

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. CB(1)290/05-06  
(These minutes have been seen  
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/PL/PLW/1

**Panel on Planning, Lands and Works**

**Minutes of meeting**  
**held on Tuesday, 25 October 2005 at 2:30 pm**  
**in the Chamber of the Legislative Council Building**

**Members present** : Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBM, GBS, JP (Chairman)  
Hon James TIEN Pei-chun, GBS, JP  
Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai, S.B.St.J., JP  
Hon WONG Yung-kan, JP  
Hon CHOY So-yuk, JP  
Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, GBS, JP  
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip  
Hon LEE Wing-tat  
Hon Daniel LAM Wai-keung, BBS, JP  
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC  
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki  
Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming, SBS, JP

**Member attending** : Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP

**Members absent** : Hon Patrick LAU Sau-shing, SBS, JP (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon Albert HO Chun-yan  
Hon James TO Kun-sun  
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, JP  
Hon LI Kwok-ying, MH

**Public officers  
attending**

**: Agenda item IV**

Ms Olivia NIP  
Deputy Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands  
(Planning & Lands) 2

Mr Rick CHAN  
Assistant Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands  
(Buildings) 1

Mr Marco WU  
Director of Buildings

Mr CHEUNG Hau-wai  
Deputy Director of Buildings

Mr LO Wai-shing  
Departmental Secretary  
Buildings Department

**Agenda item V**

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

Mr Robin IP  
Deputy Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands  
(Planning & Lands) 1

Mr Bosco FUNG  
Director of Planning

Ms Christine TSE  
District Planning Officer/Hong Kong  
Planning Department

**Attendance by  
invitation**

**: Agenda item IV**

Buildings Department Local Building Surveyors'  
Association

Mr YUEN H N, Davy  
Chairman

Mr LIU Pang-sun

Secretary

Buildings Department Structural Engineers' Association

Mr KWOK Pang-hung  
Chairman

Mr TANG Chung-ming  
Vice-Chairman

**Clerk in attendance :** Ms Anita SIT  
Senior Council Secretary (1)9

**Staff in attendance :** Mr S Y WONG  
Senior Council Secretary (1)7

Ms Christina SHIU  
Legislative Assistant (1)7

---

Action

- I Confirmation of minutes**  
(LC Paper No. CB(1)113/05-06 -- Minutes of meeting on 13 October 2005)

The minutes of the meeting held on 13 October 2005 were confirmed.

- II Information paper issued since last meeting**  
(LC Paper No. CB(1)2064/04-05(01) -- Submission from the Incorporated Owners of Hoi Fu Court on problems related to the maintenance of aluminium windows
- LC Paper No. CB(1)2065/04-05(01) -- Letter dated 11 July 2005 from the Head, Efficiency Unit informing Members of the Unit's plan to consult interested parties with a view to producing a second edition of the Review of "Introductory Guide to Public Private Partnerships"
- LC Paper No. CB(1)2097/04-05(01) -- Submission from a member of the public on the safety of aluminium windows

- LC Paper No. CB(1)2195/04-05(01) -- Copy of correspondence between the Incorporated Owners of Hoi Fu Court and the Administration on problems related to the maintenance of aluminium windows
- LC Paper No. CB(1)2210/04-05(01) -- Information sheet on the Expert Panel Forum on Sustainable Transport Planning and Central-Wan Chai Bypass organized by the Sub-committee on Wan Chai Development Phase II Review under the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee
- LC Paper No. CB(1)2223/04-05(01) -- Letter from the Incorporated Owners of Hoi Fu Court inviting members to attend a special owners' meeting of the Court
- LC Paper No. CB(1)2224/04-05(01) -- Issue raised by North District Council members at the meeting with the Legislative Council (LegCo) Members on 26 May 2005 about minor works projects not proceeded with due to the absence of owners' consent in North District
- LC Paper No. CB(1)2248/04-05(01) -- Issues raised by Tuen Mun District Council members at the meeting with LegCo Members about the relocation of the Public Cargo Working Area in Area 16 of Tuen Mun
- LC Paper No. CB(1)2259/04-05(01) -- Issues raised by Central & Western District Council members at the meeting with LegCo Members on 12 May 2005 about the planning and development of Central and Western districts
- LC Paper Nos. CB(1)30/05-06(01) and (02) -- Issues raised by the Eastern District Council members at the meeting with Legislative Council Members on 9 June

2005 relating to the provisional marine Police Regional Headquarters in Sai Wan Ho and the development of a promenade in the Eastern District and the Administration's response

LC Paper Nos. CB(1)91/05-06(01) -- Memorandum dated 15 October 2005 from the Complaints Division referring to the Panel issues on minor works projects not proceeded with due to the absence of owners' consent)

2. Members noted the information papers issued since the last meeting.

### III Items for discussion at the next meeting

(LC Paper No. CB(1)123/05-06(01) -- List of outstanding items for discussion

LC Paper No. CB(1)123/05-06(02) -- List of follow-up actions)

3. Members agreed that the following items proposed by the Administration would be discussed at the next meeting scheduled for 22 November 2005 –

- (a) Concept Plan for Lantau;
- (b) Future development on the Tamar site; and
- (c) Greening Master Plan for Central.

Members noted that for the item on “Concept Plan for Lantau”, a joint meeting with the Panel for Environmental Affairs would be held at 2:30 pm on 22 November 2005, followed by a regular meeting of the Panel on Planning, Lands and Works at 4:30 pm to discuss the other two items. Members also noted that the Administration had proposed to discuss a public works item on “Drainage improvement in Northern Hong Kong Island – Sheung Wan stormwater pumping station and the associated intercepting drains”. In this regard, members agreed to request the Administration to submit an information paper for circulation first before deciding whether it would be necessary to discuss the item at a future meeting.

#### **IV Conversion of two Assistant Director posts in the Buildings Department from single-discipline to bi-discipline posts**

- (LC Paper No. CB(1)123/05-06(03) -- Submission from the Buildings Department Local Building Surveyors' Association
- LC Paper No. CB(1)123/05-06(04) -- Submission from the Buildings Department Structural Engineers' Association
- LC Paper No. CB(1)118/05-06(04) -- Information paper from the Administration
- LC Paper No. CB(1)123/05-06(05) -- Submission from The Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors)

#### Presentation by the Administration

4. The Deputy Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning & Lands) 2 (DSHPL(P&L)2) briefed members on the background of the Administration's proposal to convert two Assistant Director (AD) posts in the Buildings Department (BD) from single-discipline to bi-discipline posts, highlighting that the proposed arrangement would open up promotional prospects for officers in both the Building Surveyor (BS) and Structural Engineer (SE) grades, and bring about more flexibility in the deployment of human resources and improvements in service standard. She also emphasised that the proposal was made based on the outcome of several reviews/studies, and the Administration had taken into consideration all the comments received from various parties concerned. The Administration planned to submit the proposal to the Establishment Subcommittee for consideration at its meeting scheduled for 7 December 2005.

5. The Director of Buildings (DB) briefly explained the background to the proposal as follows –

- (a) The issue on the opening-up of AD posts to both the BS and SE grades originated in the 1998 Organization and Management (O&M) Study. The O&M study was necessitated by the growing demand placed upon BD to improve its operational efficiency and optimise the use of resources. The controversial recommendation on the opening-up of AD posts to both the BS and SE grades was set aside in the re-organisation in 2000, but the management decided that the proposed opening-up of AD posts would be reviewed one year after the full implementation of the re-organisation.
- (b) In September 2003, the then DB considered it appropriate to revisit the issue and appointed the Deputy Director of Buildings (DDB) to head a Review Group to conduct a study with a view to examining whether or not any of the five existing AD posts could be converted from single discipline to bi-discipline. Membership of the Review

Group comprised Assistant Director/New Buildings 2, the grade manager of SE grade; Assistant Director/Support, the grade manager of BS grade; and an AD from the Efficiency Unit (EU). Staff and staff associations of the department were invited to provide input and to give their views for the consideration of the Review Group.

- (c) In November 2004, after careful deliberation of the comments and views expressed by staff and staff associations on the findings of the Review Group, DB arrived at his views on the issue. In addition to the two recommendations agreeable to all parties, (i.e. that both AD/NB1 and AD/NB2 posts should remain single discipline and be filled by a GBS and a GSE respectively) DB recommended that AD/EB1 and AD/EB2 posts should be bi-disciplinary and could be filled by a GBS or GSE, but the AD/Support post should continue to be single-disciplinary and be filled by a GBS. The AD/Support post should be reviewed after three years.
- (d) In view of the staunch position adopted by the two professional staff associations, both HPLB and the BD management considered that a careful examination of the views advanced by the two staff associations by an independent third party consultant was warranted to facilitate a decision by the departmental management on the validity of the comments made by the staff associations. EU was invited to assist.
- (e) In June 2005, EU commissioned an independent consultancy study to critically examine the opening-up of the three AD posts in question as well as the views expressed by the staff associations. The independent consultancy study was concluded in August 2005. The consultancy findings affirmed that both the BS and SE grade officers had the required competencies, professional qualification and experience in performing the duties of the two AD posts of the two Existing Buildings Divisions, and that these two posts could be opened up immediately to the two professional grades of BD. For the AD post of the Support Division, the consultant considered that SE grade officers might not currently have the required experience in handling legislative and litigation matters. However, given the recent deployment of SE grade officers to the Support Division to handle legislative and litigation work, they should in time gain the necessary experience. The opening-up of the AD post could therefore be reconsidered after three years.
- (f) On the strength of the consistent findings of the O&M Study (1998), the Review Group (2004) and the Consultancy Study (2005), and having carefully considered the views of the staff associations and all relevant factors, the management of BD proposed that the two AD posts of the Existing Buildings Divisions should be opened up, while



the AD/Support post should remain a single-discipline post and the opening-up of this post should be reviewed after three years.

Presentation of views by deputations

*Buildings Department Local Building Surveyors' Association*

6. Mr Davy YUEN, Chairman of the Association, raised objection to the proposal on behalf of the staff of the BS grade. He commented that all the reviews on the opening-up issue had been conducted with a predetermined objective and no consideration had been given to the effects of the opening-up of the AD posts on public interest and the efficiency of BD. Before considering the opening-up of the AD posts, BD should first review the effectiveness of the re-organisation in 2000. BS and SE grade officers had different expertise. They were complementary and their professional qualifications were not mutually recognised. Conversion of the AD posts to bi-discipline posts would adversely affect the professionalism of BD. BS grade officers had expertise in fire safety and maintenance and repair of buildings, but this was not the case for SE grade officers. The reviews during the past two years had led to low morale among the BS grade officers, delayed promotions for officers in the two grades, caused further dissatisfaction among staff members and jeopardised the co-operative relationship between the two grades.

7. Emphasising the importance of maintaining harmony as advocated by the Chief Executive in his Policy Agenda, Mr LIU Pang-sun, Secretary of the Association, considered it unwise to pursue the proposal and suggested that the proposal should be shelved in order to maintain a harmonious working environment.

*Buildings Department Structural Engineers' Association*

8. Mr KWOK Pang-hung, Chairman of the Association, expressed full support for the proposal and emphasised that the proposal had undergone comprehensive reviews and extensive staff consultation. He added that officers in both the BS and SE grades had accumulated enough working experience to take up the two AD posts of the Existing Buildings Divisions.

9. Mr TANG Chung-ming supplemented that officers in the SE grade also had working experience in matters such as fire safety and maintenance and repair of buildings, and it was untrue that Structural Engineers had knowledge only in structural matters of buildings. Furthermore, the present proposal was aimed at providing an equal opportunity for officers in the two grades in competing for advancement to senior directorate posts. Promotion to the posts was ultimately based on merits.

### Members' views and the Administration's response

10. Ir Dr Raymond HO supported the Administration's proposal because it could bring about more efficient use of human resources to expedite voluminous works such as removal of unauthorised building works and mandatory building inspection. He suggested that the Administration should consider opening up the other AD posts as well.

11. Mr Albert CHAN commented that there could be historical reasons for the controversy and he might not be able to make a judgement from the perspective of a third party. Nevertheless, he would not believe that the abovementioned independent consultancy study was really objective because for most of the time, consultants only provided biased results in favour of their employers. Taking note of the rationale for opening up the two AD posts of the Existing Buildings Divisions, he sought explanation on the reasons for not opening up the other three AD posts.

12. In response, DB explained that the two New Buildings Divisions were each responsible for two different areas of work. New Buildings Division 1 was responsible for ensuring that all private building developments were carried out in accordance with the Buildings Ordinance and regulations and that the general building design and construction complied with the required standards. The division comprised predominantly BS grade officers. New Building Division 2 comprised predominantly SE grade officers and was responsible for processing all structural engineering aspects of new building proposals. In view of the clear demarcation of responsibilities between the two divisions based on the specific professional knowledge and experience required, the various reviews confirmed that the AD posts of the two divisions should remain single-discipline.

13. As regards the AD post of the Support Division, DB explained that the AD post required extensive experience in legislation and litigation matters. The lack of experienced staff in the SE grade having in-depth knowledge in legislative and litigation matters was the main factor for not opening up the AD post for the time being. However, the situation would be reviewed in three years' time. He supplemented that the proposal to open up the two AD posts of the Existing Buildings Divisions would provide promotional opportunities for the most suitable and talented staff, thereby facilitating the use of human resources to the fullest extent, and enhancing the operational efficiency and service standard of BD.

14. Mr LEE Wing-tat queried why the proposal was brought to the Panel for discussion as it appeared that the proposal had no significant policy nor financial implications and was essentially a personnel management matter. In reply, DSHPL(P&L)2 clarified that personnel and promotion matters of the civil service normally would not need to be discussed by any LegCo Panel. In this case, the proposal involved a change to the designation of grades which could take up

certain directorate posts and the Administration planned to submit the proposal to the Establishment Subcommittee and thereafter the Finance Committee for consideration. It was the usual practice for the Administration to consult the relevant Panel(s) on staffing proposals before such proposals were submitted to the Establishment Subcommittee. She further said that the Administration would review the need to consult Panel(s) on this type of staffing proposals having regard to members' comment.

15. Ir Dr Raymond HO stated his view that the opening-up of the AD/Support post should be reviewed in three years' time, and in the meantime, officers from both grades should be given adequate opportunities to accumulate enough experience in legal matters. He concurred with Mr LEE Wing-tat that it was not necessary to bring up the issue of opening-up the AD posts in BD to the Panel for discussion. In relation to Mr Albert CHAN's comment on consultants, Ir Dr HO said that he would not comment on this point and would leave it to the public for a fair judgement. In reply to Ir Dr HO's enquiry, DB said that since the consultancy study was intended to be an independent study, it was EU, not the management of BD, that had selected the consultant and overseen the consultancy study.

16. While understanding the rationale for maintaining the AD posts of the two New Buildings Divisions as single-discipline posts filled by a Building Surveyor and a Structural Engineer respectively, Mr Alan LEONG enquired about the reasons for restricting the two AD posts of the Existing Buildings Divisions to BS grade officers in the past. DDB explained that when BD was first established in 1993, special attention had been given to maintenance and repair works of pre-war buildings and unauthorised building works. At that time, the professional officers employed to take up these areas of work were predominately Building Surveyors. For this reason, the two AD posts of the Existing Buildings Divisions, when created, were designated as BS grade posts. Later, BD also needed to attend to the maintenance and repair problems of post-war buildings and the number of Structural Engineers employed to take up the work had increased progressively during the years. In response to Mr Alan LEONG's enquiry on the number of BS and SE grade officers in BD, DB advised that there were about 180 BS grade officers and 120 SE grade officers at present, and he undertook to provide further information to the Panel on the number of staff in the two grades in the early 1990s.

Admin

*(Post-meeting note: The requested information was provided in the Administration's letter dated 2 November 2005, which was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)220/05-06(01) on 3 November 2005.)*

17. The Chairman said that the views expressed by deputations and Panel member would be relayed to the Establishment Subcommittee.

**V Central Reclamation Phase III**

- (LC Paper No. CB(1)123/05-06(06) -- Information paper from the Administration
- LC Paper No. CB(1)118/05-06(05) -- Approved Central District (Extension) Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H24/6
- LC Paper No. CB(1)921/04-05(02) -- Background brief on “Central and Wan Chai reclamation” prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat)

18. The Permanent Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning & Lands) (PSHPL(P&L)) said that the Central District (Extension) Outline Zoning Plan (the OZP), which mainly covered the land to be reclaimed under the Central Reclamation Phase III (CRIII) project, had been approved by the Chief Executive in Council. Both the OZP and CRIII project had gone through all the necessary statutory procedures as well as the due process of public consultation where public views and objections were fully considered. The OZP provided a broad planning and design framework for the reclamation area, viz land uses, urban form and open space that was appropriate for the unique development context of the Central Waterfront. It also aimed at optimizing the opportunities to create a world class waterfront district with unique development opportunities that could not be easily accommodated within the existing urban area.

19. The District Planning Officer/Hong Kong of the Planning Department then gave a PowerPoint presentation to brief members on the CRIII project and the land uses of the reclamation area.

*(Post-meeting note: The presentation notes tabled at the meeting were subsequently issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)154/05-06 on 26 October 2005.)*

Extent of reclamation and planned land uses

20. Mr LEE Wing-tat commented that although the computer animation in the presentation was attractive, he was not satisfied that the area of reclamation under the OZP amounted to 23 hectares (ha) and considered that it was still too much. It was not in line with the expectation of harbour protection organisations, Legislative Council (LegCo) Members and the public at large. He criticised that there was too much commercial area especially the Comprehensive Development Area (CDA). Although the buildings on the CDA might not be too high, they covered a large stretch of land. He further said that although CRIII had not been repudiated at the relevant court proceedings, the Administration should refrain from putting the reclaimed land into uses that were not concordant with the principle of returning the harbour to the people. Otherwise, the Administration would meet with strong objection from Members when it sought funding approval for infrastructure projects to be carried out on/for the reclamation area.

21. PSHPL(P&L) stressed that the legitimacy of CRIII had been affirmed by the relevant court judgement. The Administration held the same position as the public that the harbour was a public asset and thus must be protected. There would not be any more reclamation projects in the harbour other than CRIII, Wan Chai Development Phase II (WDII), and the South East Kowloon Development. The latter two projects were under review and the extent of reclamation was not yet determined. As for the land-use planning for CRIII, it should be reckoned that Central was the core area of the city for business activities and to support the development of Hong Kong to become an international financial centre, the allocation of some land in the reclamation area for commercial development was in line with the overall planning objective for Central. Moreover, all waterfront developments including the “CDA” site, piers and waterfront-related commercial and leisure uses were subject to building height restrictions. She clarified that funding approval for the reclamation works of the CRIII project had already been given by LegCo and the Administration would follow the normal funding procedure for any future infrastructure works to be carried out in the reclamation area.

22. Dr KWOK Ka-ki highlighted that the OZP covered an area of about 46.7 ha but only 14.63 ha was zoned as “Open Space”. Taking into account the “CDA”, the future new development at the Tamar site, and various other developments, the additional built-up area covered by the OZP could amount to a total gross floor area (GFA) of some 1 200 000 m<sup>2</sup>. He queried the necessity of providing so many shopping arcades and commercial premises and the idea of erecting two 60-storey towers as the new Central Government Complex at the Tamar site, obstructing the public’s convenient access to the waterfront. He commented that such land-use planning obviously contravened the principle that any reclamation in the harbour must meet the principle of “over-riding public need”. The Administration also failed to honour its promise of not putting up any reclaimed land for sale.

23. Mr James TIEN drew the Administration’s attention to the fact that when the Liberal Party supported the CRIII project in early 2000s, the understanding was that the reclaimed land would be used for constructing roads to improve the transport infrastructure in Central, but now only a portion of the reclaimed land would be used for constructing roads. While agreeing that some commercial facilities such as cafes and restaurants could attract people to the waterfront, he commented that a GFA of 190 000 m<sup>2</sup> for commercial and retail premises in the CDA was comparable to that of the whole Tamar development and this might be too much to be concordant with the expectation of LegCo Members. He also sought details on the Administration’s plan for the disposal of the CDA site.

24. Mr Alan LEONG pointed out that the various new developments in the area covered by the OZP could amount to a total GFA of some 9.3 million square feet, which was comparable to the size of 130 standard soccer pitches. The GFA of the two blocks of the International Finance Centre was only 4.5 million square feet. Excluding the Tamar development, the remaining developments which

comprised mainly office premises and shopping arcades still accounted for nearly half of the total additional GFA. This amount of built-up area was akin to two blocks of International Finance Centre lying horizontally at the Central waterfront. Besides, upon reprovisioning to the proposed new Central Government Complex at the Tamar site, the existing Government buildings at Lower Albert Road and the Murray Building would most probably be demolished for high density redevelopment. Given that the population growth in Hong Kong had slowed down, he questioned whether the current land-use planning for the reclamation area was to the best interest of the public. He opined that the Administration should critically review the serious effects of the land-use planning on the ecology of the Central District and reconsider whether it would be more desirable to do away with some of the planned developments in exchange for a better living environment for the Hong Kong public.

25. In response, PSHPL(P&L) stressed that about 47% or 9 ha of the newly reclaimed land under CRIII had been designated as “Open Space” which would be accessible to the general public. Other than the CDA, the buildings or structures that would be erected in the reclamation area would mainly be Government facilities and reprovisioned public facilities such as piers. The commercial and leisure facilities to be provided at the waterfront promenade were aimed at adding variety and attraction to the waterfront. The Administration should adopt a long-term strategic planning approach in deciding the land uses of the reclamation area. There was a need to maintain Hong Kong’s vibrancy and potential for economic development. The disposal programme for the commercial land in the reclamation area would be carefully planned taking into account the market conditions. New ideas would be adopted for the design of the commercial development/facilities in the CDA. They would be subject to the height restrictions stipulated in the OZP. Moreover, any future development within the CDA zone would require planning permission of the Town Planning Board to ensure that the development would be undertaken in an integrated and coherent manner.

26. PSHPL(P&L) further clarified that it was only in respect of the WDII project that the Administration had pledged that no reclaimed land under the project would be put up for sale. The Administration had not made a similar pledge in respect of the CRIII project. The Administration had widely consulted District Councils and this Panel on the CRIII project. The planning process was open and the draft OZP had undergone five to six rounds of consultation before it was approved. Specifically, the Administration had already provided a clear explanation about the CRIII project and the relevant planned land uses in its document for the meeting of this Panel held on 10 June 1999. She stressed that the OZP was a statutory document and the Administration must comply with the Plan in planning or implementing any uses or developments on any sites covered by the Plan. The OZP could not be amended by way of administrative means; the relevant statutory procedures must be followed should any party or the Government wish to make any amendment to the OZP.

27. The Director of Planning (DP) supplemented that in the original 1998 draft OZP, some 11 ha of reclaimed land was zoned for commercial uses allowing a maximum total GFA of 1 140 000 m<sup>2</sup>. In view of the objections received, the Administration and the Town Planning Board had conducted a comprehensive review on the plan. The extent of reclamation was then substantially reduced and the maximum GFA of the CDA site, which was the only new site designated for commercial office development on CRIII, was only 190 000 m<sup>2</sup>. The main purpose of CRIII was for constructing CWB. The issue at stake was how to put the land reclaimed for the purpose to the best uses. He considered that for the overall and long-term benefit of the community, social, economic, environmental and various other factors should be carefully considered in the planning process and a balanced view should be taken. Reserving some land in the reclamation area for commercial development would be beneficial to the long-term economic development of Hong Kong.

28. As for the future development on the Tamar site, PSHPL(P&L) informed members that as mentioned in the letter from the Director of Administration, the Administration would consult the Legislative Council Commission on matters relating to the new LegCo building shortly. Thereafter, the Administration would brief the Panel on the Tamar development project.

29. Dr KWOK Ka-ki pointed out that although the OZP was a statutory document, it could still be amended. It had not been unusual for the Administration to initiate amendments to approved OZPs. The question was whether the Administration was willing to do it.

#### Design and greening

30. Mr Albert CHAN said that after a number of bitter lessons learned in the past years, the Administration was now almost on the right track in regard to the harbour reclamation projects. He however criticized that the design for the waterfront as shown in Plan 4 attached to the Administration's paper was far from satisfactory. He found that what were shown on the Plan were mainly concrete pavements or structures with little greening. He demanded that there should be more greening in the area and urged the Administration to ensure that the standard of the design and greening would be commensurate with the importance of the area. He was worried that administrative expediency would be accorded priority consideration in designing the area, resulting in a planning blunder with structures and amenities that were unappealing aesthetically and non-conducive to public enjoyment.

31. Mr LEE Wing-tat suggested organising a design competition for local architects to identify the best design for the reclamation area.

32. In response, PSHPL(P&L) said that greening was definitely an important element in the design process and many trees would be planted in the area. As regards the design aspects, she said that the public would continue to be widely

consulted during the planning process and Mr LEE Wing-tat's idea of organising a design competition for the area could be considered. She agreed with Mr Albert CHAN that elements to add to the vibrancy of the area would be much needed. The Administration did not consider it desirable for the area to be very busy during the day but very quiet at night, like the situation of most areas in Central at present. Therefore, some waterfront-related commercial and leisure uses had been planned to add vibrancy to the waterfront.

### Central-Wan Chai Bypass

33. Miss CHOY So-yuk criticised the Administration for disregarding the public's demand for minimizing harbour reclamation under CRIII and queried why more than half of the reclaimed land was not for constructing necessary road infrastructure. Pointing out that WDII was under review and in this connection, the necessity of Central-Wan Chai Bypass (CWB) was being examined, she questioned that the Administration was trying to use CRIII to create a fait accompli so as to justify reclamation under WDII on the grounds that without such reclamation, CWB could not be completed in its entirety.

34. Dr KWOK Ka-ki commented that according to the papers provided by the Administration, even with CWB, traffic in Central would still be saturated by 2016. He highlighted that the commercial development at the CDA site and the new Central Government Complex at the Tamar site would generate substantial additional traffic in Central and thus the current land-use planning under the OZP was not sustainable in traffic terms.

35. PSHPL(P&L) responded that the Administration held the view that CWB was indispensable whilst protection of the harbour had always been the prime concern of the Administration in putting forward its proposal in order to minimise reclamation. The Sub-committee on WDII Review of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee had conducted public surveys and consultations with the Wan Chai, Central and Western, and Eastern District Councils and received general support for constructing CWB. Although the expert panel engaged by the Sub-committee to examine the necessity and possible alignments of CWB had not yet released its report and no conclusion could be drawn at the moment, the inclination was to use the tunnel method in constructing CWB. The Administration would revert to the Panel on WDII in due course, and the relevant issues could be revisited by then.



36. Dr KWOK Ka-ki pointed out that some District Councils were opposed to reclaiming land to construct CWB and asked the Administration to present the full picture. PSHPL(P&L) clarified that the support from the District Councils that she was referring to was related to the necessity of constructing CWB only. The Administration was fully aware that any reclamation under WDII had to satisfy the criteria pertinent to over-riding public needs set by the Court of Final Appeal and had to abide by the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (Cap. 531).

37. Ir Dr Raymond HO expressed support for the construction of CWB. He pointed out that CWB had been discussed for many years. Without CWB, the problem of traffic congestion in the area could not be solved and Hong Kong's economic development would be hampered. Irrespective of the final design to be adopted for CWB, some reclamation was inevitable because of the need for lead roads to CWB. He also supported the provision of a waterfront promenade for leisure activities and for the public to enjoy the beautiful harbour view, and considered it acceptable to provide some appropriate commercial facilities to support the promenade. PSHPL(P&L) thanked Dr Raymond HO for his support and reiterated the urgency of constructing CWB.

#### Motion

38. Dr KWOK Ka-ki moved the following motion –

“本事務委員會要求政府大幅減低中環填海計劃第三期內的商業用地，包括寫字樓、商場等，把土地轉為休憩用地。所有填海土地均應以以民為本的原則歸公眾使用。”

(Translation)

“That the Panel demands the Government to substantially reduce the amount of area for commercial uses under Central Reclamation Phase III, including office premises, shopping arcades, etc; and rezone the relevant sites to “Open Space”. All reclaimed land should be designated for public use in line with the people-oriented principle.”

39. Dr KWOK Ka-ki's motion was seconded by Mr Alan LEONG.

40. Miss CHOY So-yuk proposed an amendment to Dr KWOK Ka-ki's motion as follows –

“本事務委員會要求政府大幅減低中環填海計劃第三期內的商業用地，包括寫字樓、商場等，**不容許任何寫字樓、酒店等商業樓宇**，把土地轉為休憩用地。所有填海土地均應以以民為本的原則歸公眾使用。”

(Translation)

“That the Panel demands the Government to substantially reduce the amount of area for commercial uses under Central Reclamation Phase III; ~~including office premises, shopping arcades, etc;~~ **prohibit the use of the reclaimed land for any commercial developments such as office premises, hotels, etc;** and rezone the relevant sites to “Open Space”. All reclaimed land should be designated for public use in line with the people-oriented principle.”

41. Mr James TIEN proposed an amendment to Dr KWOK Ka-ki’s motion as follows –

“本事務委員會要求政府大幅減低中環填海計劃第三期內的商業用地，包括寫字樓、商場等，把土地轉為**道路或**休憩用地。所有填海土地均應以以民為本的原則歸公眾使用。”

(Translation)

“That the Panel demands the Government to substantially reduce the amount of area for commercial uses under Central Reclamation Phase III; including office premises, shopping arcades, etc; and rezone the relevant sites to **roads or** “Open Space”. All reclaimed land should be designated for public use in line with the people-oriented principle.”

Mr TIEN further said that the Liberal Party supported the idea of reducing the amount of area for commercial uses under CR III, and understood that so doing was permitted under the OZP. The Liberal Party considered that prohibiting the use of the reclaimed land for any commercial developments was not concordant with the OZP. Therefore, the Liberal Party did not support Miss CHOY’s proposed amendment.

42. Miss CHOY So-yuk explained that she did not object to the provision of some small-scale commercial and retail facilities to support the waterfront promenade. She however would not accept the construction of any office buildings and hotels on the reclaimed land.

43. The Chairman suggested and members agreed that Dr KWOK Ka-ki’s motion as amended by Miss CHOY So-yuk should be put to vote first. Except for the Chairman who did not exercise his voting right, of the members present, three members voted for and one member voted against Dr KWOK’s motion as amended by Miss CHOY. The Chairman declared that Dr KWOK’s motion as amended by Miss CHOY was carried.

44. In view of the fact that Miss CHOY So-yuk’s amendment had been carried, Mr James TIEN withdrew his proposed amendment, clarifying that his intention was to amend the original motion moved by Dr KWOK Ka-ki and not the motion as amended by Miss CHOY So-yuk.

**VI Any other business**

45. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 4:45 pm.

Council Business Division 1  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
21 November 2005