

25th Meeting of Harbourfront Commission
held at 3:00 pm on 13 December 2016 at the Conference Room
on Upper Ground Floor, Hong Kong Heritage Discovery Centre,
Kowloon Park, Haiphong Road, Tsim Sha Tsui, Kowloon, Hong Kong

Minutes of Meeting

Present

Mr Nicholas BROOKE	Chair
Mr Paul CHAN	Secretary for Development, Vice Chair
Prof Becky LOO	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Mr SO Kwok-yin	Representing Conservancy Association
Mrs Karen BARRETTO	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Freddie HAI	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Evans IU	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Dr Peter Cookson SMITH	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Sr Emily LI	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr Ivan HO	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Mr Shuki LEUNG	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Mr Hans Joachim ISLER	
Mr KAN Chak-fun	
Ms Vivian LEE	
Mr Alan LO	
Mr Vincent NG	
Mr NGAN Man-yu	
Mr Thomas CHAN	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Ms Emily MO	Assistant Commissioner for Tourism, Tourism Commission (TC)
Mr Wilson PANG	Assistant Commissioner/Urban, Transport Department (TD)
Mr LAM Sai-hung	Director of Civil Engineering and Development
Mr Raymond FAN	Deputy Director of Leisure & Cultural Services (Leisure Services), Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Mr CHEUK Fan-lun	Assistant Director/Planning & Services, Marine

Mr Raymond LEE
Miss Christine AU

Department
Director of Planning
Secretary

In Attendance

Ms Fannie KONG
Mr Francis CHAU
Mr Tim FUNG

Press Secretary to Secretary for Development
Principal Assistant Secretary (Works)2, DEVB
Assistant Secretary (Infrastructure Coordination)
4, DEVB

Mr Larry CHU
Ms Jenny WONG

Assistant Secretary (Harbour)1, DEVB
Assistant Secretary (Harbour) Special Duties,
DEVB

Miss Emily SOM
Mrs Doris FOK
Mr LEUNG Kong-yui

Assistant Secretary (Harbour) 2, DEVB
Assistant Director (Leisure Services)1, LCSD
Chair, Task Force on Water-land Interface

Absent with Apologies

Mrs Margaret BROOKE
Mr Raymond CHAN
Mr CHAN Ka-kui
Mr Walter CHAN
Ms Kelly CHAN

Representing Business Environment Council
Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers

For Agenda Item 3

Ms Amy CHEUNG

Mr Steven SIU

Assistant Director of Planning / Territorial,
Planning Department (PlanD)
Town Planner/ Strategic Planning 9, PlanD

For Agenda Item 4

Mr Tom YIP
Mr Peter CHUI

Mr Vincent AU YEUNG
Mr Simon LEE
Mr Alan MACDONALD
Ms Jennifer CHIK

District Planning Officer/ Kowloon, PlanD
Chief Engineer/ Kowloon 1, Civil Engineering
and Development Department (CEDD)
AECOM
AECOM
URBIS
LEIGH & ORANGE

For Agenda Item 5

Mr PUN Wai-keung

Mr Tony HO
Ms April KUN

Deputy Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office
(Planning & Standards), CEDD
Chief Geotechnical Engineer/Planning, CEDD
Chief Town Planner/ Studies and Research,

Mr Fred NG	PlanD
Dr Johnny CHEUK	Senior Project Manager, AECOM
Dr Eunice MAK	Deputy Project Manager, AECOM
	Planning Team Leader, AECOM

For Agenda Item 6

Miss Christine AU	Secretary, Harbourfront Commission
-------------------	------------------------------------

Action

Welcoming Message

The Chair welcomed all to the meeting. He welcomed Ms Kelly CHAN, Mr Alan LO and Mr NGAN Man-yu, whose tenure commenced on 1 July 2016, for joining the Commission. He also welcomed Mr LAM Sai-hung, who had assumed the post of Director of Civil Engineering and Development; and Mr Raymond LEE, who had assumed the post of Director of Planning, for attending the meeting for the first time.

He informed Members that Mr Thomas CHAN, Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands), was attending on behalf of Mr Michael WONG; Ms Emily MO, Assistant Commissioner for Tourism, was attending on behalf of Ms Cathy CHU; Mr Wilson PANG, Assistant Commissioner of TD, was attending on behalf of Mrs Ingrid YEUNG; Mr Raymond FAN, Deputy Director of LCSD, was attending on behalf of Ms Michelle LI; and Mr CHEUK Fan-lun, Assistant Director of MD, was attending on behalf of Ms Maisie CHENG.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 24th Meeting

- 1.1 **The Chair** said that the Secretariat circulated the draft minutes of the 24th meeting on 7 November 2016. There being no proposed amendment, the minutes were confirmed at the meeting.

Item 2 Matters Arising

A. Coach and Goods Vehicle Parking at the Harbourfront (paragraph 3.10 of the minutes of the 24th meeting)

2.1 At the invitation of the Chair, **Mr Wilson PANG** informed Members that TD was reviewing its parking policy in particular that for commercial vehicles. A comprehensive study would be conducted in 2017 and the department would report the review results to the Commission after completion of the study.

2.2 **The Chair** enquired about the timetable for the study.

2.3 **Mr Wilson PANG** responded that the comprehensive study would commence in 2017 and it would take around two years to complete.

B. Progress Update on Shatin to Central Link (paragraph 4.18 of the minutes of the 24th meeting)

2.4 **The Chair** informed Members that the written response from the Highways Department and MTR Corporation Limited in addressing Members' comments raised at the last meeting was circulated on 6 December 2016.

C. Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (paragraph 5.22 of the minutes of the 24th meeting)

2.5 **The Chair** said that the issue would be handled under agenda item 6.

D. Crowd Management Measures during Events (paragraph 10.2 of the minutes of the 24th meeting)

2.6 **The Chair** informed Members that the Police had agreed to brief the Commission on the subject.

Item 3 Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030 (Paper No. HC/13/2016)

3.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives of PlanD to the meeting.

- 3.2 **Prof Becky LOO** declared that her husband was working in PlanD and directly on the project. She would refrain from making comments in this discussion.
- 3.3 **Mr Steven SIU** presented Paper No. HC/13/2016 with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 3.4 **The Chair** enquired if there would be any initiatives to reduce car ownership, enhance use of public transport and phase out parking at the harbourfront. He opined that there would be a need for the Government to review the model of implementing large-scale infrastructure projects.
- 3.5 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** raised the following questions/ comments-
- (a) whether and how the new development strategy would have impact on the harbourfront;
 - (b) the impact of proposed strategy for transport infrastructure on Victoria Harbour and its harbourfront areas in terms of reclamation;
 - (c) the strategy to deal with the growing cross-border vehicles and private car ownership ; and
 - (d) why the waterfront linkage from West Kowloon Cultural District to Tai Kok Tsui through Yau Ma Tei Typhoon Shelter was not included as one of the possible waterfront passages in the Public Engagement (PE) booklet.
- 3.6 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** commented that the drawing up of the proposed territorial development strategy might not have fully taken into account the Harbour Planning Principles. He echoed the Chair's suggestion to review the framework for implementing large-scale infrastructure projects.
- 3.7 **Ms Amy CHEUNG** made the following responses-
- (a) on the issue of a growing number of private vehicles, curbing private car growth and managing car usage

would be one of the key strategic directions. The Government would continue adopting a rail-based public transport system, complemented by other environmentally friendly transport modes and keep encouraging the public to use public transport ;

- (b) another way of relieving transport congestion was to promote smart urban development by creating jobs closer to home and designating more employment-related land uses in new development areas outside the Metro Area;
- (c) to take forward the Hong Kong 2030+ strategy effectively, a high-level steering group was proposed to be established within the Government to coordinate, prioritise and monitor the implementation of relevant initiatives among bureaux and departments based on the overall strategic framework;
- (d) another key strategic direction was to plan for a liveable high-density city by promoting unique city characters, embracing diversity and creating vibrancy. For example, the Government would leverage Victoria Harbour as a key visitor and local attraction to promote coherent cultural clusters around the harbour, protect the harbour setting, enhance connectivity and accessibility to the harbourfront etc.; and
- (e) the possible waterfront linkages as set out in the PE booklet were indicative. Further investigation would be considered to identify new enhancement opportunities. Members' views on fine tuning the preliminary plan would be welcomed.

3.8 **The Chair** opined that connectivity along the harbourfront should be improved by further extending the waterfront promenade along both sides of the harbourfront.

3.9 **Mr Freddie HAI** commented that apart from reducing the number of private vehicles, the Government should also review the existing bus network. Noting that the Kowloon Motor Bus Company was planning to bring in a new bus model that would be environmentally friendly but longer in length, he worried

that it could create a greater burden on road traffic.

3.10 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that TD should restrict the size of buses and encourage the use of shorter buses to alleviate traffic congestion. TD should be engaged to formulate strategies to alleviate traffic congestion and the problem of illegal parking in the territory including the harbourfront. He reiterated that the Government should consider providing waterfront linkage from Tsim Sha Tsui to Tai Kok Tsui as early as possible.

3.11 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** said that Hong Kong would not have sufficient space to accommodate many vehicles. TD should examine both the size of bus and also the design of bus routes. He opined that the Hong Kong 2030+ strategy was not merely a planning study but a holistic overview of the development strategy for the territory. It required detailed examination of all development-related aspects and collaboration between various Government departments. He was disappointed that the recommendations so far had only provided preliminary concepts without substantive initiatives.

3.12 **Ms Amy CHEUNG** made the following responses-

- (a) PlanD had been working closely with other bureaux/ departments including the Transport and Housing Bureau and TD in carrying out the study and their comments from the transport perspective had been taken into account;
- (b) on transport infrastructure planning, some members of the public commented that Hong Kong might only need narrower roads in the future as smart cars with a smaller size were becoming more popular. The Government would take into account vehicles of different sizes when planning for road infrastructure; and
- (c) the Government would continue to work on the detailed initiatives for taking forward the strategy as recommended under the study having regard to development needs and comments from Members.

3.13 **Mr Raymond LEE** supplemented the followings-

- (a) Hong Kong 2030+ was a long-term strategic territorial plan, which might not involve specific project-based planning proposals. To alleviate pressure on the existing transport network, the Government proposed smart urban development by promoting more balanced home-job distribution between the metro and non-metro areas, which would in turn help reduce transport needs and improve overall traffic condition in the territory;
- (b) the objective of any regulatory regime had to strike a balance between safeguarding public interest and allowing flexibility. Innovative designs should not be denied by regulatory measures; and
- (c) having regard to actual operational needs and constraints, the Government would have to maintain the existing working function of particular sections of the harbourfront (including the New Yau Ma Tei public cargo working area) while promoting public access to the waterfront at the remaining sections.

3.14 **The Chair** enquired if the study had specifically covered the long-term planning for the harbourfront.

3.15 **Ms Amy CHEUNG** responded that there was a topical paper on “Planning and Urban Design for a Liveable High-density City” covering more information on the initiatives related to the harbourfront. The study team would provide the topical paper to Members for reference after the meeting.

PlanD

[Post-meeting note: The topical paper on “Planning and Urban Design for a Liveable High-density City” provided by PlanD was circulated to Members on 14 December 2016.]

3.16 **The Chair** asked the project team to take on board Members’ comments and keep the Commission posted on the progress of the study.

PlanD

Item 4 Review Study for Kai Tak Development (Paper No. HC/20/2016)

- 4.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the Review Study (the Review) of Kai Tak Development (KTD) was discussed at the 23rd meeting of HC's Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development (KTTF) on 18 November 2016. PlanD and CEDD briefed KTTF Members on the proposed increase in development intensity, supply of residential flats and projected population in KTD in response to the acute shortage of land for housing development and rising property price in Hong Kong. At the meeting, Members expressed concerns over the proposals in particular on the building height profile, building mass and other urban design aspects. The project team was requested to take into account Members' comments and provide a refined scheme for further deliberation.
- 4.2 **Mr Paul CHAN** added that there were increasing public aspirations for making the best use of KTD and the Government had attached great importance to the views of HC in taking forward the development of KTD. He would like to reassure Members that the Government and HC had a shared vision and were committed to protect and enhance the harbourfront for enjoyment of the community. The project team had made efforts to draw up refined schemes for further consideration.
- 4.3 In response to the Chair's invitation, **Mr Vincent NG** appreciated the Government's efforts made to comply with the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines when preparing the refined schemes. He opined that while it would be more preferable if the proposals could be discussed further at the Task Force level as some HC Members might not be fully aware of the detailed background of the issue, the planning history of KTD and past discussions on this front, he had no objection to bringing the issue for discussion at the Commission level. He asked the project team to recap the comments that were expressed by KTTF Members in the past.
- 4.4 **Mr Paul CHAN** said that the Government aimed to increase housing supply as soon as practicable and targeted to submit the related rezoning proposals to the Town Planning Board (TPB) for consideration shortly. He appreciated the views offered by Members of KTTF and believed that the refined schemes had addressed Members' concerns and achieved the

right balance between optimising land uses and creating an interesting urban design scheme for KTD.

- 4.5 **The Chair** welcomed representatives of PlanD, CEDD and their consultants to the meeting.
- 4.6 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** declared that his company was engaged in the study and therefore he would not participate in the discussion.
- 4.7 **Mr Tom YIP, Mr Alan MACDONALD and Ms Jennifer CHIK** briefed Members on the refined schemes with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 4.8 **The Chair** acknowledged the efforts made by the project team. On the building height profile of development sites along the former runway, he enquired whether the proposed heights were the maximum. He added that if the building heights could be further relaxed, the number of towers and the building bulk might be reduced to increase the provision of at-grade open space.
- 4.9 **Prof Becky LOO** raised the following comments:
 - (a) she agreed that planning was an on-going process and a review on the previous planning for KTD, which was conducted more than 10 years ago, might be necessary. She shared public aspirations that KTD should be better utilized to generate genuine public benefits including the facilitation of public enjoyment at the waterfront;
 - (b) the community expressed aspirations on different aspects. While the Government was obligated to provide more space for future generations to live, the Review should also be able to enhance the overall urban design setting such as providing a wider and attractive waterfront promenade to commensurate with the increased development density. For example, more interesting urban design initiatives could be included into the commercial towers under scheme 2;
 - (c) the proposal should bring in a better pedestrian

environment for KTD. She opined that it was not necessary to drive pedestrians onto the landscaped deck if there was sufficient provision of at-grade pedestrian pavement and crossings along the former runway in addition to the connections to the landscaped deck; and

- (d) she would like the project team to clarify whether all carparks in KTD would be built underneath the new residential or commercial developments.

4.10 **The Chair** queried how the proposed Environmentally Friendly Linkage System (EFLS) could be incorporated into the refined schemes as presented.

4.11 **Mr Alan MACDONALD** replied that the landscaped deck above Road D3 would reserve provision to accommodate the proposed EFLS. He supplemented that although planning for the stations of EFLS was conducted conceptually and proposed positions were included in the refined schemes, the implementation of EFLS had yet to be ascertained at this stage.

4.12 **Mr Ivan HO** thanked the project team for preparing the refined schemes within a short period of time. He opined that the refined schemes demonstrated a better coordination between land use planning, architectural and urban designs. He raised the following comments and enquiries-

- (a) from an urban design point of view, the schemes should strike a balance between preserving the ridgeline and enhancing streetscape, building bulk and skyline;
- (b) he noted that the revised schemes tried to improve the permeability of the residential building blocks at the former runway. He queried if the ventilation assessment conducted by the Review could fulfil the requirements of the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) on conducting a proper air ventilation assessment;
- (c) he expected the detailed design of at-grade public open space fronting the residential developments would be made available to Members. He opined that a unified design approach to develop the public open space would

be boring. A variety of pocketed open space could be created along the waterfront; and

- (d) as he had expressed at the previous KTTF meetings, he objected to the noise mitigation measures proposed under the Review. He reiterated that the noise impact should not be addressed by the mandatory installation of acoustic windows and balconies in residential developments.

4.13 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** raised the following comments and questions-

- (a) which refined scheme could provide a better pedestrian environment on the ground level in terms of connectivity and walkability;
- (b) whether there would be sufficient shading for pedestrians along the waterfront promenade;
- (c) the landscaped deck, the residential and commercial developments would have to be well connected. It would be essential to have direct and barrier-free access from the landscaped deck to the harbourfront through the development sites at both the ground and elevated levels;
- (d) the waterfront of the former runway should be revitalized by incorporating commercial and retail elements on the ground;
- (e) the urban design schemes submitted on developing Kai Tak Approach Channel (KTAC) near the Kai Tak River should be taken into account. Marina Bay in Singapore and Darling Harbour in Sydney were visited by the Harbourfront Commission. The unique shape of development on three sides interacting with one another can be achieved at the head of the KTAC. Such urban design details should be included in the proposed OZP amendments to be submitted to TPB for consideration; and
- (f) the waterbody of KTAC and the Kwun Tong Typhoon

Shelter (KTTS) should be actively utilized. As the amount of vessels berthing at the areas concerned is increasing, proper mooring facilities and anchorage areas should be provided in order to ensure public safety. Additional public landing along the water and water sports facilities on the waterfront land should also be provided to cater for the increasing water-related activities.

- 4.14 **Mr Freddie HAI** said that he understood the main objective for the Review was to increase land supply for residential and commercial uses. He commented that the residential towers as shown on the Mater Layout Plan were extremely compact using up the building frontages to achieve the target domestic GFA which could only be possible with extremely small flats. As such, it would most likely limit design flexibility in the future. He would like to understand the assumptions made in preparing the plan. He asked whether it would be possible to prepare another design for the building blocks as the current building form might restrict the project to small-size residential flats only.
- 4.15 **Mr Vincent NG** said that it would be difficult for all HC Members to comprehend the planning history of KTD and the technical details of the Review. He supplemented the following comments-
- (a) the Review aimed to increase the development density by raising the Plot Ratio (PR) of residential sites to 6.5 and relaxing their maximum building heights. He had no objection to the objective itself but it had to be complemented by a detailed urban design scheme to help achieve an interesting building height profile and a pedestrian friendly environment;
 - (b) rezoning the sites from hotel to residential uses would have a direct impact on the harbourfront setting and the adjacent public open space as the atmosphere and design of the waterfront promenade would be affected by its adjoining land uses. As an example, he said that the public open space adjacent to commercial developments could incorporate more vibrant elements and allow for a wider range of activities as compared to those adjoining

residential areas;

- (c) according to the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines, the developments fronting directly onto the Victoria Harbour should adopt a lower development density than those in the hinterland. He asked the project team to confirm that the average PR of residential sites would be lower than 6.5, which is the maximum PR proposed for inland areas;
- (d) he agreed that preservation of the ridgeline should be respected but added that the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines should also be taken into consideration. It would be acceptable to have iconic buildings/landmarks at suitable harbourfront locations to help create a more interesting skyline even if it would breach the ridgeline. He cited the 200-metre-tall tower proposed at the future Tourism Node site as a good example that a tall building at the waterfront would be acceptable; and
- (e) the proposals to be put forward for TPB's consideration should comply with the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines and be able to provide an opportunity to incorporate innovative urban design concepts.

4.16 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** said that he was concerned about the road traffic at the former runway during peak hours after the development intensity was increased. He asked whether the planned transport and road network would be able to cope with the increased population size. He recommended the project team to conduct an in-depth Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) and propose corresponding measures to increase transport capacity of the area.

4.17 **Mr Tom YIP** gave the following responses-

- (a) there was no difference in the total residential and commercial GFA to be provided by the sites at the former runway among the four schemes. The only difference was the distribution of GFA among different sites;
- (b) in schemes 1a and 1b, site 4C3 was further proposed to be

converted from commercial to residential use so that the residential GFA could be further spread out among sites and the average domestic PR could be lowered to 5.9. Different maximum building heights and variation in PRs were proposed for the sites along the former runway;

- (c) for scheme 2, two commercial sites would be converted for residential use, which would further bring down the average domestic PR of 12 residential sites to 5.4. On the other hand, PR of the remaining two commercial sites at the runway tip would be increased to 10; and
- (d) on the possibility of including even taller iconic buildings on the former runway as landmarks, he said that in consideration of the established town planning principles to preserve the 20% building free zone under ridgeline, developments which would breach the building free zone should be well justified. With reference to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) and the Harbour Planning Guidelines, landmark buildings could be located at the waterfront to create a punctuating effect to the city's skyline. Consideration should also be given to their proposed locations, function, design and compatibility with adjacent developments etc. An iconic building had been proposed at the Tourism Node site. Another landmark building reaching 200mPD would be proposed in the hinterland. Whether there would be a need for an additional landmark building in KTD should be carefully considered.

4.18 **The Chair** said that the proposed building heights under the refined schemes were far from reaching the 20% building free zone. He opined that there was still scope to increase building heights without reaching the ridgeline.

4.19 **Mr Alan MACDONALD** responded that when considering the planning issues and preparing notional architectural schemes for the area, considerations have been given to relevant building guidelines on overshadowing to ensure that there would not be any contravention of the current practice notes and guidelines.

4.20 **Mr Tom YIP** supplemented the following-

- (a) the project team had considered relevant planning guidelines before putting up the refined schemes. The proposed commercial towers in scheme 2 would complement with the iconic tower at the Tourism Node site;
- (b) as compared with scheme 1b, scheme 1a would maximize the provision of public open space within individual sites because of relatively slimmer and taller buildings;
- (c) pedestrian passages between development sites and separation between buildings as shown in the refined schemes would enhance air ventilation and visual permeability; and
- (d) to generate more benefits to the community, enhancement proposals were proposed in other areas of KTD to reinforce a leisure theme for KTD. For example, a Heritage Park was proposed in Area 2. In addition, to provide flexibility for introducing water sports activities in KTD, 'Water sports/recreation use' would be permitted in all 'Open Space' zones.

4.21 **Mr Alan MACDONALD** added the following -

- (a) there would be opportunities to develop commercial buildings with interesting designs at the runway tip;
- (b) at-grade crossings were included in the overall transport planning to facilitate pedestrian circulation. Pedestrians could also make use of stairs and lifts to gain access to the landscaped deck;
- (c) the refined schemes were more permeable than the baseline scheme and could achieve better air ventilation performances. Since the baseline scheme had also passed the air ventilation assessment, there would not be any issue for the refined schemes to fulfill requirements of the assessment. That said, air ventilation assessment would still be conducted for the refined schemes;

- (d) there would be room to further activate the public open space and the waterfront promenades along the former runway. Apart from urban design considerations, management of the public open space would be critical to bringing vibrancy and diversified uses to the harbourfront;
- (e) trees would be planted along the promenade to provide sufficient shading for pedestrians;
- (f) the project team would share the pedestrian connectivity plan with Members to demonstrate the proposed circulation and connection on the landscaped deck;
- (g) he shared Members' views that provision of marine and berthing facilities could help activate the KTAC area; and
- (h) there were pros and cons in relation to the proposed conversion of commercial sites into residential uses. While an iconic tower with a unique architectural design could become a landmark for Hong Kong, he opined that scheme 1a which performed better in terms of permeability should also be considered.

[Post-meeting note: A plan showing pedestrian circulation and connectivity to the landscaped deck was circulated for Members' information on 24 April 2017.]

4.22 Mr Peter CHUI gave the following responses-

- (a) two workshops on the design of the landscaped deck along the former runway were conducted in May and August 2016. Taking into account Members' views, CEDD enhanced the design by providing additional staircases and elevators to enhance accessibility to the landscaped deck;
- (b) it was suggested that the residential developments facing the harbour should install acoustic windows to screen off traffic noise generated from the traffic on Road D3 as it was not technically feasible to adopt a fully-enclosed noise barrier. The alternative building block

arrangements proposed under the refined schemes would give opportunities for the project team to explore alternative noise mitigation measures;

- (c) a comprehensive TIA was completed and confirmed that the traffic capacity of the planned road network would be able to cope with the traffic demand arising from the increased population size; and
- (d) realignment and widening of the existing single two-lane Shing Fung Road to form a dual two-lane road was expected to be completed by 2019 and the road traffic to the former runway could be significantly improved.

4.23 **Mr Raymond LEE** said that the project team had explained the reasons for conducting the Review, in particular the need to increase provision of housing land supply to address the increasing demand. He noted that Members were more concerned about the proposed increase in development density at Area 4 and requested for an improvement to the baseline scheme as presented to the KTTF. The project team had therefore come up with refined schemes for HC's consideration. The previous planning and development concept were formulated after extensive public engagement activities. The project team would adhere to the original concept as far as possible. Considerations had been given to the Harbour Planning Principles and Guidelines as well as the Urban Design Guidelines under HKPSG, in particular on preservation of the ridgeline. He highlighted the major differences of the refined schemes below-

- (a) under schemes 1a and 1b, Site 4C3 was further rezoned from commercial to residential use. The commercial GFA of the site would be redistributed to the remaining commercial sites. The residential sites along the former runway would have different PRs and building heights forming a more interesting skyline;
- (b) under scheme 2, two commercial sites (i.e. Site 4C3 and 4C4) would be converted into residential use. The total commercial GFA would be redistributed to the remaining two commercial sites, which would result in taller

building block at the end of the former runway;

- (c) subject to Members' comments, the project team would translate the proposed development parameters into OZP amendments so as to provide planning control over future development while allowing sufficient flexibility for future architectural design; and
- (d) he opined that schemes 1a and 1b would be able to fulfil key urban design considerations he had mentioned. Scheme 2 might contain two high-rise commercial buildings with a PR of around 10 at the end of the former runway, which would breach the ridgeline. The business viability of such large scale commercial developments in a single site would have to be carefully considered.

4.24 **The Chair** commented that the refined schemes were a significant improvement from the baseline one. He enquired whether all the refined schemes and the views of the Commission would be presented to TPB for consideration.

4.25 **Mr Raymond LEE** replied that the project team had submitted the findings of the Review to TPB in October 2016. TPB noted the findings and agreed for PlanD to consult relevant stakeholders. The Government would report the outcome of the consultation and final recommendations to TPB for consideration. PlanD would also need to translate the recommendations into amendments to OZP and commence the rezoning process.

4.26 **The Chair** advised that the Commission was not in the position to choose a refined scheme but noted that all the refined schemes would be able to comply with the Harbour Planning Principles at different degrees.

4.27 **Mr Raymond LEE** said that the project team would take into account views of the Commission when finalising the recommendations to TPB.

4.28 **Mr Vincent NG** reiterated his concern on the way that the project team communicated the latest proposals with the public. He opined that KTD was an important harbourfront area where

the community had spent tremendous efforts in planning for its future development. He opined that a three-dimensional (3D) model should be produced to help the public understand the recommended scheme and invite their views.

4.29 **Mr Freddie HAI** added the following-

- (a) his concern on design flexibility of residential sites was not addressed by the project team. Citing example in other areas with similar PR as comparison, the sites in KTD had a PR of 6.5, with smaller site areas and an average building height restriction to about 18 storeys only. Yet for the other as-built sites the residential towers were over 40 storeys high. He questioned whether the building mass assumption was too aggressive and thus predetermined that little flexibility was left for developers to produce alternative and creative layouts; and
- (b) as the Review aimed to increase land supply for residential use, he commented that the proposed changes only increased the private sector housing, thereby effectively lowered the original public-to-private sector housing ratio of the district. The public and private housing mix in KTD should be reviewed. He suggested designating some of the proposed new residential sites to develop subsidised sale flats.

4.30 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** opined that scheme 2 was preferred because it presented a more dynamic building height variation which would help achieve a more interesting skyline. A diversified building form and wider separation between development sites would be provided under the scheme. He added the following comments-

- (a) it would be more appropriate to put commercial uses near MTR stations to create commercial nodes instead of along the former runway, which would generate additional traffic;
- (b) the public open space on the landscaped deck should be connected to the podiums of adjacent residential or commercial developments; and

- (c) the final recommendations should include the development plan for KTAC in a greater detail. He supported to produce a 3D model and present all refined schemes to TPB.

4.31 **The Chair** said that the Commission's views would be conveyed to TPB for its reference and asked when the recommendations would be presented to TPB. He suggested to PlanD that a workshop should be organised for Members to contribute further on the final recommendations to be presented to TPB.

[Post-meeting note: In response to Members' comments and requests, PlanD and CEDD arranged a workshop on 18 January 2017. A 3D model was produced to illustrate the refined scheme for the former runway area. The Secretariat conveyed the Commission's views to TPB on 19 January 2017. The views of the Commission and the refined schemes were submitted to the TPB for consideration on 20 January 2017.]

Item 5 Pilot Study on Underground Space Development in Selected Strategic Urban Areas – Stage One Public Engagement (Paper No. HC/14/2016)

- 5.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives of CEDD, PlanD and AECOM to the meeting.
- 5.2 **Dr Johnny CHEUK** took Members through the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 5.3 **The Chair** was concerned about the potential disruptions such underground space developments would bring about to public enjoyment of Kowloon Park and Victoria Park during the development phase. He added that a key element of underground space development was to improve connectivity and suggested that attractions be provided to make the underground space interesting and development rationale be elaborated on to gain public support.
- 5.4 **Mr Freddie HAI** commented that he did not object in principle to carry out a study but would like to ask for more justifications to develop underground space in busy centres. Citing Tsim Sha

Tsui as an example, he opined that Tsim Sha Tsui was already busy with retail activities everywhere, it would be nice to give the public an alternative in different character. The public had been enjoying very pleasant and tranquil walking experience passing through Kowloon Park to other destinations in the district. It was important to allow people to have a choice. Instead of providing more retail via the proposed underground pedestrian network, he believed if improvement was to be sought, adding more access points to Park Lane to improve accessibility from Nathan Road to Kowloon Park would be sufficient for enhancing pedestrian connectivity in the area. He opined that the underground shopping street concept was totally unnecessary and could not support the proposal.

- 5.5 On the proposed development in Causeway Bay, **Mr Ivan HO** commented that the existing at-grade pedestrian connections in the area were efficient and the walking experience through Victoria Park was pleasant. Developing the space underneath the Park, which might cause disruptions to public enjoyment, would not be desirable.
- 5.6 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** echoed that an enjoyable walking experience would be the most important consideration. He commented underground space development was an effective way to improve urban walkability, particularly through connections with Mass Transit Railway (MTR) station concourses. Apart from improving connectivity, the project team should also activate the underground space by adding specific uses such as commercial and recreational elements. Based on overseas experience, he considered that it was technically feasible to develop underground space without causing much disturbance to the public open space above.
- 5.7 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** said that it was acceptable to develop underground space to address land shortage in key urban areas. While it was pleasant to walk through Kowloon Park, its above-ground topography has indeed restricted pedestrian movement in particular for the physically challenged. He opined that developing a user-friendly underground pedestrian network would bring convenience to the ageing population in Hong Kong.

5.8 **Prof Becky LOO** made the following comments on the proposed development in Tsim Sha Tsui:

- (a) underground space development should not be carried out at the expense of the at-grade pedestrian connectivity;
- (b) underground space should not be dominated by commercial uses;
- (c) good air ventilation and adequate exits must be provided at the underground space having regard to the weather characteristics of Hong Kong; and
- (d) the project team should report details to the Task Force on Harbourfront Developments in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing when ready.

5.9 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** commented that the focus of the project team should be on comprehensive district plans to improve the existing pedestrian networks and address the district problems identified. This should include above-ground and at-grade options in addition to underground space solutions with clear cost/ benefit analyses for each. For example, rather than developing underground space, whether providing escalators at entrances to Kowloon Park and covered walkways might be sufficient to overcome the topographical constraint on district connectivity in Tsim Sha Tsui. In Wan Chai, extending the current elevated walkway network might be more effective to alleviate congestion along different routes, combined with tunnel connections between the MTR station and the redevelopment of Government offices. In Causeway Bay and Happy Valley, the district problems should take into account the future EMSD site and Hong Kong Stadium redevelopment plans. Connection between Tin Hau MTR Station and Victoria Park be resolved with a short underground tunnel. Rather than stand-alone tunnels, inviting private owners to connect their properties underground such as originally envisaged near Sogo could be more effective. He suggested the project team to take a broader perspective and look into different options (i.e. not just underground) to address the district problems thoroughly and efficiently.

- 5.10 **Mrs Karen BARRETTO** echoed Prof Becky LOO and added that air ventilation would be a major consideration in the development of underground space in particular for space that would be used for car parks, sewage treatment facilities and water pumping stations. She also commented that good signage system would be essential for way-finding in underground space.
- 5.11 **Mr Ken SO** said that the development should take good care of the trees and he preferred at-grade pedestrian connections. He suggested that it would be more effective to divert the congested traffic to underground rather than bringing pedestrians to the underground level.
- 5.12 **Dr Johnny CHEUK** made the following responses-
- (a) all the proposed underground space development in the four strategic areas were close to MTR stations. Pedestrians travelling on the MTR could gain access to the underground pedestrian network and reached their destinations conveniently;
 - (b) underground connections would only serve as an additional option while pedestrians could still choose to use at-grade walkways;
 - (c) after carrying out a pedestrian survey in Tsim Sha Tsui, the project team understood better the purposes of commuters in the area. The proposed underground connections would become an alternative option for pedestrians and should be welcomed by commuters working in the areas;
 - (d) after conducting several focus group meetings and consulting the relevant District Councils, it was observed that underground space developments providing additional pedestrian passageways and supporting facilities were supported by many stakeholders to address the congested at-grade environment and improve the walking experience for pedestrians, particularly during hot and rainy days;

- (e) many overseas examples showcased that underground space development offered opportunities for better park designs by integrating the underground space with the at-grade park facilities to enhance public enjoyment; and
- (f) the project team would consider Members' suggestions including encouraging private owners to connect the underground space in their developments in formulating underground master plans for the strategic urban areas.

5.13 **Mr Shuki LEUNG** added that connecting the proposed underground space developments to existing and planned MTR stations could help improve the congested above-ground pedestrian environment and facilitate better crowd control/management. This would offer an additional choice of a more friendly walking environment for pedestrians while causing a limited amount of disruptions to public open spaces and facilities. On these grounds, he supported the proposal.

5.14 **The Chair** thanked the project team for briefing Members on the study and asked them to take on board Members' comments.

Item 6 Setting Up of a Working Group on the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (Paper No. HC/15/2016)

6.1 **The Chair** informed the meeting that Members agreed at the last meeting to set up a dedicated working group under the Commission to examine the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance and matters related to its application. Upon invitation of the Chair, **Members** endorsed the proposed terms of reference of the working group subject to further review by the working group.

6.2 **Miss Christine AU** said the Secretariat would invite Members to join the working group and arrange its first meeting shortly.

[Post-meeting note: The Secretariat invited Members to join the Working Group on the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (WGPHO) on 21 December 2016. The first meeting of WGPHO was held on 24 February 2017.]

Item 7 Progress Report from Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island (Paper No. HC/16/2016)

- 7.1 In his capacity as the Chair of the Task Force, **the Chair** had nothing to further supplement on the progress report.

Item 8 Progress Report from Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development (Paper No. HC/17/2016)

- 8.1 **Mr Vincent NG**, the Chair of the Task Force, had no further points to add to the progress report.

Item 9 Progress Report from Task Force on Harbourfront Developments in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing (Paper No. HC/18/2016)

- 9.1 **Prof Becky LOO**, the Chair of the Task Force, had no further points to add to the progress report.

Item 10 Progress Report from Task Force on Water-land Interface (Paper No. HC/19/2016)

- 10.1 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui**, the Chair of the Task Force, had no further points to add to the progress report.

Item 11 Any Other Business

- 11.1 **The Chair** enquired about the progress of extending the two temporary uses at the new Central harbourfront.
- 11.2 **Miss Christine AU** responded that the open tender for the Central Harbourfront Event Space was closed on 9 September 2016. After assessment, a tenancy for three years from June 2017 to June 2020 was awarded to the incumbent tenant on 16 November 2016. She added that the open tender for the Hong

Kong Observation Wheel site was underway and would be closed on 30 December 2016.

11.3 **The Chair** asked about the result of the Clockenflap Music and Arts Festival 2016.

11.4 In response, **Miss Christine AU** said it was the first time Clockenflap was held at the new Central harbourfront. The three-day music and arts festival covered a large area totalling seven hectares including the Central and Western Promenade (Central Section), the Central Harbourfront Event Space, the Hong Kong Observation Wheel site and a vacant land to the north of Lung Wo Road.

11.5 **The Chair** commented that improvement works were needed in some areas to provide better drainage and surface pavement to facilitate organising large-scale event at the harbourfront.

11.6 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that the Government had made little progress in enhancing the harbourfront and a long list of projects were pending for completion.

11.7 **The Chair** said the Secretary for Development had committed to provide a formal response to Members on the proposed establishment of a Harbourfront Authority in January 2017.

11.8 There being on other business, the meeting ended at 6:35 pm.

Secretariat
Harbourfront Commission
April 2017