

**Minutes of 841st Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 19 August 2005**

Present

Permanent Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands
(Planning & Lands)
Mrs. Rita Lau

Chairperson

Hon. Patrick S.S. Lau

Vice-Chairman

Mrs. Angelina P.L. Lee

Dr. Peter K.K. Wong

Mr. Michael K.C. Lai

Professor K.C. Ho

Mr. S.L. Ng

Mr. C.K. Wong

Mr. Erwin A. Hardy

Professor Nora F.Y. Tam

Mr. Tony W.C. Tse

Mr. Nelson W.Y. Chan

Mr. David W.M. Chan

Professor David Dudgeon

Mr. Tony C.N. Kan

Professor N.K. Leung

Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim

Mr. Stanley Y.F. Wong

Mr. Alfred Donald Yap

Principle Assistant Secretary (Transport)
Environment, Transport and Works Bureau
Mr. Eric Yue

Assistant Director (2), Home Affairs Department
Mr. Patrick Li

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection
Environmental Protection Department
Dr. Michael Chiu

Director of Lands
Mr. Patrick L.C. Lau

Director of Planning
Miss Ophelia Y.S. Wong

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Mr. Raymond T.L. Chiu

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Dr. Alex S.K. Chan

Dr. Rebecca L.H. Chiu

Mr. Alex C.W. Lui

Mr. Francis Y.T. Lui

Mr. Keith G. McKinnell

Dr. Pamela R. Rogers

Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong

Ms. Carmen K.M. Chan

Mr. Leslie H.C. Chen

Dr. Lily Chiang

Professor Peter R. Hills

Mr. Edmund K.H. Leung

Dr. C.N. Ng

Mr. Daniel B.M. To

Ms. Sylvia S.F. Yau

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board

Mr. P.Y. Tam

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung (a.m.)

Ms. Brenda K.Y. Au (p.m.)

Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Ms. Irene W. S. Lai (a.m.)

Miss Helen S.H. Lau (p.m.)

[Open Meeting]

1. The Chairperson extended a welcome to all Members.

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of Minutes of the 840th Meeting held on 5.8.2005

2. The minutes of the 840th meeting held on 5.8.2005 were confirmed without amendment.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

Abandonment of Town Planning Appeal No. 10 of 2004
Temporary Container Vehicle and Visitor Car Park
for a Period of 3 Years in “Residential (Group D)” zone
Lot 1212DRP (Part) in DD115 and Adjoining Government Land
Chung Yip Road, Nam Sang Wai, Yuen Long
(Application No. A/YL-NSW/142)

3. The Secretary reported that the subject appeal was received by the Town Planning Appeal Board (TPAB) on 2.9.2004 against the decision of the Board to reject on review on 18.6.2004 an application (No. A/YL-NSW/142) for a temporary container vehicle and visitor car park for 3 years at a site zoned “Residential (Group D)” on the Nam Sang Wai Outline Zoning Plan. On 15.8.2005, the appeal was abandoned by the appellant of his own accord. TPAB formally confirmed that the appeal was abandoned in accordance with Regulation 7(1) of the Town Planning (Appeals) Regulations on the same day.

[Mr. Nelson W.Y. Chan arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

- (ii) Abandonment of Town Planning Appeal No. 6 of 2004
Proposed 74 Village Houses (other than New Territories Exempted House) and
Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction from 8.23m to 9m
Lot 1198RP (Part) in DD 109, Kam Tin, Yuen Long
(Application No. A/YL-KTN/168)
-

4. The Secretary reported that the subject appeal was received by the Town Planning Appeal Board (TPAB) on 24.5.2004 against the decision of the Board to reject on review on 19.3.2004 an application (No. A/YL-KTN/168) for 74 village houses (other than New Territories Exempted House) and minor relaxation of the building height restriction from 8.23m to 9m at a site zoned "Village Type Development" on the Kam Tin North Outline Zoning Plan. On 16.8.2005, the appeal was abandoned by the appellant of his own accord. On 17.8.2005, TPAB formally confirmed that the appeal was abandoned in accordance with Regulation 7(1) of the Town Planning (Appeals) Regulations.

(iii) Town Planning Appeal Statistics

5. The Secretary reported that as at 19.8.2005, 21 cases were yet to be heard by the Town Planning Appeal Board. Details of the appeal statistics were as follows :

Allowed	:	12
Dismissed	:	81
Abandoned/Withdrawn/Invalid	:	111
Yet to be Heard	:	21
Decision Outstanding	:	2
<hr/>		
Total	:	227

[Mr. S.L. Ng and Professor Nora F.Y. Tam arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 3

Harbour Planning – Approach and Process

(TPB Paper No. 7390)

[Open Meeting]

6. The following representatives from the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC) and the Planning Department (PlanD) were invited to the meeting at this point:

Mr. Vincent Ng)	
Mr. Paul Zimmerman)	HEC
Mr. Nicholas Brooke)	
Mr. Raymond Wong	-	PlanD

7. The Chairperson extended a welcome and invited the representatives of HEC and PlanD to brief Members on the Paper.

Presentation Session

[Mrs. Angelina P.L. Lee, Professor David Dudgeon and Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim arrived during the presentation session.]

8. Mr. Raymond Wong briefly introduced the establishment of HEC and the tasks of its Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review.

9. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Messrs. Vincent Ng and Paul Zimmerman presented the following information and views:

- (a) international examples showing good practices in harbour planning, including Tokay Bay, Ningbo, Kaohsiung, Sydney, Singapore, Port Terminal in Yokohama, Fisherman’s Wharf in San Francisco, Washington Harbour in Washington, Gantry Plaza State Park, Battery Park City and Thames Barrier Park in New York, and Harbour Area in Genoa;

- (b) helicopter and ground level views on the harbour-front areas at various parts of Hong Kong;
- (c) statistics on harbour-front land uses/land ownership, marine uses requiring land interfaces and economics of harbour planning;
- (d) the challenges in harbour planning, including the need to improve the accessibility to the harbour-front, vibrancy of the harbour-front, land/water interfaces, and the arrangement of competing land uses to maximise the provision of open spaces and promenades for public enjoyment;
- (e) the need for adopting a holistic and interactive process on harbour-front planning by formulating an integrated harbour planning framework and initiating district reviews of existing land and marine uses;
- (f) details of the proposed integrated harbour planning framework;
- (g) details of the major stages, study districts, study approach and programme of the proposed District Reviews; and
- (h) the Government organisational structure associated with harbour-front planning and implementation, highlighting the roles of HEC and the Board.

Discussion session

[Mr. C.K. Wong arrived during the discussion session.]

10. Major comments and questions raised by Members were summarised as follows :

Public participation

- (a) noting the conflicting public ideas or suggestions received, interested to know how HEC would take them forward;

- (b) in view of the large number of stakeholders interested in and who might be affected, how the public consultation would be conducted;

Stakeholders engagement

- (c) while supporting the proposal of engaging the public in the District Reviews, it would also be important to engage urban designers, planning-related professionals and other appropriate agents in the process to ensure that proposals for harbour-front enhancement would be feasible and their design of good quality;
- (d) development proposals involving the harbour-front submitted to the Board should be circulated to HEC for comment;

Timetable/short-term initiatives

- (e) a work programme with a realistic timeframe should be drawn up to avoid undue delay in the study process. Since planning for Kai Tak had gone on for over 10 years, there was a strong need to speed up the planning process to enable early developments;
- (f) apart from preparing a long-term plan for the entire Harbour, more immediate projects should be identified and implemented to achieve visible impact of enhancement. This could help gain the support from the public on various planning concepts for the harbour-front;
- (g) apart from requesting Government departments to enhance harbour-front areas, private developers owning sites adjoining the Harbour should also be encouraged to enhance the waterfront near their developments for public enjoyment at no cost to Government; and
- (h) for short-term projects, consideration could be given to improving the accessibility to various parts of the harbour-front such as areas around the International Financial Centre, Lei Yue Mun and the Western District. More specifically for the latter, the fences along the harbour-front should be removed and the connection of the Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park along

the harbour-front with other parts of the Western District should be improved.

11. In response, Messrs. Nicholas Brooke, Paul Zimmerman, Vincent Ng and Raymond Wong made the following main points:

Public participation

- (a) majority of the studies/projects undertaken or monitored by HEC were now at the stage of public consultation. Special briefing sessions to various groups and stakeholders including District Councils would be arranged;
- (b) the harbour planning principles adopted by HEC in harbour planning were strongly supported by the District Councils;
- (c) to address conflicting demands, it would be important to set out an overall framework to help identify the long-term demands, territorial requirements, values and tradeoffs involved;

Stakeholders engagement

- (d) professionals of various disciplines had been engaged in reviewing and refining the harbour planning principles. HEC would examine the design of the development proposals at the harbour-front against the harbour planning principles. Key stakeholders including urban designers, planners, architects, etc. would also be engaged in the District Reviews;
- (e) the Board would be consulted during the study process as appropriate;

Timetable/Short-term initiatives

- (f) there was a need for an integrated harbour plan. Harbour planning should not be carried out in a piecemeal manner. It should be an on-going process for changes, taking account of the changing community aspirations;

- (g) the initial task of HEC was to establish the harbour planning framework and principles. District Reviews, starting with the Hung Hom waterfront, would commence in late 2005/early 2006;
- (h) there was a timeframe for various districts, for example, detailed land use proposals for Kai Tak and Wan Chai areas would be ready in 12 months, but it would take longer to complete the district reviews for the entire Harbour as different districts were involved;
- (i) several short-term harbour-front enhancement projects were being pursued by HEC. The first one was the development of a temporary promenade at West Kowloon waterfront, which was near completion. Members would be invited to the opening scheduled for 17.9.2005. The next project would be the enhancement of Central Ferry Piers and the adjoining areas;
- (j) some other short-term proposals to remove the incompatible temporary uses such as cargo handling, car park and storage areas along the harbour-front had been suggested to the Government. However, implementation of such proposals would depend on the availability of funding and the identification of implementation/management/maintenance agents; and
- (k) whether the process could be speeded up and whether good design would be adopted and implemented hinged on the fundamental issues on how harbour planning would be integrated with land use planning, the interface and working relationship between HEC and the Board, and who had the authority to make the final decision given that numerous parties (including HEC, the Board, various policy committees and government departments, District Councils and LegCo) were involved in different aspects of planning, development and management of waterfront projects.

12. On the last point, several Members pointed out that HEC and the Board had their respective specified roles. The Board was charged with the statutory responsibility to examine and consider development proposals submitted under the Town Planning Ordinance, while HEC, as an advisory body, tendered advice to Government on harbour-front

enhancement. The Government should take the lead in the coordination of implementing harbour planning proposals.

13. Messrs. Paul Zimmerman and Nicholas Brooke said that since HEC was only an advisory body, it had no authority over project implementation. They considered that a champion was needed to steer the process and remove Government's red tapes. High level policy decision giving priority to harbour-front enhancement projects with necessary funding for project implementation was also vital.

14. The Chairperson remarked that the temporary promenade in West Kowloon was a showcase to demonstrate to the public the works of HEC, it was a good example for similar actions to be taken and showed how the harbour-front could be enhanced. She invited Members to visit the promenade. She said that an administrative arrangement had already been established for PlanD to circulate development applications and proposals for the harbour-front areas to the HEC Secretariat for HEC Members' information and comments. This would allow HEC Members' views to be fully reflected to the Board. She thanked the representatives of HEC and PlanD for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.