

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)1129/05-06

(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/PL/PLW/1

Panel on Planning, Lands and Works

**Minutes of special meeting
held on Saturday, 17 December 2005 at 9:00 am
in the Chamber of the Legislative Council Building**

Members present : Hon Patrick LAU Sau-shing, SBS, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Hon James TIEN Pei-chun, GBS, JP
Hon Albert HO Chun-yan
Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai, S.B.St.J., JP
Hon CHOY So-yuk, JP
Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, GBS, JP
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, JP
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon LEE Wing-tat
Hon LI Kwok-ying, MH
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki

Members attending : Hon Margaret NG
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP
Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP

Members absent : Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBM, GBS, JP (Chairman)
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon WONG Yung-kan, JP
Hon Daniel LAM Wai-keung, BBS, JP
Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming, SBS, JP

**Public officers
attending**

: Agenda item I

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

Mrs MAK LOK Suet-ling, Susan, JP
Deputy Director of Administration 1

Mr CHAN Shuen-jiu, Sidney
Assistant Director of Administration
(Tamar Development)

Ms TSE Kin-ching, Christine
District Planning Officer/Hong Kong
Planning Department

Mr YUEN Ka-tat, Peter
Project Director 1
Architectural Services Department

**Attendance by
invitation**

: Agenda item I

Professional Property Services Limited

Mr Nicholas BROOKE

Mrs Margaret BROOKE

Individual

Ir Prof William H K LAM

Citizen Envisioning@Harbour

Mr Albert LAI
Convenor

Individual

Mr Gerry KIPLING

Individual

Mr Peter MILLWARD

Action Group on Protection of The Harbour

Mr CHONG Wing-fai, Winfield
Member

The Hong Kong Construction Association Ltd.

Mr Conrad WONG
President

Mr David SUFF
Vice-President

Central & Western District Council

Ms CHENG Lai-king
Chairlady
Food, Environment, Hygiene and Works Committee

The Hong Kong Institute of Architects

Prof Bernard LIM
President

Mr Vincent NG
Vice President

The Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects

Mr Evans IU Po-lung
Council Member

The Hong Kong Institution of Engineers

Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok
Vice-President

Hong Kong Institute of Real Estate Administration

Mr TONG Chun-wan
President

The Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors

Mr CHEUNG Tat-tong
Immediate Past President

Mr T C WONG
Representative

Civic Exchange

Ms Christine LOH
Chief Executive Officer

WWF Hong Kong

Mr Markus SHAW
Chairman

Mr Tony TURNER
Trustee and Member of Executive Council

Individual

Mr Winston K S CHU

Society for Protection of The Harbour Limited

Mr LOK Kung-chin, Hardy
Director

Friends of The Harbour

Mr Dennis LI
Representative

Individual

Dr Bill BARRON

Save Our Shorelines

Mr John BOWDEN
Chair

Clear The Air

Dr FUNG Chi-hung
Associate Professor, Hong Kong University of Science
and Technology
Representative, Clear The Air

Friends of the Earth (HK)

Mrs Mei NG
Director

Individual

Mr Norman de BRACKINGHE

Individual

Ms Santa RAYMOND

Individual

Mr John BATTE

Designing Hong Kong Harbour District/
The Experience Group, Limited

Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN
Convenor, Designing Hong Kong Harbour District and
Principal, The Experience Group, Limited

Wan Chai District Council

Mr Steve CHAN
Member

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

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

Ms Christina SHIU
Legislative Assistant (1)7

I Tamar development project and land-use planning for Central Reclamation Phase III

(LC Paper No. CB(1)511/05-06(15) -- Email dated 25 November 2005 from Mr Peter WOOD

LC Paper No. CB(1)511/05-06(16) -- Submission dated 10 December 2005 from Mr Steve CHAN, Wan Chai District Council Member)

Presentation by deputations

As the Chairman was unable to attend the meeting, the Deputy Chairman chaired the meeting. The Deputy Chairman welcomed deputations to the meeting. He suggested and members agreed that each deputation would be given four minutes for their oral presentation. The Administration would give a response to the views of the deputations before members asked questions. He then invited the deputations to present their views on the “Tamar development project and land-use planning for Central Reclamation Phase III”.

*Nicholas and Margaret BROOKE, Professional Property Services Limited
(LC Paper Nos. CB(1)262/05-06(03) and CB(1)511/05-06(04))*

2. Mr Nicholas BROOKE considered that the harbour was the heart of Hong Kong. It was a unique part of Hong Kong's heritage and a unique asset of Hong Kong. It should be treated with extreme care and given unique attention. The Tamar site was part of the harbour-front and should be considered in the context of the overall development of the harbour-front, not as an isolated development project. In planning the harbour-front, the Administration should adopt a holistic approach rather than a piecemeal approach. Unlike development projects in districts such as Wan Chai and Central, there had been no recent public engagement or consultation for the Tamar development project. The community's aspirations had changed since 1998 and the public wished to be involved in the planning process. The Administration should not hide behind the previous approval of the Town Planning Board (TPB) and other historical decisions. The current proposal should be evaluated in the context of the current circumstances. There was plenty of time to gauge and secure support from the community and there was no need to rush. While not being anti-development, he hoped that the ultimate solution would be optimum for all stakeholders. The Administration should demonstrate the case in business terms of its effect on public coffers and conduct a comprehensive study instead of just focusing exclusively on the Tamar site. Legislative Council (LegCo) Members should resist the rush when being pressurized and urged to make a decision without adequate research and diligence. Members should be absolutely convinced that the ultimate solution would be the best for Hong Kong.

*Ir Prof William H K LAM
(LC Paper No. CB(1)511/05-06(08))*

3. Ir Prof William LAM highlighted some key findings of the Expert Panel on Sustainable Transport Planning and Central-Wan Chai Bypass (Expert Panel) which were related to Central Reclamation Phase III (CRIII). He explained that the objective of transport planning in Hong Kong was to promote safe, efficient and reliable transport systems to meet the economic, social and recreational needs of Hong Kong in an environmentally acceptable manner. The Expert Panel had carried out an in-depth study on a number of key issues in relation to sustainable transport planning for the study area. He then briefed members on the short-term, medium-term and long-term measures recommended by the Expert Panel. Short-term measures included implementing transportation management measures, revamping tunnel toll arrangements, managing development programme and enhancing pedestrian access to the waterfront. Medium-term measures included measures such as construction of the Central-Wan Chai Bypass (CWB) to improve the reliability of the road network, enhancing the multi-modal transport network, providing slip roads to magnify the effectiveness of the CWB and requiring the Government to address the related environmental and social concerns. Long-term measures included, among others, reinforcing the holistic approach towards transport/land use planning, recognizing the integration of land use and transport planning as a basis for sustainable transport planning and strengthening the integration of land use and transport planning so as to fulfill the sustainable transport planning principle.

*Citizen Envisioning@Harbour (CE@H)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)314/05-06(01))*

4. Mr Albert LAI, Convenor of CE@H, said that in recent years the value judgment of Hong Kong people on the land use planning for Central especially the Tamar site had changed a lot. This could be demonstrated by a survey result that the public would support lowering the intensity of developments in exchange for a better quality of life; and the demand of the public for more open space in developments and more emphasis on cultural and historical elements and antiques in the development process. It appeared that the Government had not given enough thought to the two options of retaining and reprovisioning the Central Government Offices (CGO). A comparison should be conducted through a comprehensive sustainability impact assessment including economic, environmental and social aspects. The anticipated economic benefits from the reprovisioning of CGO might not be able to materialize because some buildings involved had been classified as antiques and could not be redeveloped. Environmentally speaking, the public wanted to use the Tamar site for various purposes such as open space and cultural activities. Whether the benefits of a planning scheme would be enjoyed by the entire spectrum of the community was an important consideration from the social perspective.

*Mr Gerry KIPLING
(LC Paper No. CB(1)325/05-06(01))*

5. Mr Gerry KIPLING said that LegCo Members and attendees of the meeting had a duty of care to the citizens of Hong Kong in protecting Hong Kong from the excesses of development and poor urban planning. Building a large office structure on the prime waterfront was unfair for the public and the issue should be given critically reviewed. The Tamar site was the last significant site in the harbour-front area. There was no justification for Government offices to be located on this prime site. If there was a need for relocation, there should be other suitable sites. The future use of the site occupied by the existing CGO had not been addressed. The site offered an excellent opportunity to add a “green lung” to an already heavily polluted urban environment. The idea could tie in nicely with the Hong Kong Park and the Hong Kong Botanical Garden and merited consideration. All great cities had a major open/amenity space in their city centres and Hong Kong should follow suit. Continuation of the high intensity development would destroy the harbour-front of Hong Kong, creating a “wall” which would block the view to and from the harbour-front. He also expressed concern on how the design of the new Central Government Complex (CGC) would be awarded and emphasized that the design should be commensurate with the prime harbour-front site. Careful consideration should be given to the matter.

*Mr Peter MILLWARD
(LC Paper Nos. CB(1)262/05-06(01) and CB(1)289/05-06(06))*

6. As Mr Peter MILLWARD was unable to attend the meeting, the Deputy Chairman advised that Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN would relay Mr MILLWARD’s views at the latter part of the meeting.

*Action Group on Protection of The Harbour (AGPTH)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)511/05-06(06))*

7. Mr Winfield CHONG, Member of AGPTH, said that AGPTH had been joining hands with Hong Kong citizens in protecting the harbour. AGPTH objected to unnecessary reclamation because the harbour belonged to all Hong Kong citizens. The public should be able to share and to have access to the harbour. He was concerned about traffic congestion arising from the future commercial premises of some 850 000 m² gross floor area in the comprehensive development area in CRIII and the anticipated traffic saturation by 2016 in some parts of the road network which might lead to further reclamation. He supported the motion passed by the Panel at its meeting held on 25 October 2005. The reprovisioning of CGC at the Tamar site would cost some \$5 billion from the public coffers and should be considered with prudence. Given that there was insufficient information on issues of concern such as the impact of the Tamar development project on the environment and traffic of the area and the future use of the site occupied by the existing CGO, he objected to proceeding with the project. The “wall effect” created by high-rise buildings would lead to

deterioration in air quality. Pursuant to the judgment of the Court of Final Appeal on 9 January 2004, the Administration had to review Wan Chai Reclamation Phase II and the Wan Chai section of CWB. Pointing out that the related works were still pending, he considered that the Administration should review the planning for CRIII, including the Tamar development project.

*The Hong Kong Construction Association Ltd. (HKCA)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)527/05-06(01))*

8. Mr David SUFF, Vice-President of HKCA, said that HKCA welcomed the decision to revive the Tamar development project and to proceed with CRIII, and was supportive of building the CGC, LegCo Complex and Civic Place at the Tamar site because that was the best way forward. One major consideration was that the current unemployment rate in the construction industry was very high. The Tamar development project would help revive the industry and provide the much needed jobs. He considered that the design and build approach (D&B) was the best approach for the Tamar development project and it could achieve a similar effect as an open design competition in securing an optimum design for public viewing and discussion. The Tamar development project included two hectares (ha) of open space for the Civic Place for public use, with good connection to the waterfront. While the CRIII project was primarily aimed at providing land for essential transport infrastructure developments, the portion of CWB in the area would be built underground and would not affect the public, and the area above was zoned as "Open Space" to provide a waterfront promenade for enjoyment of the public. There was a genuine need for a bypass for vehicular traffic to relief current and anticipated traffic congestion. To bring the traffic underground was the best way for the waterfront. The planning should blend in with the surrounding environment.

Central & Western District Council (CWDC)

9. Ms CHENG Lai-king, Chairlady of Food, Environment, Hygiene and Works Committee of CWDC said that CWDC and many members of the public objected to reclamation for the purpose of building roads. Environmental pollution, noise pollution and air pollution were common subjects of complaints. It was often a result of poor planning. She was concerned that high-rise buildings were being built along the waterfront and the reprovisioning of CGC at the Tamar site would aggravate the situation. There was insufficient information and no comprehensive planning in this regard. She also expressed concern on the future use of the existing site occupied by CGO and was worried that it would be used for property development in the future. The Tamar site was located at the Central waterfront and CWDC passed a motion in May 2004 strongly requesting the Administration, inter alia, to investigate the relocation of non-recreational/leisure public/Government facilities along the Central and Western waterfront. There were some 10 to 20 Government facilities such as mortuary and cargo loading and unloading areas located at the waterfront, but the Administration had never assessed whether it was appropriate for those facilities to continue to be located at

the waterfront. She pointed out that the Administration had not consulted the CWDC on the re-launch of the Tamar project which would add a few more high-rise buildings to the area, not to mention the need to finance the project costing some \$5 billion from the public coffer and the question of whether the new CGC could accommodate all the necessary bureaux and departments. She also commented that the Administration had not given much information on the rationale for constructing the CGC with such magnificence. She reiterated that CWDC objected to constructing high-rise buildings on the land reclaimed under CRIII because further developments in the area would adversely affect air quality, air circulation and landscape, and even hinder television reception. She urged the Administration to reconsider the use of the Tamar site.

The Hong Kong Institute of Architects (HKIA)

10. Prof Bernard LIM, President of HKIA, said that he supported the idea of public participation in designing a waterfront for enjoyment of the public. The staggered buildings such as the groundscraper should be well planned so as to avoid having over-sized buildings in the area. Pointing out that about half of the Tamar site had been designated as “Open Space” for public use with connection to the waterfront, he supported the construction of the new CGC, which would not be of high intensity, at the Tamar site. He considered that there should be quality design for the Tamar development project and suggested that an open design competition should be held so that the public could have knowledge of the options available and give comments on the designs before a decision was made. HKIA could assist in organizing a two-stage international design competition which could be completed within six months for identifying a quality design. He had reservations on adopting the D&B approach because the approach often put cost-effectiveness before design considerations and design ideas would only come from a single contractor. In identifying quality designs, the public should be given opportunities in participating in the process. In view of the complexity of the project, he was worried about the possibility of massive claims in the future if the project was carried out in a rush. Some detailed requirements might not have been delineated in the original tender document and the resulting buildings might not be of quality design or meet the needs of the community. He expressed concern on the effect on local architectural firms of international tendering under the requirements of the World Trade Organization. He considered that the Administration should promote an international platform for participation by local professionals.

The Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects (HKILA)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)511/05-06(11))

11. Mr Evans IU, Council Member of HKILA said that HKILA had already provided a written submission to the Panel and he did not have further views to present to the Panel at the meeting.

*The Hong Kong Institution of Engineers (HKIE)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)527/05-06(02))*

12. Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Vice-President of HKIE, said that HKIE agreed to the overall conceptual requirements and arrangements for the projects in the reclaimed areas at the Central waterfront including the Tamar site. The proposed building heights were compatible with surrounding buildings and the low plot ratio was reasonable. He recommended that the carparking spaces should be made underground as far as possible. Expressing concern that the new developments would give rise to traffic problems in the area, he pointed out that CWB and Road P2 could relieve the traffic congestion problem. The delay in constructing CWB would aggravate traffic problems. He urged the Administration to consider mass transit systems and suggested the construction of an automatic people mover to connect the Tamar area and the waterfront with the nearest transport nodes in addition to the proposed footbridges and landscaped pedestrian deck. He objected to the D&B approach because cost would become the predominant consideration and suggested that there should be an initial planning/design phase covering the conceptual planning of the principal elements of the development and architectural designs of the Government buildings and main features in order to provide the framework and for subsequent detailed design. In view of the complexity and significance of the project, it would be necessary to carry out the design and construction of the project in separate phases.

Hong Kong Institute of Real Estate Administration (HKIREA)

13. Mr TONG Chun-wan, President of HKIREA, said that HKIREA supported the provision of a decent CGC and other public facilities at the Tamar site, but in view of the fact that the site was a prime site, a quality design for the project should be ensured. Apart from meeting the accommodation needs of the Government, the facilities of the Tamar development project should bring benefits to the public as well. He did not consider that leaving the Tamar site undeveloped would be beneficial to the public. He supported the idea that the land to be reclaimed under CRIII should mainly be used for constructing CWB instead of using it for property development, but agreed that some of the land could be used for public facilities such as galleries, art museums and restaurants. Designating all the reclaimed land under CRIII as “Open Space” might not be the most desirable arrangement from the public finance angle. He hoped that the Administration would consider these points in taking forward the Tamar development project.

*The Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors (HKIS)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)511/05-06(14))*

14. Mr CHEUNG Tat-tong, Immediate Past President of HKIS, said that HKIS supported the implementation of the Tamar development project. From the viewpoint of land supply, he pointed out that the vacancy rate of Grade A office space in Central had been decreasing and the rental had increased drastically in the

past two years. He said that inadequate supply and extremely high rental cost of Grade A office space in Central would adversely affect the economic development of Hong Kong. The competitive advantage of Hong Kong over other international cities as an international business and financial centre would be much reduced. The Tamar development was first put forward in 1998 and it took four years before a decision was made and another year for seeking funding approval from LegCo, after which the project was suspended due to the outbreak of the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome. It would be unbelievable if there was a need for relocation eight years ago but not at present. The operating expenses in these eight years of the existing CGO would be able to cover a substantial portion of the construction cost of a new CGC. The existing CGO could not meet present operational needs. Both the Administration and LegCo needed more space for future development. The existing LegCo Building was not purposely built for LegCo. It was neither suitable nor adequate for LegCo's future use. Pointing out that the proposed development intensity had been reduced when compared with that in 2003, he hoped that there would not be any "wall effect" obstructing the view to and from the harbour. He also suggested that the Government should consult relevant professional groups in considering the adoption of the D&B approach.

Civic Exchange (CEx)

(LC Paper Nos. CB(1)325/05-06(04) and CB(1)511/05-06(02))

15. Ms Christine LOH, Chief Executive Officer of CEx, said that the Administration should stop and think twice before taking the Tamar development project forward. The demand of the public in planning matters in present days was different from that in the past. The public demanded more beautiful and green open space, not a piece of concrete land with a few withering trees. However, the provision of green open space had not been on the top of the priority list in planning. Isolated open space left after the construction of roads would not be able to meet the demands of the public. The Tamar development project was the starting point of a series of developments along the Central waterfront. If it was proceeded with in a rush, the opportunities for alternative better developments would be lost. The six-lane Road P2 would prevent pedestrian access to the waterfront and pedestrians could only use footbridges or walk through arcades in the groundscraper to reach the waterfront instead of walking at grade. She cautioned that the public should not be misled by eye-catching presentation materials introducing the attractiveness of the waterfront promenade, and queried that the quality of the waterfront promenade might not be as good as what it seemed. She was worried about the situation in Central in 10 to 20 years' time. She expressed serious doubt as to whether the existing Central OZP would bring about developments that Hong Kong people could be proud of in the future.

*WWF Hong Kong (WWF)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)364/05-06(11))*

16. Mr Markus SHAW, Chairman of WWF, said that the issue at stake was not only about the Tamar site, but the Central waterfront's future. The Administration and the public acknowledged that there would be no further reclamation in the harbour, and there was only one chance to get the Central waterfront right. The decision would affect future generations. The public and the Government spoke the same language but had completely different visions and ideas about a world-class waterfront for the people. The Administration had been adopting the same development model in the past, but time had changed and the population growth had slowed down. The public's views on development and quality of life were also changing. However, the Administration's way of thinking remained the same. The focus was on building roads and maximizing efficiency. Road P2 would block pedestrian access to the waterfront and podiums and footbridges had to be provided instead. Pointing out that podiums would keep people away from using the open space, he queried whether there were any podiums properly designed for the people. He was worried that the proposed CGC and LegCo Complex would be brutal, monolithic and inhumane complexes, surrounded by roads and public spaces where no one would wish to go. The CGC would be no different from the unappealing Government buildings in Wan Chai. LegCo should stay at the current LegCo Building with parks surrounding it and the existing CGO with greenery and heritage buildings surrounding it should be preserved. He was also worried that there would be high density redevelopments at the sites occupied by the existing CGO and heritage buildings nearby in the future. These buildings gave the community a sense of its history and belonging that could not be measured in monetary terms. He emphasized that he was not anti-development, but believed that there should be more appropriate development for Hong Kong. He was concerned whether the waterfront would be a waterfront which could survive the times, a waterfront for the people and a waterfront created with foresight and vision and having historical value.

*Mr Winston K S CHU
(LC Paper Nos. CB(1)325/05-06(05), CB(1)511/05-06(01) and CB(1)527/05-06(03))*

17. Mr Winston CHU said that according to the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (PHO) (Cap. 531), the harbour was a special public asset and a natural heritage of the people of Hong Kong. The Government had a duty to protect and preserve it and had to justify any proposal for reclamation. The Government had a duty to carry out public consultation and to give the public the opportunity to object. In 2002, the Government carried out a public consultation in which the Government advised the public and LegCo that as long as CRIII provided some public benefit, the proposed reclamation would be lawful. The public and LegCo were therefore misled into believing that CRIII, including the proposed office and commercial developments thereon, complied with PHO. In 2004, the Court of Final Appeal pronounced that the correct test was not some "public benefit", but

that the Government had to demonstrate an “overriding public need”. The Administration had to demonstrate that the need must be overriding, public and present; the reclamation must be minimal; there must be no reasonable alternative; and each area proposed to be reclaimed must be justified. Since then, the Government had not conducted any further public consultation nor given the public the opportunity of objecting to CRIII based upon the correct interpretation of the law. The Government had a clear duty to do so. The Government was taking away a piece of the harbour that belonged to the people of Hong Kong and it should allow the people to consider whether the reasons advanced were sufficient. The public must be given the opportunity to object to the Government’s proposal to sell the five pieces of reclaimed land totaling 800 000 sq. ft. for extensive office and commercial development because the proposal might fail the Court of Final Appeal test. The total gross floor area created would amount to some 9.25 million sq. ft. It would also attract some 7 000 vehicles per hour to Central. As a matter of fairness and logic, the land was created from the people’s harbour by public funds and should be given back to the people for public enjoyment. LegCo had to be given the opportunity to have a debate on the basis of the correct legal interpretation of the PHO. The original purpose of CRIII was to provide the necessary land for constructing roads to alleviate traffic congestion. However, the commercial developments on CRIII would defeat the purpose by aggravating traffic congestion. There would be traffic congestion again by 2016.

Society For Protection Of The Harbour Limited (SPTHL)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)325/05-06(06))

18. Mr Hardy LOK, Director of SPTHL, said that the objective of SPTHL was the protection of the harbour’s eternity. He requested the Administration to think twice before moving on. Although TPB had rejected SPTHL’s request for rezoning the Central Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) at its hearing on 5 August 2005, it considered that there were many good concepts in SPTHL’s proposal which were worth consideration and requested the Administration to plan developments such as the groundscraper, commercial premises and recreational space with prudence in order to ensure easy access to the waterfront so as to meet the public’s aspirations. The Administration should conduct a comprehensive and independent assessment and rethink its planning policy. Before this, the Administration should stop all plans at CRIII, including the Tamar site; rethink as there was no urgency in carrying out the developments and to avoid further reclamation in the future if the present planning was wrong; and obtain a consensus by conducting thorough consultation with the public on the optimized plan. The Tamar site should be used by the public for leisure and communal purposes, such as organizing diversified activities and enjoying the view of the harbour. The public should be proud of it. It could also become a tourist attraction. The Administration should adopt a mature attitude and allow adequate time for planning for a long-term and optimum planning for the Central waterfront.

Friends Of The Harbour (FOTH)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)511/05-06(07))

19. Mr Dennis LI, Representative of FOTH, said that FOTH had commissioned Sir Peter HALL of The Bartlett School of Planning of University College London to conduct a consultancy study on the potential of the Tamar site. The Tamar site was located at the mid-point of the proposed waterfront promenade. The Tamar site should not be developed in isolation. It should be considered by LegCo together with other developments in Central. He requested the Government to consult the public on the planned land uses on the land reclaimed under CRIII and the Tamar site before finalizing the proposal. The consultancy report provided many good suggestions on the potential of the Tamar site, such as a waterfront plaza. He considered that the Tamar site was the last precious site for developing a waterfront plaza and asked the Administration to respect the views of the public and conduct comprehensive consultation before taking the Tamar development project forward.

Dr Bill BARRON
(LC Paper No. CB(1)511/05-06(09))

20. Dr Bill BARRON said that he would talk about the transport situation along the waterfront and the Government's land policy which was straining the transport system to the breaking point and undermining the Government's environmental objectives, and running counter to common sense principles. The responsibility for the transport problem and the low quality of life thus arising was not so much on the Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works, but rather the Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands, because the decision to relocate into the area some 39 000 jobs from elsewhere in Hong Kong, thus generating traffic of some 7 000 vehicles per hour, defied common sense. The CWB was intended to relieve traffic congestion but the proposed new developments in the area would undo the benefits that CWB would create and defeat the original purpose. Even with Road P2, he was worried that the Government would use traffic congestion as an argument for further reclamation by 2016. The Government might have plans of subsidizing parallel mass transit railway lines, banning private cars from Central or building double-decking or even triple-decking roads. Even before the traffic reached gridlock, Central and the area around Tamar would be dominated by traffic for 12 hours a day from 8 am to 8 pm and the situation would be unpleasant and unhealthy. The lands policy came far ahead of environmental considerations. He considered that public sector greed was the reason for planning developments at the waterfront. Government lands policy was aimed at maximizing revenue, regardless of the consequences. He queried whether CWB was just an excuse for a land grant and provided a convenient rationale for increasing the intensity of the developments at the waterfront. As nearly half of the jobs to be relocated to the area were related to the new CGC, to stop and rethink the relocation of the CGO would be the first step. That would open up more space, reduce traffic into the area and leave potentials for better uses of the site.

*Save Our Shorelines (SOS)**(LC Paper Nos. CB(1)364/05-06(10) and CB(1)527/05-06(04))*

21. Mr John BOWDEN, Chair of SOS, said that he would focus on Road P2 and use it as an example to demonstrate that there were errors in the current planning which originated from the planning of CRIII. He demonstrated the changes in the planning of the Tamar site and the nearby areas since 1994. In 1998, the proposed Road P2 had been designed to serve the planned developments by then. The area had gone through many OZP changes since then with a reduction of some 60% in the number of planned buildings, but the planned capacities of the road network had been maintained. The height of the proposed buildings remaining was also lower than before. The plan for CRIII that had been gazetted in 1998 gave the clearest indication of what had once been intended for the site with some 20 development blocks. The CRIII site had been reduced in area by 20% and the extent of construction development by almost 50% but the reduction in service roadways had not been proportional to this change. This demonstrated that the thinking in planning had not been kept up-to-date when needs and requirements had changed. He suggested to stop, think and re-plan because there was still time.

*Clear The Air (CTA)**(LC Paper Nos. CB(1)325/05-06(02), CB(1)511/05-06(13), CB(1)527/05-06(05) and CB(1)527/05-06(06))*

22. Dr FUNG Chi-hung, Representative of CTA, said that the official figures in the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report (July 2001) seriously underestimated the pollution levels. The highest predicted concentration of respirable suspended particles (RSP) at the Central roadside station was not expected to exceed an average concentration of 80 micrograms per cubic metre but in 2003 the highest figure was 257. The model used in the EIA assumed Central was a flat surface, with no buildings and the street canyon effect of buildings had been neglected. If a more accurate assessment could be conducted, the concentration might be two to five times higher. Over the past six years, the concentration of RSP violated the Air Quality Objective (AQO) standard both in one-year average and in 24-hour maximum. The AQO standard could be used as a reference indicator of the impact on the health of the citizens. In 2004, for the one-year average, it was 42% over AQO and for the 24-hour maximum, it was 12% over AQO. The figure was more than double of the figure in the 2001 report. Similarly, over the past six years, the concentration of NO₂ violated the AQO standard both in one-year average and in 24-hour maximum. In 2004, the concentration was 38% higher than the AQO standard in 2004. For NO₂ 24-hour maximum concentration, it was 37% higher than AQO standard. For NO₂ hourly maximum concentration, it was 30% higher than AQO standard in 2004. Thus, the model underestimated the NO₂ concentration in Central. Even without taking the street canyon effect into account, the concentration of NO₂ was just able to meet the AQO standard at the receptors but there was still a large area that did not meet

the standard. To meet AQO was to safeguard the health and well-being of the community. He pointed out that the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) had indicated that possible ways to achieve and maintain AQO included preventive measures through intervention in the planning stage or enforcement of the relevant legislation on AQO in order to prevent excessive discharge of pollutants into the air. The Government should conduct a more reliable EIA for air quality and use a proper model that took into account the street canyon effect.

*Friends of the Earth (HK) (FoE(HK))
(LC Paper No. CB(1)527/05-06(07))*

23. Mrs Mei NG, Director of FoE(HK), pointed out that the EIA for the projects planned for the Central waterfront was modeled on wrong assumptions and used relic 1999 data in assessing environmental impacts. Many recent developments had not been taken into account. The Government would be setting a bad example in adopting a passive attitude to changing circumstances. She considered that ignoring health impacts was bad governance, pointing out that 367 hours of high air pollution index well over 100 had been recorded at the Central roadside station during the year. Adding high-rise buildings to the area would aggravate the situation. According to a recent survey, 80% of the interviewees reported suffering from respiratory illnesses and half of them were depressed as a result of air pollution. Heat island effect would be intensified. A recent study commissioned by EPD had shown that there would be a two degree Celsius difference in air temperature between downtown and suburban areas in Hong Kong. With one degree Celsius' increase in air temperature, an extra 1.7 billion electricity units would be consumed, an equivalent of \$1.7 billion in electricity bill. It would also lead to climatic changes. She further pointed out that the Tamar development project bypassed the sustainability test. Although a sustainability assessment tool for strategic policy making was advocated by the Government in 2001, she queried whether the Government had set an example in this regard. Hong Kong, ranked 41st on the list of livable cities in the world, had slipped. Air pollution had been identified as a primary unfavorable factor. There was a need to rethink the impact of urban development on air pollution. FoE(HK) urged LegCo not to approve the Tamar Development until a new EIA; a comprehensive heat island effect and canyon effect assessment; a comprehensive traffic impact assessment; and a sustainability development assessment were undertaken by the Government. Without these assessments, she was worried about the consequences.

*Mr Norman de BRACKINGHE
(LC Paper Nos. CB(1)364/05-06(05) and CB(1)511/05-06(05))*

24. Mr Norman de BRACKINGHE said that for him the focal point of Hong Kong was the harbour ever since he came to Hong Kong. The harbour had always been a potent image in various materials ranging from China trade paintings to publicity of the Hong Kong Tourism Board. The images of the harbour and Central proclaimed the essence of Hong Kong and they were the memories that the

local people and the tourists carried with them. Worldwide waterfront areas were reserved for the people to relax, to stroll or to exercise in a space away from the throb of the city, its noise and its pollution. The waterfront should be somewhere that the public could enjoy, with a sense of both distance and belonging. There was no need for additional shopping facilities at the Tamar site and the waterfront. The public's access to the Tamar and waterfront areas should be casual and easy. Meadow was a possibility. He pointed out that the proposed roads adjacent to the Tamar site would block the public's access to the waterfront and cause air and noise pollution. At night, empty Government buildings would stand soulless in the area. There was absolutely no need to rush to develop the site. He queried whether there had been studies to explore other possible locations for Government offices. He suggested that the groundscraper of the Cyberport, which was less than half-occupied, could be considered for use as Government offices with a mass transit railway connection. He pleaded to retain for the future generation the harbour amid a vibrant city.

Ms Santa RAYMOND
(LC Paper No. CB(1)511/05-06(12))

25. Ms Santa RAYMOND suggested reusing the existing buildings rather than moving. She said that constructing new premises was likely to cost around twice as much as refurbishing the existing buildings. The existing buildings had years of life in them and the Government had a great opportunity to lead by example in refurbishing rather than constructing and illustrate forcefully that the Government was concerned with sustainability and environmental issues. Rather than increasing landfill, others would be encouraged to reduce it. The LegCo Building, an iconic architecture, could be preserved and refurbished to meet future needs. For the people of Hong Kong, the building was a symbol of Government, and of their pride in their citizenship and no modern building could compete. By moving into Government House, the Chief Executive confirmed his belief in the importance of history. Likewise, other governments throughout the world had chosen to refurbish their historic buildings rather than moving elsewhere. The LegCo Building and CGO were well located alongside the "green lungs" of Hong Kong. These buildings could be refurbished to increase space efficiency. Through using space effectively, existing premises could accommodate 30% more people. A study on space needs might have been carried out, but new audits were needed. Technology also needed updating to enhance efficiency. Government was known for poor communication. The right space and the right use of space could improve communication. However, bringing people together in one place, as was suggested for Tamar, could have the reverse effect. People on different floors might well meet less than those coming in for specific meetings. Centralization also made organizations vulnerable to terrorist attack, viral attack and to such things as electricity failure. Decentralization into local centres avoided all these dangers, whilst enhancing the individual's quality of life and that of the community. Decentralization also reduced travelling time and costs and impact on the environment. Before taking any action, the Government should audit its space usage using modern business models. It would then become clear that there was

no need for the Tamar development project. In reusing, rather than constructing, the Government had a golden opportunity to put its house in order, physically, financially, organizationally, morally and humanely; and to enhance what existed, rather than ruining the heritage of the future generation.

Mr John BATTEN

(LC Paper Nos. CB(1)364/05-06(04) and CB(1)511/05-06(10))

26. Mr John BATTEN said that it was unwise to carry out the CRIII project and the Tamar development project. Many developments in Mong Kok and Tsim Sha Tsui had blocked the ridgeline of Lion Rock from Wanchai. Similarly, from the Tsim Sha Tsui waterfront, the International Finance Centre blocked the view of the Peak. He considered that the Administration and the proponents of the CRIII project and the Tamar development project were absurd. Pointing out that how to control the Administration in the planning process was a challenge, he criticized that the Administration was bureaucratic and decisions for Hong Kong were made by the bureaucracy. He considered that the Administration should take the well-being of future generations into account in making its decisions. He emphasized that the evidence against the Tamar development project was compelling.

Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN, Convenor, Designing Hong Kong Harbour District and Principal, The Experience Group, Limited

(LC Paper Nos. CB(1)235/05-06(01) and CB(1)511/05-06(03))

27. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN, Convenor, Designing Hong Kong Harbour District and Principal, The Experience Group, Limited, presented his own views and Mr Peter MILLWARD's views. He showed pictures of waterfronts in selected cities and compared them with Hong Kong's waterfront to support his views that Hong Kong's waterfront was not properly designed. He opined that at present, it was difficult for the people of Hong Kong to reach the waterfront because the current design did not facilitate easy access. According to the current planning, the proposed high capacity roads would block pedestrian access to the harbour-front. There would not be vibrant street level activities in the planned areas. Pedestrians could not cross the high capacity roads at grade and could only use footbridges or subways to reach the waterfront. He doubted whether many people would go to the waterfront and the Civic Place if they were built according to the current planning. The sizes of the plots of land according to the current planning were too large when compared with existing smaller plots of land where there were vibrant street level activities. The area along the waterfront would be sterilized by high capacity roads which could not be crossed by pedestrians. He drew members' attention to the planned massive road infrastructure in Central and commented that there should be uninterrupted connection to the waterfront with vibrant streets where people could walk about and would not be limited to using crossings far apart. He commented that unlike West Kowloon, Kai Tak and Hung Hom, Central had not much space and requested the Administration to rethink the planning for the reclamation area under CRIII and the Tamar site. He opined that cultural

facilities could be provisioned in Central because they would generate traffic during non-peak hours. He considered that the planning for the area should be enhanced.

*Wan Chai District Council (WCDC)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)511/05-06(16))*

28. Mr Steve CHAN, Member of WCDC, said that he supported the view that the Administration should rethink the planning for the reclamation area under CRIII and Tamar before moving ahead. He considered that the core issue was sustainable development. He had requested the Planning Department to provide the public with perspectives of the Tamar development project viewed from the Peak but he had not seen that yet. According to the Urban Design Guidelines for Hong Kong, preservation of the public view was one of the important guidelines in planning. He demonstrated his hypothesized visual impacts of the Tamar development project on the landscape by showing simulated views, with the proposed CGC in place and at different heights of 130m PD and 160m PD, of the ridgeline on Hong Kong side as viewed from the Hong Kong Cultural Centre in Tsim Sha Tsui and of the harbour as viewed from the Peak. He pointed out that development should be sustainable thereby benefiting future generations. He expressed concern on the impact that possible redevelopment of the site occupied by the existing CGO would have on the historical buildings and the green surroundings nearby. He was also concerned with the quality of the public space to be provided. Though grand, the Civic Place might not be used by the public because of political reasons. He queried whether the waterfront would be easily accessible. He expressed concern on the need for further reclamation by 2016 in order to solve the traffic congestion problem.

Response by the Administration

29. The Deputy Chairman summarized that attending deputations had raised a number of issues including the land-use planning for the Central waterfront, the environmental issues and traffic impact arising from the current planning, the accessibility of the future waterfront and Civic Place to pedestrians, public consultation, cost-effectiveness of the Tamar development project, future use of the site of the existing CGO, the approach adopted for delivery of the project vis-à-vis the design of the project, and timetable for implementation of the project. He invited the Administration to respond to the views of the deputations. Mr Abraham SHEK suggested and members agreed that the Administration should also provide a written response to the views/concerns raised by deputations attending the meeting.

30. The Deputy Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands) 1 (DS/HPL(P&L)1 advised that the current land-use planning for the Central waterfront had balanced various land-use needs. 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 structures that would be erected in the reclamation area included, inter alia, reprovisioned public facilities such as piers. The current planning was in line with the planning objective of creating a world class waterfront district with unique development opportunities that could not be easily accommodated within the existing urban area and would support the continued development of Hong Kong as an international financial centre. A world-class waterfront promenade running in the east-west direction and three principal design corridors running in the north-south direction would provide continuous pedestrian and visual connections between the existing urban area and the new waterfront. CRIII was a duly authorized project and had gone through all the necessary statutory procedures as well as the due process of public consultation where public views and objections had been fully considered. The relevant OZP had been approved by the Executive Council on the recommendation of TPB in 2000.

31. The District Planning Officer/Hong Kong of the Planning Department (DPO/PD) explained that according to Transport Department’s advice, the planned road network, including CBW and Road P2, would be able to cope with the traffic generated from the planned developments within the Central reclamation areas. The future use of the existing sites occupied by CGO and Murray Building had not been determined at this stage as there was still some time before completion of the Tamar project and reprovisioning of the CGO and offices at Murray Building. The CGO and Murray Building sites were currently zoned for “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) use on the Central District OZP. Any proposal for rezoning the sites to other uses must undergo the public consultation procedures as stipulated in the Town Planning Ordinance and was subject to the approval of TPB.

32. The Deputy Director of Administration 1 said that after a thorough process of public consultation as required under the Town Planning Ordinance, the Tamar site had been formally rezoned for “G/IC” and “Open Space” uses on the draft Central District (Extension) OZP in 2000. The G/IC and the Civic Place sites were about 2.2 ha and 2 ha respectively. The Tamar development project would have no significant or long-term effect on the environment or the air quality. The Exhibition Gallery had already been excised from the current project plan. The number of car-parking spaces to be provided at Tamar would be around 500 under the current project plan with 380 for CGC and 120 for LCC and thus the impact of the project on the traffic condition in Central should be negligible. According to a recent assessment conducted by the Transport Department in 2005, the traffic generated by the future developments in CRIII and Tamar would account for no more than 4% of the total traffic volume in Central Business District and Admiralty. The height of the proposed CGC had been reduced from 180m PD to 130m PD – 160m PD in order to protect the ridgeline. The prequalification

exercise for the Tamar development project was aimed at shortlisting applicants with the required capabilities, including that of producing a quality design, to undertake the project. The project would also take due account of the Harbour Planning Principles and Urban Design Guidelines. The 2003 indicative figure for the number of staff working in CGC and LegCo Complex was some 3 000 and a similar number was expected for the current project. Details of the project such as the gross floor area requirements and other user requirements would be updated based on the inputs of Government bureaux and the Legislative Council Commission. The implementation timetable of the project was as follows –

- | | |
|--|------------------------------|
| (a) Issue of prequalification document | 4 th quarter 2005 |
| (b) Completion of the prequalification exercise | 2 nd quarter 2006 |
| (c) Formal consultation with the Panel on Planning, Lands and Works, the Public Works Subcommittee and the Finance Committee | 2 nd quarter 2006 |
| (d) Issue of tender document | 3 rd quarter 2006 |
| (e) Completion of selection of tenders | early 2007 |
| (f) Completion of project | 2010 |

Discussion

33. Dr KWOK Ka-ki commented that there was practically no further consultation with the public on the planning for the Central waterfront after 1998 although the awareness of the public on harbour protection had been considerably raised since then. The current planning for the Central waterfront had been decided through a bureaucratic process. The Planning Department merely indicated that requests for rezoning could be submitted to the Town Planning Board. It had no idea on how the site of the existing CGO should be developed and how to develop the Central waterfront into a vibrant waterfront with characteristics. He was not convinced that under the current planning, the waterfront would become a waterfront in which Hong Kong people would take pride and which tourists would welcome. He was particularly concerned that the Administration was trying to rush the Tamar development project. As the project was to be delivered by using the D&B approach, the public could not take part in the design process. While the Administration repeatedly stressed that 2 ha of “Open Space” within the Tamar site would be made available for use by the public, he doubted if the future Civil Place fronting the CGC could really cater for this purpose. Apart from the claim of protecting the ridgeline, the Administration had not been able to substantiate how the future buildings at Tamar would not have a “wall” effect and other adverse effects on the environment. He considered that there should be a comprehensive review of the planning of the Central waterfront and the Administration should refrain from taking the project forward before completion of the review.

34. Ms Emily LAU declared interest because The Frontier had received \$442,880 from The Hong Kong Construction Association Limited for conducting

a research study on public-private-partnership. While appreciating that the unemployment rate in the construction industry remained high, she queried the need for the Administration to take forward the Tamar development project in a rush, and doubted whether the project could move forward without taking into consideration the views of the public and the stance of political parties. She commented that the waterfront was a decent place in many other cities but this was not the case for Hong Kong. She echoed Mr Abraham SHEK's suggestion to request the Administration to provide a written response to the comments made by the deputations which she considered were very valuable and worth serious consideration. She considered that the bureau secretary should have attended the meeting and the Panel should hold another meeting for the Administration to present its response. In reply, The Deputy Chairman advised that a letter had already been sent to the Administration to request the bureau secretary or other senior officials to attend the meeting.

35. Ms Margaret NG clarified that the bundling of the CGC and the LegCo Complex was not the desire or request of the Legislative Council Commission. LegCo did not request for the Tamar site and did not consider that the Tamar site was the only suitable site for the new LegCo Complex. LegCo had been proposing various sites for a new LegCo Complex for some 10 years, but those proposals were turned down by the Administration one after another. While the Administration acknowledged that LegCo had autonomy in choosing another suitable site, the Administration had pointed out that it might take a considerable period of time under the circumstances. The views expressed by the deputations demonstrated the quality and power of Hong Kong's civil society. She hoped that the views and concerns of the deputations would be heeded and duly considered by the Administration and Members. The Deputy Chairman confirmed the stance of the Legislative Council Commission on the issue of the new LegCo Complex as explicated by Ms NG.

36. Mr Albert HO hoped that the Administration did not hold a preconceived view that the deputations were attending the meeting simply for the sake of raising objections to the proposals of the Administration. As he saw it, the deputations had spent their precious time in conducting in-depth research on the subject and preparing their presentations for which the Administration should be grateful. They showed their genuine concern towards and identification with Hong Kong and this was important for the sustainable development of Hong Kong. He considered that there should be adequate public discussion on the Tamar development project before making a decision. He pointed out that there was no urgency and the whole matter should be handled with prudence. The public's awareness of environmental issues such as harbour reclamation had been raised considerably in recent years and the decisions made previously might not be able to live up to the present-day demands of the public. The Democratic Party (DP) would further discuss the subject with concerned parties before taking a position. The Administration should also hold an open mind and further discuss the subject with the public before making any decision. In the case that the Tamar development project could not materialize, other alternatives for the

reprovisioning of LegCo and the Court of Final Appeal should be provided by the Administration.

37. Miss CHOY So-yuk declared interest that the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong (DAB) had also received funds from The Hong Kong Construction Association Limited to conduct a research study. DAB objected to reclamation and constructing commercial buildings on reclaimed land. DAB demanded that there should be a waterfront promenade extending all the way from Chai Wan to Kennedy Town. DAB did not support reprovisioning the new CGC at the Tamar site. She explained that DAB had given support to the previous proposal for the Tamar development project on the then understanding that there would be an environmental-friendly new town in South East Kowloon, West Kowloon would be designated as “Open Space” and the planning for Central and Wan Chai was yet to be completed. A lot of changes had taken place over the planning for the harbour-front areas in the past few years. She appealed to other Members to keep up with the times and asked the Administration to really listen to the views of the public. The situation of the harbour had deteriorated and the well-being of the future generations must be considered.

38. Mr LEE Wing-tat pointed out that in considering the issues in question, DP was guided by three principles. Firstly, DP considered that the Victoria Harbour and the waterfront belonged to people of Hong Kong, not the Government or the Chief Executive. Secondly, DP did not wish to rush the project because developments based on poor planning and harbour reclamation were irreversible. Thirdly, DP did not agree to a piecemeal approach in planning and there should be a comprehensive and overall review in planning for Central, Wan Chai and the waterfront. The last piece of valuable land in Central should be returned to the people of Hong Kong. He expressed concern on the assumptions and data used in the Administration’s assessment of the air quality in Central as pointed out by some deputations. He remarked that the Administration should clear all the queries raised by the deputations before reverting to LegCo. Utmost care should be exercised in deciding on the future use of the Tamar site.

39. Mr Alan LEONG commented that the Administration was obstinate and profit-driven and could not keep up with the times in the planning process. As a result, the Administration had become reactive time after time and the situation would only worsen. The Administration should rethink on how it could assimilate the views of the public in a structured way so that the future developments taking place in various parts of Hong Kong could endure the times and the public could embrace the products of the Government’s planning. The Administration should reform the town planning mechanism. The Administration would be seen to be lack of long-term planning and vision if it considered that it was too early to discuss the future use of the existing site of the CGO. He was worried that the site and its surrounding green areas would be used for developing high-rise buildings. He also expressed concern on the assessments of the air quality in Central conducted by the Administration in the past.

40. Ir Dr Raymond HO commented that while the Administration had conducted consultation on the land-use planning for the new Central waterfront and the Tamar development project some time in the past, undertaking more consultation on these matters would be desirable to gauge the latest public views. The Tamar development project had been discussed by LegCo Panels since 2001 and endorsed by the Public Works Subcommittee (PWSC) in 2003. The circumstances had changed but the Administration had not taken the opportunity to collect public views. He was very disappointed that the responsible bureau secretary and permanent secretary were not present at the meeting. He commented that the existing Infrastructure Exhibition Gallery beside the City Hall was too small when compared with those in other major cities. While agreeing that the planned Exhibition Gallery could be located at another appropriate location other than the Tamar site in Central, he hoped that the Administration would come up with a proposal as soon as possible. He expressed objection to the idea of reprovisioning CGC in Kai Tak and cautioned that many contentious issues would arise again because of the lack of ancillary facilities in Kai Tak and everything would have to start from scratch.

Motion

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

“鑑於中環海濱對本港未來的重要性，以及政府承諾使香港成為一個達世界級的城市和為市民建設一個朝氣蓬勃、可供大眾享用的優美中環海濱，本事務委員會敦促政府遵從城市規劃委員會於2005年8月5日¹所作出的建議及履行本事務委員會於2005年10月25日²所通過的動議，重新檢討現時的添馬艦發展及中環海濱土地用途規劃，和在採取任何進一步的工程及規劃前向公眾諮詢；並在作檢討及公眾諮詢前，暫停有關添馬艦發展的招標程序；以及本事務委員會須成立小組委員會，檢討中環海濱的規劃(包括添馬艦發展)。”

註譯：

1 城規會於 2005 年 8 月 5 日會議上，討論有團體申請修改中環及灣仔大綱圖的要求時，作出了下列的建議：

城規會同意要求政府為此重要的海旁，特別是「橫向型樓宇」及與海旁有關的商業及休憩用途地帶，制訂或修改規劃/設計大綱，以確保將來的發展融入海旁的環境、方便市民到達海旁，以及令視野更廣闊。

2 規劃地政及工程事務委員會於 2005 年 10 月 25 日所通過的動議：

“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，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, in view of the importance of the Central waterfront to the future of Hong Kong, and the Government's undertaking to develop Hong Kong into a world class city and provide a vibrant and beautiful Central

waterfront for the enjoyment of the community, this Panel urges the Government to comply with the recommendations made by the Town Planning Board on 5 August 2005¹ and the motion passed by this Panel on 25 October 2005² by reviewing afresh the current Tamar development project and the planned land uses for the Central waterfront, and consulting the public before taking forward any further project and planning work, and also suspending the tender procedure relating to the development of the Tamar site pending the review and public consultation; and ; and that this Panel shall establish a subcommittee to review the planning for the Central waterfront (including the development of the Tamar site).”

Notes:

- 1 The Town Planning Board made the following recommendation at its meeting on 5 August 2005 when discussing an application from an organization concerned for amending the plans for Central and Wan Chai:
The Town Planning Board agreed to request the Government to prepare or refine the planning/design briefs for this important waterfront, in particular the groundscraper and the waterfront related commercial and leisure uses sites, to ensure that future developments would blend in with the waterfront setting, facilitate pedestrian access to the waterfront, and promote visual permeability of the developments.
- 2 The Panel on Planning, Lands and Works passed the following motion on 25 October 2005: "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."

42. In relation to the proposal of establishing a subcommittee under the Panel, The Deputy Chairman asked if members would agree to deal with the proposal at another upcoming Panel meeting.

43. Dr KWOK Ka-ki commented that as the present meeting was a formal Panel meeting, the motion should be dealt with at the present meeting so as to properly respond to the deputations' common request for a review and further public consultation. He objected to processing the motion at another Panel meeting.

44. The Deputy Chairman clarified that his question was only related to the proposal of establishing a subcommittee under the Panel, as he was somehow concerned with the number of members participating in making the decision. He personally supported establishing a subcommittee under the Panel because it would allow more time for discussion.

45. Ir Dr Raymond HO commented that in view of the importance of the motion, it would be more desirable to deal with it at another Panel meeting, a special meeting if need be, so as to allow more members to participate in the discussion.

46. Mr LEE Wing-tat said that the present meeting was a formal meeting and thus the motion should be proceeded with in accordance with the relevant procedures. He supported establishing a subcommittee under the Panel to allow for more intensive discussion with the Administration and more consultation with interested parties.

47. Dr KWOK Ka-ki considered that a subcommittee was required because it would facilitate more focused and intensive discussion. Not establishing a subcommittee might actually cause further delay in the matter.

48. Ms Emily LAU alerted the Administration that thorough consultation must be conducted before submitting a proposal to PWSC or Finance Committee (FC). As Chairman of FC, she hoped that there would be sufficient discussion even if the Panel had diverse views on the issues.

49. Members agreed to proceed with the motion. The Deputy Chairman then put the motion to vote. Of the six members present, all members voted for and no member voted against Dr KWOK Ka-ki's motion. The Deputy Chairman declared that Dr KWOK's motion was carried.

II Any other business

50. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 12:00 noon.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
27 March 2006