

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)1401/06-07
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref: CB1/PS/1/05

Panel on Planning, Lands and Works

**Subcommittee to Review the Planning for the
Central Waterfront (including the Tamar Site)**

**Minutes of the meeting on
Thursday, 8 March 2007, at 9:00 am
in Conference Room A of the Legislative Council Building**

- Members present** : Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBM, GBS, JP (Chairman)
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP
Hon WONG Yung-kan, JP
Hon CHOY So-yuk, JP
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, JP
Hon LEE Wing-tat
Hon Daniel LAM Wai-keung, SBS, JP
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
- Member attending** : Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP
- Members absent** : Hon Albert HO Chun-yan
Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, GBS, JP
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming, SBS, JP
- Public officers attending** : Miss WONG Yuet-wah
Principal Assistant Secretary for Housing, Planning and
Lands (Planning & Lands) 2
- Ms Phyllis LI
Chief Town Planner/Special Duties (1)
Planning Department

Mr CHAN Chung-yuen
Senior Engineer/Housing & Planning
Transport Department

Clerk in attendance : Ms Anita SIT
Chief Council Secretary (1)4

Staff in attendance : Mr WONG Siu-yee
Senior Council Secretary (1)7

Ms Christina SHIU
Legislative Assistant (1)7

Action

I Planning for the Comprehensive Development Area adjoining Central Piers No. 4 to No. 6 and the commercial site to the north of Two International Finance Centre

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1083/06-07(01) -- Information paper provided by the Administration)

The Subcommittee deliberated (index of proceedings attached at **Annex**)

2. The Administration was requested to provide the following information –
 - (a) a list of enhancement works that had been undertaken along the harbourfront area adjoining the Central Ferry Piers;
 - (b) relevant extracts from the minutes of those meetings of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee when the planning for the Central waterfront including the two sites in question was discussed;
 - (c) confirmation on whether the width of Road P2 could be reduced if the planned developments at the two sites in question were not implemented; and
 - (d) relevant data to substantiate the purported need to reserve land for commercial/hotel developments at the two sites in question.

II Any other business

3. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 10:40 am.

Panel on Planning, Lands and Works

**Subcommittee to Review the Planning for the
Central Waterfront (including the Tamar Site)**

**Proceedings of the meeting
on Thursday, 8 March 2007, at 9:00 am
in Conference Room A of the Legislative Council Building**

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
000000 - 000142	Chairman	Opening remarks	
000143 - 000312	Administration	Briefing by the Administration (LC Paper No. CB(1)1083/06-07(01))	
000313 - 001318	Dr KWOK Ka-ki Administration	<p>Dr KWOK's concern that the future commercial/hotel buildings on Site 1 and Site 2 would block the view of the harbour and create a wall effect in the area; his view that the Administration should consult the public on the desirability of having the buildings on the sites; his comment that little had been done at the waterfront area adjoining the Central Piers to provide amenities for public use.</p> <p>The Administration's response that –</p> <p>(a) the two subject sites and the adjoining areas were formed under the Central Reclamation Phase I (CRI) project and covered by the approved Central District Outline Zoning Plan (OZP), which was drawn up in 1994 and the latest plan was approved by the Chief Executive in Council in February 2003;</p> <p>(b) at the request of the Town Planning Board (TPB), Planning Department (PlanD) would carry out a Central Reclamation Urban Design Study (the Study) to refine the existing urban design framework of the Central Reclamation and to prepare planning/design briefs for the key sites, including Site 1 and Site 2;</p> <p>(c) it was necessary to reserve land for</p>	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		<p>commercial developments in Central District with a view to maintaining the status of Hong Kong as an Asian financial hub and sustaining the long-term economic development;</p> <p>(d) the demand for commercial premises in Central District had increased significantly since 2003 but the supply in the foreseeable future was relatively limited, hence there was a need for reservation of commercial sites in the Central reclamation area;</p> <p>(e) as Site 1 was zoned "Comprehensive Development Area", detailed planning guidelines would be drawn up for development of the area, and the future developer would be required to submit a Master Layout Plan for approval by TPB;</p> <p>(f) open space areas had been provided above some of the Central Piers and a waterfront promenade had been completed in the area for public enjoyment of the harbour;</p> <p>(g) the Study would make reference to the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee's (HEC) Harbour Planning Principles, TPB's Vision Statement for the Victoria Harbour, Urban Design Guidelines, and the recommendations and design brief formulated by HEC for the Central Piers and the adjoining areas.</p> <p>Dr KWOK's request for detailed information on the enhancement works that had been undertaken along the waterfront area adjoining the Central Piers.</p>	<p>Administration to provide information</p>

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
001319 - 002057	Ms CHOY So-yuk Administration	<p>Ms CHOY's view that the Administration should review the planning for the two subject sites in order to protect the harbourfront environment and preserve the skyline of the Hong Kong Island; her comment that the current planning for Site 1 and Site 2 would not be accepted by Legislative Council Members, the relevant District Council and the public at large and it was necessary to lower the maximum gross floor area and height limit for the buildings to be developed at the sites.</p> <p>The Administration's response that –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the planning for Site 1 and Site 2 had undergone due statutory process involving public consultation, including consultation with the Central and Western District Council; no objection was received in respect of the two sites during the exhibition of and consultation on the relevant draft OZP and subsequent revisions; (b) the proposed developments on Sites 1 and 2 would not block the ridgeline and they would be subject to comprehensive planning and design to ensure compatibility with the waterfront environment; (c) the Study outline was considered by TPB and HEC on 14 July 2006 and 26 July 2006 respectively, and they had no objection to the outline; and (d) the illustrative design concept of the new Central harbourfront and the Master Layout Plan presented to the Subcommittee in October 2006 would be subject to further refinement in the Study. Public views would be fully gauged during the course of the Study. 	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
002058 - 002248	Mr Daniel LAM Administration	<p>Mr LAM's view that, where possible, the outlying island ferry operators should be allowed to undertake commercial developments on top of Pier No. 4 to 6 so as to relieve the pressure on ferry fares; the developments on the reclaimed area should be in harmony with the environment, and should not create traffic congestion.</p> <p>The Administration's response that despite the provision of a waterfront promenade adjacent to the piers, the pedestrian traffic in the area was still relatively low. Some piers and the adjoining area also required a facelift. The Study would look into measures to enhance the vibrancy and pedestrian movement in the area.</p>	
002249 - 002939	Ms Audrey EU Administration	<p>Ms EU's view that notwithstanding that the developments on the reclaimed area had been planned years ago, the Administration should review the development plan to meet the public's prevailing aspiration regarding the protection of the harbourfront areas; the construction of a 28-storey office building and two hotel buildings of 15 and 17-storey high (including a 3-level podium) on the Central waterfront area would not satisfy the "overriding public need test" laid down by the Court of Final Appeal in relation to the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (Cap. 531) (PHO).</p> <p>The Administration's response that the CRI project was planned in 1998 and was not affected by the CFA ruling; the Study would assess the impacts of the planned developments on air ventilation, etc; and public views would be heeded in refining the design of the developments.</p>	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
002940 - 003614	Mr Abraham SHEK Administration	<p>Mr SHEK's expression of support for the current planning for the subject sites; his view that the Administration should explain to Members and the public in greater detail about the justifications for the planned developments on the subject sites, and whether a wall effect would be created by the developments, and if so, ways to resolve the problem; his further comment that the Administration should explain to the public the respective costs and benefits of using the sites as currently planned and the alternative of using them to provide amenities only.</p> <p>The Administration's response that –</p> <p>(a) owing to the limited supply and rise in rental in Central in recent years, it was necessary to reserve land at the subject sites to provide land for commercial/hotel developments to sustain the growth of the Central Business District and Hong Kong's development as an international financial and business centre;</p> <p>(b) the proposed buildings on the sites were much lower than the surrounding high-rise buildings, and would not block the views to the ridgeline of the Hong Kong Island. The proposed development near the Central piers on Site 1 was low density with a maximum plot ratio of 2.95. It was too early to conclude that there would be a wall effect; and</p> <p>(c) more detailed design guidelines for development of the sites would be drawn up after the completion of the Study.</p>	
003615 - 004454	Mr Alan LEONG Administration	<p>Mr LEONG's view that –</p> <p>(a) public aspirations had changed since 1994 when the developments on the two sites were planned;</p>	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		<p>(b) the prevalent view nowadays was that the harbourfront should be left free of any buildings as far as possible;</p> <p>(c) the present case highlighted the need for the Administration to review its town planning procedures;</p> <p>(d) the limited harbourfront areas should not be used to meet the endless need for commercial developments; and</p> <p>(e) there was no conflict between city development and protection of the harbour; instead they complemented each other for the benefit of Hong Kong.</p> <p>Mr LEONG's enquiries on –</p> <p>(a) whether and when the HEC had been consulted on the development plan for the sites, whether HEC was presented with the same information as that provided in the Administration's present paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)1083/06-07(01)), and what the outcome of the consultation was;</p> <p>(b) whether the Administration had assessed the resultant traffic volume arising from the planned developments on the sites; and</p> <p>(c) whether the width of Road P2 could be reduced if the planned developments at the sites were not implemented.</p> <p>The Administration's response that –</p> <p>(a) the planning of the area had been reviewed from time to time. The revisions to the draft Central District OZP in 2000 and 2002 involved the two subject sites, and no objection had been received from the public during the respective consultation on and</p>	<p>Administration to provide information</p>

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		<p>exhibition of the revised plans;</p> <p>(b) the Administration had briefed HEC a few times on the development plans for the new Central reclamation area covering Site 1 and Site 2. The Administration would provide the relevant minutes of meetings to the Subcommittee for information;</p> <p>(c) the relevant traffic studies conducted in 2002 and 2005 concluded that the planned roads in the waterfront area including Road P2 should be able to cope with the traffic needs in the area upon full implementation of the planned developments; and</p> <p>(d) whether Road P2 could be narrower if the two subject sites were not developed would require further study.</p>	
004455 - 005307	Mr LEE Wing-tat Administration	<p>Mr LEE's view that –</p> <p>(a) the public's consensus was that buildings should not be allowed, as far as possible, to be constructed on the harbourfront, and if such buildings were necessary, they should be low-rise;</p> <p>(b) public aspirations on protection of the harbour had intensified enormously in recent years, and yet the development parameters for the two sites had not been revised since 1998 to take heed of the latest public aspirations; and</p> <p>(c) the plot ratio of 2.95 for Site 1 was on the high side.</p> <p>The Administration's response that the Central District was an important commercial hub, and reserving land for commercial/hotel development purposes in the district was in Hong Kong's long-term interest. A plot ratio of 2.95 for Site 1 was considered reasonable.</p>	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
005308 - 005921	Mr CHAN Kam-lam Administration	<p>Mr CHAN's view that –</p> <p>(a) the current planning for the two sites had struck a balance between protecting the harbourfront from being blocked by high-rise buildings, and the need to provide land for commercial developments in Central District. The plot ratio of 2.95 for Site 1 was relatively low compared with the plot ratio of about 15 to 18 in the surrounding areas; and</p> <p>(b) the use of the precious harbourfront sites should be maximized, and the procedures laid down for town planning should be followed. The current planning for the two sites had been put up for public consultation, and no objection had been received from the public during the statutory consultation process.</p>	
005922 - 010921	Dr KWOK Ka-ki Mr Daniel LAM Administration	<p>Dr KWOK's view that the Administration should heed the prevalent public aspirations regarding the protection of the harbour, which would be in Hong Kong's long-term interests as an international financial centre, and that consideration should be given to locating the planned commercial buildings in other areas of Hong Kong.</p> <p>Dr KWOK's enquiries on –</p> <p>(a) whether it was the Administration's intention to grant the right for development of the commercial premises on Site 1 to a certain developer on the grounds of the need to relieve the pressure on ferry fares; and</p> <p>(b) the estimated amount of general revenue which could be generated from the sale of land lots in the Central reclamation area.</p> <p>Mr LAM's clarification that the Islands</p>	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		<p>District Council had suggested to the Administration as early as in the mid-1990s to allow ferry service operators to engage in commercial activities on top of the ferry piers to relieve the pressure on ferry fares. The relevant arrangements should however be fair and open. The suggestion should not be taken as to induce any transfer of interests between the Administration and the ferry service operators.</p> <p>The Administration's response that –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the detailed planning and design for the two sites was still being studied and the sites would not be put up for sale for the time being; (b) the development rights of the sites would not be awarded to a designated developer; (c) more than half of the reclaimed areas in the Central harbourfront would be used as public open space for amenity purposes, and only a limited amount of area was designated for commercial developments in order to sustain the development of the Central Business District and Hong Kong's development as Asia's financial centre; and (d) the estimated land values of the two sites had yet to be worked out. 	
010922 - 011511	Ms CHOY So-yuk Administration	<p>Ms CHOY's view that in view of the limited harbourfront areas for amenity purposes on Hong Kong Island, the Administration should review the planning for the two sites.</p> <p>Ms CHOY's enquiry on –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the relationship between Road P2 and the traffic generated from the planned developments on the two sites; and (b) whether the information regarding the 	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		<p>transport needs in the reclaimed area was supplied by a consultant who was said to have taken possession of the information gathered during the studies and asked for payments for release of the information.</p> <p>The Administration's response that –</p> <p>(a) the construction of Road P2 did not involve extra reclamation of land, although it catered for the traffic need of the developments in the new reclamation area and neighbouring areas;</p> <p>(b) the transport planning for the area had taken into account the developments on the two sites;</p> <p>(c) for reference, the traffic volume generated by the developments on the two sites would only be about 20% of the overall traffic volume generated from the neighbouring Airport Railway Station, International Finance Centre I & II and the Four Seasons Hotel developments; and</p> <p>(d) many consultant companies could conduct transport studies in the Territory and there was no question of monopolizing the studies or the information collected from the studies.</p>	
011512 - 011800	Mr LEE Wing-tat Administration	Mr LEE's view that nowadays, there was a strong sentiment among Hong Kong people against using the land at the harbourfront for the construction of high-rise buildings. PlanD should take the initiative to conduct thorough public consultation and review the planning for the two sites.	
011801 - 012300	Mr Abraham SHEK Administration	<p>Mr SHEK's comment that –</p> <p>(a) the Administration should make use of models to enable members, and the public through television broadcast, to</p>	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		<p>better understand the situation, e.g. the height of the new developments on the subject sites in comparison with the buildings in the surrounding areas;</p> <p>(b) the Administration should make public the estimated land value of the two sites when used for different purposes; and</p> <p>(c) the developments on the two sites should not be considered in isolation; instead they should be considered in conjunction with the other developments in the Central harbourfront area, such as the planned groundscraper on Site 4.</p> <p>The Administration's response that the current paper was prepared in response to the Subcommittee's request for information on the planning for Site 1 and Site 2. The Subcommittee had been briefed on the illustrative concept of the new Central harbourfront in October last year and would be further consulted in the course of the Study at a later stage. Where appropriate, visual aids like models would be used in the future presentations on the planning for the area.</p>	
012301 - 013124	Ms Audrey EU Administration	<p>Ms EU's expression of agreement to the view that the Administration should make available all the information relevant to the planning for the two sites, and should use a model to present the planning.</p> <p>Ms EU's enquiry on whether the Administration would review the height limits of the future buildings on Site 1 in the planning applications approved by the TPB, and request for written information on whether the width of Road P2 could be reduced if the planned developments on the two sites were not implemented; and relevant data to substantiate the purported need to reserve land for commercial/hotel developments at the two sites.</p>	Administration to provide information

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		<p>The Administration's response that –</p> <p>(a) the Study would examine the building height for Site 1, and the planning applications for Site 1 approved by TPB as listed in the Annex had already expired;</p> <p>(b) the demand for commercial premises in Central District was assessed based on the relevant statistics provided by the Buildings Department and the Rating and Valuation Department. The take-up rate of commercial premises in Central District had increased remarkably in recent years, and the supply of Grade A offices in Central District would be very limited in the foreseeable future. Hence it was estimated that there would be an enormous demand for commercial premises in Central District in the next few years; and</p> <p>(c) Road P2 would be built to cater for the traffic of the developments on Central Reclamation Phases I, II and III, and those developments on Sites 1 and 2 would constitute a very small portion of the overall traffic from the reclamation areas. As such, even if the commercial premises on the two sites were not built, it was unlikely that the width of Road P2 could be reduced.</p>	
013125 - 013311	Dr KWOK Ka-ki Chairman Clerk	Dr KWOK's suggestion that at the next meeting of the Subcommittee, the Administration should present the overall planning for the Central harbourfront reclamation area, including the proposed groundscraper on Site 4; and his remark that the Administration should critically review the current planning taking into account the views of Members expressed at this meeting.	