

**Panel on Planning, Lands and Works
Subcommittee to Review the Planning for the
Central Waterfront (including the Tamar Site)**

Follow-up to meeting on 8 March 2007

(a) A list of enhancement works that have been undertaken along the harbourfront area adjoining the Central Ferry Piers

To further the Government's policy objective of creating a vibrant harbour-front, we have planned a continuous waterfront promenade along the Central Ferry Piers and a majority part of it has been completed. Pier-top open spaces at Central Pier Nos. 2 and 3 and public viewing decks at Central Pier Nos. 7 and 8 have been provided for the public to enjoy the harbour. To enhance pedestrian access to the waterfront, a footbridge has been provided linking Two IFC with Central Pier No. 3. A footbridge is being built to link up Central Pier Nos. 7 and 8 with the hinterland and the existing footbridge network.

2. In addition, the Civil Engineering and Development Department is carrying out enhancement works along the harbourfront area adjoining the Central Ferry Piers under the Greening Master Plan contract. These include:

- (i) replacing and adding new trees/plants in the existing planters along the waterfront promenade;
- (ii) planting trees/shrubs in the area around the electricity substation and near the bus terminus;
- (iii) planting new trees in pits outside the piers which is scheduled to start in April 2007; and
- (iv) enhancing the planting along the existing footbridge linking Two IFC with Central Pier No. 3 which will be completed by early April 2007.

3. The Government would continue to include enhancement works in future development projects where appropriate.

(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

4. The Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC) discussed the planning for the Central waterfront at the following meetings (the relevant extracts of minutes are at the respective annexes):

- (i) 9th meeting held on 24 November 2005 (**Annex A**); and
- (ii) 12th meeting held on 26 July 2006 (**Annex B**).

(c) Confirmation on whether the width of Road P2 can be reduced if the planned developments at the two sites in question are not implemented

5. Road P2 in the Central Reclamation area will be a dual 2-lane road with limited widening at road junctions. Road P2 is designed to serve both existing and planned developments at Central Reclamation Phases I, II and III. Developments at Phase I have been completed and put to use on schedule. They include the Airport Railway Station, One and Two IFC, the Four Seasons Hotel and the Central Ferry Piers. While the two commercial development sites in question have been taken into account in the planning of the transport infrastructure for all three phases, given the relatively small scale of development, the traffic generated would not have a major impact on the road capacity required to support all the developments in the area. Even excluding the two subject sites, Road P2 will still be needed and the planned capacity, i.e. width of the road, cannot be reduced.

(d) Relevant data to substantiate the purported need to reserve land for commercial/hotel developments at the two sites in question

Data on Private Office Developments in the Central District

6. Information on the take-up rate and supply of private office developments in the Central District is provided in **Tables 1 and 2** respectively. According to the information provided by the Rating and Valuation Department (RVD), for the period from 2003 to 2006, there has been an increase in the take-up of private office developments in the Central District. At the year end of 2006, the overall vacancy rate has gone down from 15.1% in 2003 to only 4.9% in 2006 with vacancy rate for Grade A office standing even lower at 3.9%. As for the take-up rate of office floor space, a general increasing trend has been depicted after SARS in 2003, especially for Grade A office developments. However, there is very limited new office supply for the coming three years and even nil supply for Grade A office developments in Central.

7. As regards the rental of Grade A office developments in the Central District, the data compiled for the period from 2003 to January 2007 based on RVD figures in **Table 3** show that there is both an upward trend in the 'Average Rents for Central District' and 'Rental Index for Sheung Wan/Central District'. The increase in rental for Grade A office developments in the Central District reflects the shortage in supply.

8. The above figures show that the future office floor space supply in the Central District will unlikely be adequate to meet the foreseeable demand, particularly for Grade A offices. The reservation of a modest amount of land for future commercial office developments in the Central District is necessary to sustain the development of the Central Business District and the competitiveness of Hong Kong as an international financial centre. This in turn will help to bolster the economic development of Hong Kong.

Data on Hotel Developments in the Central District

9. The Government has been monitoring the supply of hotel rooms. According to the information of the Hong Kong Tourism Board (HKTB) as shown in **Table 4**, there is a supply of about 12,000 new hotel rooms for the whole territory from 2007 to 2009 and beyond, but the foreseeable supply in the Central District is very limited (only 23 rooms). On the demand side, the occupancy rate of hotel rooms in Hong Kong has been increasing and has reached 87% in 2006.

10. Further to the implementation and expansion of the 'Individual Visit Scheme' as well as an increase in the number of visitors from all over the world, there is a growing demand for different types of hotels in Hong Kong. While the hotel supply and demand and room rates are market-led, it is incumbent upon the Government to respond to market demand and facilitate hotel developments as part of our efforts to promote tourism. To sustain the continual growth of the business and tourism sector in Hong Kong, there is a need to reserve land for future hotel developments in the Central District. As the area near Central Pier Nos. 4 to 6 is close to the harbourfront and Central Business District, with easy access to the MTR stations and the ferry piers to all major outlying islands, HKTB is in support of the reservation of land in the area for hotel development.

**Ninth Meeting of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee
held at 2:30 pm on 24 November 2005
at 3/F, 3 Edinburgh Place, Central, Hong Kong**

Minutes of Meeting

Present

Professor Lee Chack-fan
Dr Andrew Thomson

Mr Leung Kong-yui

Dr Ng Mee-kam
Mrs Mei Ng
Mr Vincent Ng

Mr Kim O Chan
Ir Dr Greg Wong Chak-yan

Mr Louis H B Loong

Mr Dennis Li

Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke
Mr Chan Chit-kwai, Stephen
Dr Chan Wai-kwan
Mr Chan Yiu-fai, Steve
Mr Kwok Chun-wah, Jimmy
Professor Lam Kin-che
Mr Thomas Chow

Mr Bosco Fung
Mr John Chai
Mr Lau Ka-keung

Miss Wong Yuet-wah

Chairman
Representing Business Environment Council
(BEC)
Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics
and Transport in Hong Kong
Representing Citizen Envisioning@Harbour
Representing Friends of the Earth
Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
(HKIA)
Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Representing Hong Kong Institution of
Engineers
Representing Real Estate Developers
Association of Hong Kong
Representing Society for Protection of the
Harbour Limited (SPH)

Deputy Secretary (Transport)¹, Environment,
Transport and Works Bureau
Director of Planning
Director of Civil Engineering and Development
Deputy Commissioner for Transport/Planning
and Technical Services
Secretary

In Attendance

Mr Robin Ip

Mr L T Ma

Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)¹,
Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau (HPLB)
Project Manager/Hong Kong Island and Islands,
Civil Engineering and Development
Department (CEDD)

Mr Talis Wong
Mr Raymond Lee
Mr Raymond Wong

Chief Engineer/Kowloon, CEDD
District Planning Officer/Kowloon, Planning
Department (PlanD)
Chief Town Planner/Sub-Regional Planning,
PlanD

For item 2

Ms Christine Tse

District Planning Officer/Hong Kong, PlanD

For item 3

Miss Au King-chi
Mr Danny Lau
Mr Vincent Fung
Mr P L Kwan
Mr Anthony Kwan
Ms Cynthia Liu

Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)3, HPLB
Principal Assistant Secretary (Planning and
Lands)5, HPLB
Principal Assistant Secretary (Culture)1, Home
Affairs Bureau (HAB)
Project Manager/Kowloon, CEDD
Assistant Director/Metro & Urban Renewal,
PlanD
Chief Manager (Special Projects), Leisure and
Cultural Services Department (LCSD)

For item 4

Mr Kelvin Chan

Senior Town Planner/Kowloon 1, PlanD

For item 6

Mr Simon Yu
Mr Edwin Chan

Assistant Director (Estate Management), Lands
Department (LandsD)
Chief Estate Surveyor (Estate Management),
LandsD

Absent with Apologies

Dr Kwok Ngai-kuen, Alvin
Mr Leslie H C Chen
Mr Chan Kwok-fai, Bernard
Mrs Aliana Ho
Professor Jim Chi-yung
Mr Lau Hing-tat, Patrick
Ms Lee Wai-king, Starry
Mr Wu Man-keung, John
Mrs Rita Lau
Ms Margaret Hsia

Representing Conservancy Association
Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape
Architects
Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Representing Hong Kong Tourism Board
Permanent Secretary for Housing, Planning and
Lands (Planning and Lands)
Assistant Director (2), Home Affairs
Department (HAD)

Item 2 Planning concepts of the approved Central District (Extension) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) (Paper No. 28/2005) (original item 5)

2.1 Ms Christine Tse presented the concepts behind the OZP. Mr Bosco Fung added that the planning of the area had gone through a due process of extensive public consultation and deliberation by the Town Planning Board (TPB). The current land use proposals for the area reflected broad consensus of the community at the time of plan preparation. The Chairman invited Members' views on the presentation and a letter of 4 November 2005 from Mr Paul Zimmerman, in the capacity of the Convenor of Designing Hong Kong Harbour District (DHKHD). The letter was addressed to the Legislative Council Panel on Planning, Lands and Works (LegCo Panel) and related to PlanD's presentation and the Tamar project. The LegCo Panel discussed the Tamar project at its meeting on 22 November 2005.

2.2 Taking into account the history of the OZP, **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** considered it sufficient to refine certain zoning proposals on the OZP so as to provide more details on the development parameters and design guidelines for these proposals. Taking the groundscraper as an example, he suggested that the public be provided with information on the gross floor area for various uses in the development, so that they could express views in the preparation of a planning brief for the development. **Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke** said that the groundscraper concept would produce a much larger building foot print than a normal high-rise development, hence its cost-effectiveness might need to be reviewed taking account of the prevailing market situation and latest building technology. He also enquired if the traffic and other services requirements generated from the proposed developments in the area had been catered for in the planned infrastructure provision.

2.3 **Dr Andrew Thomson** supported an integrated waterfront in Central, to take into account the findings of the Harbour-front Enhancement Review – Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Areas (HER) and the Central Harbourfront and Me project. The Harbour Business Forum (HBF) was also examining the Central District (Extension) OZP, including the groundscraper proposal. Preliminary observations indicated the need for further enhancement of vibrancy, building forms and integration of people with the harbour-front.

2.4 In view of the large foot print, **Mr Vincent Ng** considered it necessary to increase the permeability, open space and the non-building area of the groundscraper site for the public. He suggested that 3D models be produced for reference of the public when the planning brief was prepared for public consultation. **Mr Dennis Li** said that SPH was concerned about the data provided by Transport Department (TD) to the Expert Panel on Sustainable Transport Planning and Central - Wan Chai Bypass (CWB), which showed that, given the scale of the current proposed developments in the harbour-front area, the traffic condition might saturate by 2016 despite the construction of the CWB and Road P2. He requested the Government to advise on the long term solutions to the anticipated traffic problems.

2.5 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** agreed that details of the groundscraper should be provided to the public when the planning brief was prepared. As different uses would generate

different traffic patterns at various times, the traffic impact on the planning of the area should be carefully considered. **Dr Ng Mee-kam** supported the idea of enhancing the planning and design aspects of the area. She enquired if there would be additional connections between the harbour-front and the adjoining areas in addition to the three open space corridors, and if sustainability assessment would be adopted during the process.

2.6 **Mr Jimmy Kwok** suggested that the connectivity and integration of the area with the adjoining areas might need to be improved in order to increase the vibrancy. To reduce road usage, consideration should be given to marine transport for servicing the area, such as for movement of refuse. To facilitate the public to better appreciate the impacts of development around the harbour, **Mr Steve Chan** requested the Government to provide a visual impact study on the harbour-front developments viewed from the Peak. This request was declined. **Ir Dr Greg Wong** suggested dividing the groundscraper site into several smaller sites, with better connectivity by footbridges.

2.7 **Mrs Mei Ng** considered that the planning of open spaces in the area should be people and district-oriented, with multiple elements gearing towards greater vibrancy. The planning process should also be on-going to allow public participation.

2.8 **Mr Bosco Fung** said the TPB had agreed that planning and design briefs for the groundscraper and the adjacent waterfront developments should be prepared. The groundscraper concept was actually a proposal originated from some of the objectors to the Central District (Extension) OZP published in 1998. The concept was accepted by the TPB and was subsequently incorporated in the revised OZP. The design requirements for the groundscraper could be further discussed when the planning brief was prepared. During the preparation of the planning brief, the public, HEC, District Council, etc would be consulted. Regarding the visual impact of harbour-front development when viewed from the Peak, there were already restrictions on building heights along the harbour-front to minimize adverse visual impacts.

2.9 **Mr K K Lau** said TD had provided the data to the Expert Panel before the Expert Panel Forum on 3 September 2005, which had also been uploaded to the HEC website. According to the data, with the CWB, the volume/capacity ratios of the

CWB and the Gloucester Road would be 0.7 and 0.9 respectively by 2016, which meant that both roads would not reach their full capacity at that time. The Expert Panel opined that in order to make development sustainable in transport term, other transport management measures in addition to the CWB should be adopted. TD would work towards this direction. On connectivity between the promenade and inland areas, there would be at-grade pedestrian crossings in addition to the proposed three corridors.

2.10 The Chairman thanked PlanD for their presentation.

**Twelfth Meeting of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee
held at 2:30 pm on 26 July 2006
at 3/F, 3 Edinburgh Place, Central, Hong Kong**

Minutes of Meeting

Present

Professor Lee Chack-fan
Mr Roger Nissim

Mr Leung Kong-yui

Dr Alvin Kwok
Mrs Mei Ng
Mr Vincent Ng
Mr Leslie Chen

Ms Pong Yuen-yee
Ir Dr Greg Wong

Mr Mason Hung
Mr Louis Loong

Mr Hardy Lok

Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke
Mr Jimmy Kwok
Professor Lam Kin-che
Mr Patrick Lau
Ms Starry Lee
Mr John Wu
Mr Thomas Chow

Mr Bosco Fung
Mr John Chai
Mr K K Lau

Miss Wong Yuet-wah

In Attendance

Mr Robin Ip

Ms Lydia Lam

Chairman
Representing Business Environment Council
(BEC)
Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics
and Transport in Hong Kong
Representing Conservancy Association
Representing Friends of the Earth
Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape
Architects
Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Representing Hong Kong Institution of
Engineers
Representing Hong Kong Tourism Board
Representing Real Estate Developers
Association of Hong Kong (REDA)
Representing Society for Protection of the
Harbour Limited

Deputy Secretary (Transport)¹, Environment,
Transport and Works Bureau
Director of Planning
Director of Civil Engineering and Development
Deputy Commissioner for Transport/Planning
and Technical Services
Secretary

Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)¹,
Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau (HPLB)
Assistant Secretary (Planning)³, HPLB

Mr L T Ma	Project Manager/Hong Kong Island and Islands, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Mr Talis Wong	Chief Engineer/Kowloon, CEDD
Mr Raymond Wong	Assistant Director of Planning/Territorial (Acting)
Ms Phyllis Li	Assistant Director of Planning/Special Duties (Acting)
Mr Kelvin Chan	District Planning Officer/Kowloon (Acting), Planning Department (PlanD)
Mr Roy Li	Senior Town Planner/Special Duties(1)2, PlanD
Miss Angela Tam	Chief Executive Officer(2)1, Home Affairs Department (HAD)

Absent with Apologies

Dr Ng Mee-kam	Representing Citizen Envisioning@Harbour
Mr Bernard Chan	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr Stephen Chan	
Mr Steve Chan	
Dr Chan Wai-kwan	
Professor Jim Chi-yung	
Mrs Rita Lau	Permanent Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands)
Miss Linda Law	Assistant Director(2) (Acting), HAD

Item 5 Refinement of the Urban Design Framework for the Central Reclamation and Preparation of Planning/Design Briefs for Key Development Sites (Urban Design Study) (Paper No. 14/2006)

5.1 Upon invitation of the Chairman, Ms Phyllis Li presented the paper.

5.2 Mr Vincent Ng welcomed PlanD's proposed Urban Design Study and agreed that the HPR Sub-committee should provide comments on the study. He requested that there should not be any pre-determined design and enquired about the possibility of preserving the existing Star Ferry Pier clock tower and Queen's Pier.

**HPR
Sub-committee**

5.3 Mr L T Ma said that as stipulated in the approved Outline Zoning Plan (OZP), to provide for the Airport Railway Extended Overrun Tunnel and an underground drainage box culvert in addition to Road P2, the existing Star Ferry Pier and Queen's Pier, which were neither declared monuments nor graded historical buildings, needed to be demolished. It should be noted that while the clock tower was Government property, the clock belonged to the "Star" Ferry Company Limited (SF). Having conducted a technical feasibility study in 2005 for relocating the existing clock to the new clock tower, the SF considered that this was not feasible as new parts and components of the clock necessary for the relocation and subsequent maintenance were not available. A new clock with similar

rhythmic sound would therefore be installed in the new clock tower and the existing chime would be dismantled and displayed at the new clock tower.

5.4 **Mr Robin Ip** echoed the views of Mr Ma. He said the new Star Ferry Pier, together with the new clock tower, was designed under a historical heritage approach proposed by the SF and was submitted to the TPB in January 2002 when considering the proposed amendments to the OZP relating to the reprovisioning arrangement of the Star Ferry Pier. The amendments to the OZP, which included amendments to allow reprovisioning of the Star Ferry Pier, were subsequently exhibited for public inspection in February 2002, and no objection was received.

5.5 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** considered that the reasons for demolishing the existing Star Ferry Pier clock tower and Queen's Pier should be explained to the public. **Dr Alvin Kwok** suggested that the public should be consulted on this issue under the Urban Design Study. **Mr Ip** said that the plan to demolish the existing Star Ferry Pier clock tower and Queen's Pier had gone through a statutory planning process including public consultation.

5.6 **Mr Bosco Fung** said that, as an alternative, consideration could be given to the possibility of incorporating some special features of the existing clock tower in the design of the new Central harbour-front. **Ir Dr Greg Wong** said that if preservation of the existing clock tower in situ at this stage would have cost and planning implications, the Government could consider removing the clock tower structure in several pieces like the case of Murray House and re-assembling them in the future nearby Central Waterfront promenade.

5.7 In response to Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke, **Ms Li** said that one of the tasks of the Urban Design Study was to recommend design controls, i.e. mechanisms to take forward the recommendations of the study for implementation. Some of the sites in the study area were zoned "Comprehensive Development Areas" on the OZPs, the development of which required submission of Master Layout Plans (MLPs) to TPB for approval. Based on the Urban Design Study, PlanD would prepare planning briefs, which were guidelines to be endorsed by the TPB, for

developers to prepare MLPs. In addition, all vacant sites in the area were Government land and therefore the recommended requirements under the study could be implemented through the land lease and allocation mechanisms as appropriate.

5.8 In reply to Mr Roger Nissim, Ms Li said that like other OZPs, the Central District (Extension) OZP was subject to review from time to time and that the latest reviews by the TPB took place in August 2005 and March 2006 in connection with several rezoning requests/application. Mr Ip said that for the long term development of the economy and interest of the public, there was a need to implement the OZPs as soon as possible. PlanD's Urban Design Study was on the right track of implementation.

5.9 Ir Dr Wong suggested that since the public had concern over the air ventilation of the future development in Central particularly the groundscraper, the air ventilation assessment parameters and analytical process should be open and transparent. Mr Patrick Lau considered that micro-transport issues such as means to facilitate better circulation of visitors in the area should be included in the Urban Design Study. The Chairman encouraged further exchange of views between HEC and PlanD on the study in the coming months.

Table 1

Take-up of Private Office Floorspace in Central District* in Recent Years

Year End	Take-up (GFA sq. m.)			Vacancy Rate (%)		
	Grade A	Others	Total	Grade A	Others	Total
2003 ¹	63,300	-1,900	61,400	15.2%	14.7%	15.1%
2004 ¹	90,700	27,300	118,000	10.8%	11.6%	11.0%
2005 ¹	131,500	24,300	155,800	6.5%	8.5%	7.0%
2006 ¹	66,000	22,500	88,500	3.9%	7.7%	4.9%

Notes :

* Central District includes TPUs 121 to 124 as defined by Rating and Valuation Department (RVD) in Hong Kong Property Review.

Sources :

1. Based on Hong Kong Property Review 2004 - 2006 and preliminary figures for Hong Kong Property Review 2007 provided by RVD.

Table 2**Estimated Supply of Private Office in Central District***

Year End		Office GFA (sq. m.)		
		Grade A	Others	Total
Existing Stock	2006 ¹	2,122,500	749,600	2,872,100
Forecast Completion	2007 ¹	0	0	0
	2008 ¹	0	2,000	2,000
	2009 ²	0	2,200	2,200
Estimated Supply by 2009		2,122,500	753,800	2,876,300

Notes :

- * Central District includes TPUs 121 to 124 as defined by Rating and Valuation Department (RVD) in Hong Kong Property Review.

Sources :

1. Based on Hong Kong Property Review 2004 - 2006 and preliminary figures for Hong Kong Property Review 2007 provided by RVD.
2. Based on " New Buildings for which Notification of Commencement of Work has been Received" in Monthly Digest October 2006 published by the Buildings Department.

Table 3**Average Rents and Rental Index for Grade A Private Office in Central District in Recent Years**

Year / Month	Average Rents for Central District** (HK\$ / sq. m. per month)	Rental Index for Sheung Wan / Central District (1999=100)
2003	266	67.3
2004	290	72.0
2005	414	104.3
2006		
1-3	496	127.0
4-6	567	138.5
7-9*	573	143.7
10-12*	562	147.0
2007		
1*	622	154.8

Notes :

* Provisional figures.

** Changes in average rents between different periods may be due to variations in the characteristics of the different properties being analysed and should not be taken as indicating a general change in value over the period. To measure rental changes over the relevant periods, please refer to the rental index.

Sources :

1. Hong Kong Property Review 2004 - 2006, Rating and Valuation Department (RVD)
2. Hong Kong Property Review - Monthly Supplement March 2007, RVD

Table 4**Estimated Future Supply of Hotel in Hong Kong (as at end 2006)**

	Whole Territory		Central District *	
	No. of Projects	No. of Rooms	No. of Projects	No. of Rooms
Confirmed Projects**				
2007	22	7,055	1	23
2008	8	2,165	0	0
2009 and Beyond	9	2,874	0	0
Total	39	12,094	1	23

Notes:

* Central District includes TPUs 121 to 124 as defined by Rating and Valuation Department (RVD) in Hong Kong Property Review.

** Based on information shown in Hong Kong Tourism Board's "Hotel Supply Situation- as at Dec 2006".