of the Western Harbour Crossing near Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park could be removed to improve the walkability of the area;
- (b) there was a pedestrian crossing at Chung Kong Road near the Central Police Station, which should be shown on TD's plans; and
- (c) the Sheung Wan Bus Terminus site at Chung Kong Road should be developed as soon as possible so that the entire elevated walkway could be connected from Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park to Shun Tak Centre

4.6 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** was of the view that waterfront promenades and open spaces at waterfront area should also be shown on TD's plans so that Members could have a better idea of the connectivity along the harbourfront.

4.7 Noting that the Sheung Wan Bus Terminus site had been put on the land application list, **Mr Andy Leung** enquired whether there would be any provision in the land lease to enhance pedestrian connection in the area. In response, **Mr Anthony Li** said that provision could be put in the land sale condition of the Sheung Wan Bus Terminus site to require the future developer to connect up the two elevated walkways within the site.

4.8 Regarding the connectivity at Central, **the Chair** opined that the proposed linkage from the AIA building via the car park of the City Hall to the new reclamation area would be a key component. He asked when the connection would be completed. **Mr Anthony Li** responded that there was no definite programme for the connection.

4.9 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** had the following comments -

- (a) the area of Central should be planned as an integrated transport interchange and hence the connections between different modes of transports should be improved;

Action

- (b) the subway system should also be shown on TD's plans;
 - (c) the connections between the future landscaped deck in Sites 1 and 2 and the ground level should be planned carefully;
 - (d) the landing of the footbridge at the Hutchison House should be improved and be connected with the new elevated walkway system;
 - (e) the ground level connection between International Finance Centre (IFC) I and IFC II should be improved; and
 - (f) the paved area north of the General Post Office had been used as road, which was not shown in the "Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront" (UDS).
- 4.10 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** commented that there seemed to be insufficient at-grade pedestrian linkages in the western part of Central area. He also suggested introducing some commercial activities in the City Hall area given its future connection with the Hutchison House.
- 4.11 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** suggested that the information of people flow should also be provided so that Members could consider in the context where the pedestrian connections should be.
- 4.12 Regarding the connectivity at Tamar, **Mr Andy Leung** suggested that the Government should negotiate with the owner(s) of Admiralty Centre to explore the feasibility to connect the footbridge south of Central Government Offices with the first floor of the Centre.
- 4.13 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** stressed that connectivity was an extremely important issue both at grade and at an elevated level. The elevated walkway proposal put forward for the CITIC Tower area and extended to the east was based purely on function without any resource to good urban design and sensible urban environment. The notion that an elevated walkway could virtually wrap itself around two prominent sides of the Hong Kong Academy for Performing Arts should be reviewed, and a far more holistic approach adopted to try and ensure a more sympathetic solution in line with agreed urban design criteria.

Action

- 4.14 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that he would support the footbridge along Gloucester Road if the connections and vibrancy at the street level could be maintained. He further suggested that the footbridge should be extended to Causeway Bay.
- 4.15 **Mr David Chan** considered that the elevated footbridge system should be barrier-free.
- 4.16 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** commented that the elevated walkway system should not be designed just for people to walk but should also be a place for people to gather and interact. **Mr Tam Po-yiu** shared with Mr Zimmerman's view and suggested that TD's plans should show activity nodes at all levels.
- 4.17 **Mr Anthony Li** noted Members comments and said that barrier-free design would be adopted for all new footbridges and the Highways Department would install lifts to existing footbridges in phases.
- 4.18 In closing the discussion, **the Chair** concluded that Members appreciated TD's endeavour in providing the comprehensive plan in the vicinity and were of the view that the information was useful. TD should consider Members' comments in refining the proposed connectivity in the areas and revert to the Task Force to report any updates on a regular basis, say every six to nine months.

TD

Item 5 Proposal by Servicemen's Guides Association to Refurbish its Building at Fenwick Pier (Paper No. TFHK/06/2012)

- 5.1 Before discussion, **the Chair** declared interest as the Chairman of Professional Property Services Ltd, which was one of the consultants of Servicemen's Guides Association (SGA) in the project.
- 5.2 **Mr Andy Leung** was invited to take over the chairmanship temporarily from Mr Nicholas Brooke on agenda item 5.

(Note: As Mr Andy Leung had taken over the chairmanship throughout the discussion of Item 5, "the Chair" to which the remaining paragraphs in Item 5 referred should be understood as Mr

Action

Andy Leung rather than Mr Nicholas Brooke.)

- 5.3 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** declared that she was the Chief Executive Officer of Professional Property Services Ltd and had assisted SGA in the formulation of business plan for this project.
- 5.4 **The Chair** proposed and Members agreed that Mr and Mrs Brooke could continue to stay in the meeting as observers but should refrain from participating in the discussion on this item.
- 5.5 **Mr Theodore Paul Algire** and **Fr Ronald R. Saucci** presented SGA's proposal, with the aid of a PowerPoint and an animation.
- 5.6 **The Chair** informed Members that Messrs Vincent Ng and Leung Kong-yui were not able to attend this meeting but they had submitted written comments in support of SGA's proposal, which were tabled at the meeting.
- 5.7 **The Chair** enquired whether the operation of the premises on club licence would deter the general public from enjoying the facilities in the Pier.
- 5.8 **Mr Algire** responded that there was no restriction for people to join the club as members and the membership was free of charge. SGA's plan was that the premises would not be operated on club licence under the future land lease.
- 5.9 **Mr Eric Fok** supported the proposal for the SGA building to remain in situ and be upgraded with a view to integrating with the surrounding waterfront area and giving a better impression to foreign visiting navies. He opined that the traditional services and retail shops currently provided in the SGA building should be preserved after the refurbishment works as far as possible.
- 5.10 **Mr Algire** said that SGA would work with the Government on the terms of the new lease so to preserve the iconic retail shops in the premises.
- 5.11 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** was of the view that the SGA building might not be able to properly serve its function in receiving visiting navies given that its future location was in the hinterland. He also questioned where the holding area, security zone and pontoon would be in the future.

Action

- 5.12 **Mr Algire** said that SGA had considered relocating the SGA building to several waterfront locations but it was finally determined that it would be easier for SGA to proceed if the building remained at the present location. Three sets of landing steps would be constructed on the new seawall to facilitate the arrival of the visiting navies.
- 5.13 **Mr Mak Chi-biu** pointed out that in 2009, the Executive Council had authorised the closing of Lung King Street under the Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance. He advised that SGA should take into account the closure of the street in future in designing the entrance of the refurbished building.
- 5.14 **Ms Ginger Kiang** said that the location of Fenwick Pier fell within the study area of the UDS and was originally planned to be an open space. She commented that there might be a need to refine the SGA proposal so as to integrate with the overall planning and design framework as set out in the UDS. She further said that the proposed green link connecting the SGA site with the harbourfront should be open to public.
- 5.15 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** was of the view that the SGA building could be better located at the waterfront in view of its functions. He also questioned about the boundary of this project in relation to the extension project of the HKAPA; and the necessity to build an elevated footbridge to connect the refurbished building with the extension of HKAPA.
- 5.16 **Ms Joanne Chan** supported the SGA building to remain in situ. She enquired that if the Pier became popular upon completion of the refurbishment, whether there was any policy for the shops to remain rent-free; and whether there would be any measures if the facilities including car parking spaces were not sufficient to cater for increased patronage.
- 5.17 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** asked whether the Government supported the SGA's proposal. He objected strongly to the failure to provide a world-class landing for foreign navies in Hong Kong. He considered the landing steps entirely inadequate and the long distance to the building a mistake, and called on the Government to provide a waterfront site and well designed pier.

Action

- 5.18 **Mrs Winnie Kang** informed Members that the Harbour Unit and the Development Opportunities Office of DEVB had been working closely with SGA for a long time on the project. DEVB was supportive to the proposal in consideration of the vitality that the proposal would bring to the waterfront and importance of SGA's hospitality services to visiting navies.
- 5.19 In response to Members' comments and enquiries, **Mr Joe Ranger** said that while SGA would prefer a waterfront location, it was decided that the SGA building should remain stay put after a series of discussions and deliberations. He also said that little security procedure was required to be carried out for visiting navies inside the building.
- 5.20 **Mr Algire** supplemented that SGA was aware of the future road closure of King Lung Street and its refurbishment plan would not involve any expansion of the existing boundary of the SGA site. All the open space area within the site, including the proposed covered walkway, would be opened to the public round the clock. Regarding the demand for parking spaces, **Fr Saucci** said that not many people would drive their cars to the building.
- 5.21 In conclusion, **the Chair** concluded that the Task Force agreed to give in-principle support to the proposal and suggested SGA taking into account Members' views when working out the detailed design and the operation models, as well as the connectivity and interface issues.

Item 6 Proposal for the Construction of Additional Floors above Central Piers Nos. 4 to 6 (Paper No. TFHK/07/2012)

- 6.1 **Mr Mak Chi-biu** of CEDD presented the paper, with the aid of a PowerPoint and a physical model.
- 6.2 **The Chair** opined that the revised design was a significant improvement to the previous one.
- 6.3 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** opined that while the present design was architecturally more appealing than the previous one, at least one extra floor could be added on the piers so that more interesting and flexible design could be adopted.

Action

- 6.4 **Mr Andy Leung** said that the present scheme was much better than the previous one in terms of architectural design and planning. It was important that the detailed design of the piers should be integrated with the design of the future landscaped deck in Sites 1 and 2.
- 6.5 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** opined that the present design was far better than the previous one and would have much higher chance to be commercially viable. Echoing Mr Andy Leung's view, she considered it important to integrate the designs of the piers with the future landscaped decks in Sites 1 and 2.
- 6.6 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that he was pleased to see the progress. The rooftop would be a good public open space if it was well designed with benches and shelters. He also appreciated that the design would offer indoor and outdoor dining facilities. He gave support to the revised design.
- 6.7 **Mr Chan Hok-fung** asked whether the proposed operation model could help subsidise the ferry fare. He supported the proposed "harbourfront SOHO" theme for the piers and welcomed the proposed mix of one-third of the area for retail and two-third for food and beverages facilities. He also suggested that shelters and benches should be provided as it would be hot at the rooftop in summer.
- 6.8 In response to Dr Smith's comments, **Mr Mak Chi-biu** said that the project team had explored whether there was any opportunity to add one to two floors on top of the additional 1.5 floors. A fire engineering study revealed that it would be very difficult for such proposal to satisfy the means of escape requirement. The project team hence decided to increase the usable area instead. Regarding the detailed design of the public open space, CEDD would take into account Members' comments when finalising the design.
- 6.9 In response to Mr Chan's enquiry, **Mr Jose Yam** said that the consultant had looked into the business feasibility of the project and considered it commercially viable. It was confident that the revenue generated from the additional floors of the piers would be able to subsidise the ferry operation.
- 6.10 In closing the discussion, **the Chair** concluded that Members appreciated the significant improvement and were supportive of the revised design of the additional floors of the piers. The

Action

project team was advised to take into account Members' comments when preparing the detailed design for submission to the Town Planning Board (TPB).

Item 7 Amendments to the Approved Central District (Extension) Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H24/6 (Paper No. TFHK/07/2012)

- 7.1 **Miss Paulina Kwan** of PlanD presented the paper, with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 7.2 **The Chair** commented that the modifications were technical in nature. He asked when the rezoning of sites on the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) would be addressed.
- 7.3 **Mr Eric Yue** responded that as the implementation details of key sites identified in the UDS were still subject to investigation, zoning amendments on the OZP would be addressed at a later stage. At this stage, only technical amendments to update the Notes of the OZP and to incorporate the planning intentions and the minor relaxation of building height restrictions clause in the Notes were proposed.
- 7.4 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** opined that it was not necessary to consider the amendments to the Notes when details of the development sites were not ready at this stage. He did not support the incorporation of the minor height relaxation clause into the Notes and he was of the view that minor height relaxation applications at the new Central harbourfront should be considered on a case-by-case basis. **Mr Lam Kin-lai** also expressed concerns to endorse the incorporation of the minor height relaxation clause into the Notes of the OZP.
- 7.5 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** opined that the OZP being circulated to Members was made ten years ago and was outdated. **Mr Zimmerman** said that some features already built on the grounds were not shown on the plan.
- 7.6 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** noted that the minor height relaxation clause was meant to facilitate the TPB's administration and decision making. Notwithstanding that, Members would need to know the TPB's criteria on what height relaxation was considered as "minor" before they could give support to the proposed incorporation of such clause into the Notes of the OZP. He

Action

suggested that the TPB might take into account the Harbour Planning Guidelines and Principles in making the decision.

- 7.7 **Ms Ginger Kiang** advised Members the TPB would base on justifications like the site constraints and design merits when considering applications for minor height relaxation.
- 7.8 **The Chair** opined that the new Central harbourfront was a prime harbourfront site, it might not be appropriate to provide a blanket approval for minor height relaxation across the area. He shared Mr Zimmerman's view that applications for minor height relaxation should be considered on a case-by-case basis.
- 7.9 **Mr Eric Yue** explained that the incorporation of the minor relaxation clause for building height restriction was a usual practice when imposing the building height restriction in OZP review. This was to allow flexibility so that there was a provision for minor height relaxation and an applicant could submit a Section 16 application to the TPB for consideration. Before making a decision, the TPB would consider each application on individual merits including planning and design merits. The granting of approval was not automatic and was subject to TPB's scrutiny.
- 7.10 **The Chair** was concerned that incorporation of such clause would encourage project proponents to apply for minor height relaxation at the area.
- 7.11 Holding a contrary view, **Mr Andy Leung** opined that the minor height relaxation clause would enable architects to have more flexibility for innovative design. He suggested that all applicants for minor height relaxation at the harbourfront area should be invited to make a presentation on their proposals to the Harbourfront Commission.
- 7.12 **Ms Ginger Kiang** explained that if the minor height relaxation clause was not incorporated into the Notes of the OZP, meritorious projects with minor height exceedance would have to apply for rezoning, which would involve a much longer statutory procedure.
- 7.13 In closing the discussion, **the Chair** said that majority of Members were of the view that tall buildings should not be encouraged at the harbourfront and concluded that the Task Force did not support the proposed incorporation of the minor

Action

height relaxation clause into the Notes of the OZP.

Item 8 Any Other Business

Date of Next Meeting

- 8.1 **The Chair** announced that the next meeting was tentatively scheduled for late July 2012.
- 8.2 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

Secretariat

**Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island
July 2012**