

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. CB(1)2232/05-06  
(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 Friday, 9 June 2006 at 10:45 am**  
**in Conference Room A of the Legislative Council Building**

- Members present** : Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBM, GBS, JP (Chairman)  
Hon Patrick LAU Sau-shing, SBS, JP (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon James TIEN Pei-chun, GBS, JP  
Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai, S.B.St.J., JP  
Hon James TO Kun-sun  
Hon WONG Yung-kan, JP  
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, JP  
Hon LEE Wing-tat  
Hon LI Kwok-ying, MH  
Hon Daniel LAM Wai-keung, BBS, JP  
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC  
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki  
Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming, SBS, JP
- Members attending** : Hon CHAN Yuen-han, JP  
Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP
- Members absent** : Hon Albert HO Chun-yan  
Hon CHOY So-yuk, JP  
Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, GBS, JP  
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip

**Public officers  
attending**

**: Agenda item I**

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

Mr Thomas CHOW  
Deputy Secretary for the Environment, Transport and  
Works (Transport) 1

Mr L T MA  
Project Manager (Hong Kong Island & Islands)  
Civil Engineering and Development Department

Ms Phyllis LI  
Chief Town Planner/Special Duties (1)  
Planning Department

Mr Lawrence KWAN  
Chief Engineer/Traffic Engineering (HK)  
Transport Department

**Attendance by  
invitation**

**: Agenda item I**

Harbour-front Enhancement Committee – Sub-committee  
on Wan Chai Development Phase II Review

Mr K Y LEUNG  
Chairman

Maunsell Consultants Asia Limited

Mr Dickson LO  
Managing Director

Mr Peter CHEEK  
Associate

City Planning Consultants Limited

Ms Iris TAM  
Managing Director

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

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

Ms Christina SHIU  
Legislative Assistant (1)7

---

Action

**Request for holding a special meeting to discuss the reported presence of seriously contaminated materials at the Tamar site**

Dr KWOK Ka-ki informed the meeting that he would like to raise a matter relating to the Tamar development project under Agenda Item II – “Any other business”. A letter dated 8 June 2006 from Dr KWOK regarding the reported presence of seriously contaminated materials at the Tamar site was then tabled at the meeting. Taking note of the letter, members agreed to consider the matter before proceeding to Agenda Item I on Wan Chai Development Phase II Review.

2. Dr KWOK requested holding an urgent special meeting to discuss the reported presence of seriously contaminated materials at the Tamar site. He suggested that the special meeting should be held before the Finance Committee (FC) meeting scheduled for 23 June 2006 and the Administration should be invited to attend the special meeting to provide information on the matter to allay the concerns of members and the public.

3. Mr Abraham SHEK said that while the environmental issues relating to the Tamar development project was important, as the Administration had already issued a press release to clarify the issue, it would not be necessary to hold a meeting to discuss the issue. The Administration could be asked to provide further information on the matter and that would suffice. The press release dated 8 June 2006 issued by the Administration regarding ground investigation conducted for the Tamar development was then tabled at the meeting.

*(Post-meeting note: The letter from Dr KWOK Ka-ki (LC Paper No. CB(1)1734/05-06(01)) was issued to members on 12 June 2006 and the press release issued by the Administration (LC Paper No. FC78/05-06) was issued to FC members on 9 June 2006.)*

4. Dr KWOK Ka-ki considered that a press release alone was not adequate. He was concerned about a drastic increase in project cost arising from additional treatment works if there were indeed contaminated materials at the Tamar site, like the case involving the Choy Lee Shipyard site. He was also concerned about possible health hazards since some facilities, such as carparks, would be built

underground at the Tamar site. He considered that the Administration had not provided sufficient information on the ground conditions of the Tamar site for the Panel and the Subcommittee to Review the Planning for the Central Waterfront (including the Tamar Site). As treatment of contaminated materials would need extra cost, the Administration should be given an opportunity to clarify the matter. He therefore suggested that a special meeting should be held to discuss the matter.

5. Ir Dr Raymond HO pointed out that it was technically feasible and uncomplicated to handle heavy metals found underground. The press release issued by the Administration had already clarified the situation and there was no evidence that seriously contaminated materials were present at the Tamar site. He considered that the presence of heavy metals, even if it was indeed the case, should not delay the Tamar development project and there should be no need for the Panel to discuss the issue at a special meeting.

6. Mr Patrick LAU said that the Administration had conducted site investigations and the site investigation reports should contain information on the presence or otherwise of seriously contaminated materials at the Tamar site. He doubted whether a special meeting was required.

7. Mr Alan LEONG expressed support to request the Administration to provide further information and to hold a special meeting before 23 June 2006 because the presence of seriously contaminated materials would affect the users of the future buildings at the Tamar site and extra funding might be required under the Tamar development project for treating the contaminated materials. He suggested that arranging for a special meeting and seeking relevant information from the Administration could proceed in parallel. If members considered that there was no need for holding a special meeting after receiving the information, the special meeting could be cancelled.

8. Mr James TO considered that holding a special meeting to discuss the matter was a prudent act in view of the potential effects of the presence of heavily contaminated materials on the project. For example, it might lead to substantial claims by the contractor of the project against the Government.

9. Mr Abraham SHEK supported the view to request the Administration to provide an information paper on the matter because the reports on site investigations might be too technical in nature. He considered that even if a special meeting was to be held, it should not affect the consideration of the funding proposal for the Tamar development project by FC on 23 June 2006.

10. At the Chairman's suggestion, members agreed that a time slot on Monday, 19 June 2006 starting from 9:00 am would be reserved for a special meeting. The Administration would be requested to provide an information paper on the matter. In circulating the information paper, members would be invited to indicate whether they supported holding the special meeting.

(*Post-meeting note:* The Administration's information paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)1756/05-06(01)) providing relevant information was issued to members on 14 June 2006. As the majority of Panel members did not support holding the special meeting, the special meeting was not held.)

**I Wan Chai Development Phase II Review – Harbour-front Enhancement Review – Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Areas: Outcome of Public Engagement at the Envisioning Stage**

- (LC Paper No. CB(1)1706/05-06(01) -- Information paper on “Wan Chai Development Phase II Review – Follow-up to the discussion on 23 May 2006” provided by the Administration
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1519/05-06(03) -- Information paper on “Wan Chai Development Phase II Review Harbour-front Enhancement Review – Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Areas Outcome of Public Engagement at the Envisioning Stage” provided by the Administration
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1519/05-06(04) -- Background brief on “Wan Chai Development Phase II Review” prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1552/05-06(01) -- Submission dated 20 May 2006 from Society for Protection of the Harbour
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1582/05-06(01) -- Submission dated 23 May 2006 from Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN, Convenor, Designing Hong Kong Harbour District and Principal, The Experience Group, Limited
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1582/05-06(02) -- Letter dated 22 May 2006 from Hon Daniel LAM Wai-keung regarding the options for the Central-Wan Chai Bypass)

11. The Deputy Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands) 1 (DS/HPL(P&L)1) said that at the meeting on 23 May 2006, members had received a detailed briefing on the subject from relevant bureaux and departments and the Maunsell Consultants Asia Limited (the Consultants). The Administration had also provided further information in response to members' enquiries made at that meeting. The Consultants would prepare a draft Concept Plan taking into account the views collected, including the views of members.

#### Reclamation issues

Admin

12. Dr KWOK Ka-ki pointed out that in accordance with the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (Cap. 531) (PHO), the burden of proof for the "overriding public need test" rested with the Administration. He expressed concern on which officials would be responsible for providing the proof and bear the legal responsibilities that might arise from the future reclamation at the Wan Chai waterfront, and asked when the Administration would carry out the "overriding public need test". He requested the Administration to provide documents to show that the Consultants had been instructed to review the Central-Wan Chai Bypass (CWB) for compliance with the PHO and the "overriding public need test" laid down by the Court of Final Appeal (CFA). He expected that reclamation in the harbour for the construction of CWB would face legal challenge.

13. Mr LEE Wing-tat also urged the Administration to exercise great prudence in pursuing any reclamation proposal. If the Administration considered that the reclamation under Wan Chai Development Phase II (WDII) would be able to satisfy the "overriding public need test", it should take the case to court to seek a ruling first to confirm the legality of the proposed reclamation and to avoid future disputes.

14. In reply, DS/HPL(P&L)1 said that the Administration was fully aware of the need to satisfy the "overriding public need test" in any reclamation works in the harbour. According to the judgment of the CFA, the need must be compelling and present. In considering any harbour reclamation works, the Administration would take into account economic, environmental and social needs of the community and ensure that the extent of reclamation would be kept to a minimum. The Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC) was conducting a public engagement exercise titled Harbour-front Enhancement Review – Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Areas (HER Project) under the steer of HEC's Sub-committee on Wan Chai Development Phase II Review. Relevant bureaux and departments had been involved in the process, and legal advice had been sought from the Department of Justice on related legal issues. He assured members that the Administration would be very prudent in handling the matter.

#### Alignments and construction forms

15. Mr James TIEN considered that the Tunnel Option was better than the Flyover Option for CWB. Referring to Tunnel Variation 1, he enquired why reclamation was required near the Island Eastern Corridor (IEC) and the Hong

Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre (HKCEC) but not at the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter (CBTS). He also enquired about the technical feasibility of further improving the design of Tunnel Variation 1 so that no reclamation or less reclamation would be required.

16. In response, DS/HPL(P&L)1 explained that some reclamation would be required near IEC for providing connection with the elevated IEC flyover structure, and near HKCEC because the CWB tunnel structure would be above sea level at the crossing point with the tunnel structure of the Mass Transit Railway (MTR) Tsuen Wan Line. The construction of the planned slip roads would also require some reclamation.

17. The Project Manager (Hong Kong Island & Islands) of the Civil Engineering and Development Department (Proj Mgr/CEDD) added that whether reclamation would be required at a certain location depended on the depth of the tunnel. At the crossing point, the CWB tunnel structure would pass above the tunnel structure of the MTR Tsuen Wan Line as passing underneath was not feasible. The CWB tunnel structure would be above sea level and hence reclamation would be required. The slip roads at Wan Chai North would also require reclamation as they rose above seabed to their portals at ground level. On the other hand, at the crossing point with the Cross-Harbour Tunnel, the CWB tunnel structure could descend deep enough to pass underneath the Cross-Harbour Tunnel and hence no reclamation would be required. Tunnel Variation 1 was put forward by the Consultants while Tunnel Variations 2 and 3 were prepared in response to public views expressed during the Envisioning Stage of the HER Project. Taking into account the need to satisfy the “overriding public need test”, the Consultants recommended that Tunnel Variation 1 was the most practical option because it would require the least amount of reclamation.

18. Mr Dickson LO, Managing Director of Maunsell Consultants Asia Limited, supplemented that as the CWB tunnel structure would be above sea level at 2.5 mPD at the crossing point with the MTR Tsuen Wan Line, reclamation up to a level at about 5 mPD would be required for a seawall to offer protection to the CWB tunnel structure.

19. Mr Patrick LAU supported the Tunnel Option because it would have less visual impact. He considered that the Administration should place more emphasis on the design of CWB to ensure that the least amount of reclamation would be required, although this might incur a higher construction cost. He suggested demolishing part of the IEC flyover so as to reduce the gradient at the connection point with CWB and maintain a larger area of the sea surface. He also suggested that the Administration consider introducing some water features on the reclaimed land above the CWB tunnel so as to reduce the visual impact of reclamation.

20. DS/HPL(P&L)1 and Proj Mgr/CEDD responded that according to the Consultants, Tunnel Variation 1 would require less reclamation than Tunnel Variations 2 and 3. Mr LAU’s suggestion of introducing some water features could be explored when the Concept Plan was developed for further public

engagement in the Realization Stage. As regards connection with the IEC, it was also recommended by the Consultants in Tunnel Variation 1 that a small part of the IEC at the connection point with CWB be demolished which had the effect of reducing the extent of reclamation.

21. Dr KWOK Ka-ki sought explanation on why different areas of reclamation would be required for different tunnel options. He also questioned whether 15 hectares (ha) was the minimum amount of reclamation for the construction of CWB. He considered that the Administration should also put forward an option which would not require reclamation for consideration by the public.

22. In reply, DS/HPL(P&L)1 explained that it was the objective of the Administration to keep reclamation to a minimum so as to satisfy the “overriding public need test”. In exploring how to construct CWB, the Consultants had considered many different options. After a detailed research process, Tunnel Variation 1 was found to require 15 ha of reclamation, the least among the three tunnel variations.

23. Proj Mgr/CEDD further explained that the amount of reclamation under each option was the reclamation necessary for that particular option. Different options for the construction of CWB, such as the Flyover Option, At-grade Option and Tunnel Option, had been put forward for discussion during the Envisioning Stage and views collected had been assimilated into the various options as appropriate. In respect of the Tunnel Option, the area of reclamation required mainly depended on the depth of the tunnel structure. In formulating Tunnel Variation 1, the original thinking was for the tunnel to ascend above the seabed at the CBTS and in that case, reclamation would be required to offer protection to the tunnel. Taking into consideration the public’s views on reclamation at CBTS, the Consultants refined the scheme so that the tunnel structure would remain submerged under the seabed after crossing the Cross-Harbour Tunnel. The tunnel would be at a sufficient depth when it passed through the CBTS so that less reclamation would be required. The Consultants considered that Tunnel Variation 1 would best meet the PHO and “overriding public need test”. After deciding on the construction form of CWB, the Consultants would prepare a report to make a recommendation and to provide supporting evidence that all parts of the reclamation were fully justified and that the area of reclamation was the minimum. The report would have to be agreed by the Sub-committee on WDII Review and vetted by the Department of Justice.

#### Consultancy work

24. In reply to Dr KWOK Ka-ki’s enquiries on the Consultants’ involvement in the CWB and WD II projects, Proj Mgr/CEDD advised that Maunsell Consultants Asia Limited had been awarded two consultancy agreements, one by the Highways Department for the design and supervision of the construction works of CWB and the other by the former Territory Development Department (now CEDD) for the design and supervision of the construction works of the WDII

project. Under the latter consultancy agreement, the Consultants participated in the public engagement work of the HER Project following the advice given by HEC to the Administration. In view of the judgment of the CFA, the Administration had instructed the Consultants to put forward recommendations which would comply with the PHO. The Consultants had submitted their recommendations on the construction form of CWB and an analysis of the views collected during the public engagement to facilitate the Sub-committee on WDII Review in its discussion and in taking the matter forward. After the construction form of CWB had been decided, the Consultants would be responsible for putting up evidence to support that the extent of reclamation for the recommended option would be the minimum. With regard to the consultancy agreements, the design and supervision of construction were different phases of the agreements. The Consultants would only proceed from design phase to supervision of construction phase upon receipt of instruction from the Administration. He added that the Administration had not yet submitted funding proposals for the construction works of the CWB and WDII projects and supervision of construction would be instructed only after obtaining approval for construction fundings.

Admin

25. Dr KWOK Ka-ki was concerned that there might be a conflict of interest as the Consultants were to undertake the consultancy work for both the WDII Review and CWB. He questioned the impartiality of the Consultants under the circumstances and requested the Administration to provide copies of the consultancy agreements relating to CWB and the WDII Review which had been awarded to the Consultants and to provide information on the agreed consultancy fees under the agreements.

#### Traffic management measures and traffic load

26. Mr LEE Wing-tat pointed out that according to the Expert Panel on Sustainable Transport Planning and Central-Wan Chai Bypass (Expert Panel), any measure taken alone, such as the construction of CWB, would not be able to solve traffic congestion and other traffic management measures would still be needed in parallel. The Administration however gave the public an impression that constructing CWB would solve all traffic problems. He considered that the Administration had not made the best endeavour in implementing traffic management measures, such as rationalization of tunnel tolls and electronic road pricing. He enquired whether there were views received which proposed drastic traffic management measures for solving traffic congestion instead of constructing CWB. He considered that the public should be given a choice on whether to support the construction of CWB for smooth traffic or to bear with the consequences of traffic management measures if they did not support the construction of CWB. The views received during the public engagement exercise should be disclosed to the public.

27. Mr Patrick LAU also asked whether there would be any interim traffic management measures before the completion of CWB.

28. In reply, DS/HPL(P&L)1 emphasized that there was indeed a compelling

and present need for constructing CWB to alleviate traffic congestion in the area and along the Connaught Road Central/Harcourt Road/Gloucester Road Corridor (the Corridor). The Expert Panel also supported the construction of CWB.

29. The Deputy Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works (Transport) 1 (DS/ETW(T)1) added that currently, about 90% of the passenger trips in Hong Kong were made through public transportation. The rate of private vehicle ownership in Hong Kong was merely 50 vehicles per 1 000 persons and many private vehicles were used only occasionally. To achieve a significant reduction in the number of private vehicles would require a drastic increase in relevant tax items such as the first registration tax and the duty on petrol. It was questionable if the community would accept a drastic increase in these tax items. He said that the Administration had been adopting a basket of measures to manage traffic along the Corridor and in attaining the goal of sustainable transport. The measures that had been implemented on the Corridor included the restrictions on loading and unloading activities, changes to traffic lane demarcations, reduction of bus trips and enhancement of turning pockets for buses. The rationalization of bus routes since 1999 had led to a 17% reduction in the number of bus trips going through Central. The Administration would continue its efforts in this regard, although it would not be an easy task as residents preferred to have point-to-point bus services without a reduction in their frequencies. Vehicles using the Cross-Harbour Tunnel were not the sole cause of traffic congestion on the Corridor. Vehicles heading for other areas such as Happy Valley also caused traffic congestion after 6:30 pm in the evening. The Administration would continue its efforts in negotiating with the two tunnel companies on measures to achieve a more balanced distribution of traffic among the three harbour crossings. The Administration had also commissioned a consultancy study on electronic road pricing to test the sensitivities of various pricing scenarios.

30. Ms Iris TAM, Managing Director of City Planning Consultants Limited, added that under the HER Project, telephone and road-side surveys had been conducted. More than 75% of the respondents considered that traffic congestion was a problem which had to be solved. Among the measures to tackle traffic congestion, “construction of CWB and implementing traffic management measures in parallel” was ranked first by most respondents, followed by “traffic management measures only” and “construction of CWB only”. About 46% of the respondents preferred the Tunnel Option.

31. Mr K Y LEUNG, Chairman of the Sub-committee on WDII Review, pointed out that the details of the views received during the Envisioning Stage of the HER Project could be found on the CD-ROM included in the Envisioning Stage Public Engagement Report. Many of the views on alternative measures for solving traffic congestion without constructing CWB were either too simple or not mature enough to be pursued further. For instance, there was a suggestion to double the frequency of the MTR trains, which was not practical as had been revealed by the MTR Corporation Limited.

32. Dr KWOK Ka-ki expressed concern on whether the Administration had

carried out any measures in response to the recommendation of the Expert Panel to reduce the development intensity in Central Reclamation Phase III and the Tamar site so as to reduce the traffic load. He considered that the Administration should be forward-looking in planning for the Central Reclamation Phase III and the Tamar site to avoid traffic congestion in the future. The Administration should not be selective in adopting the recommendations of the Expert Panel. He also queried whether the Administration had implemented adequate traffic management measures to tackle traffic congestion.

33. In reply, DS/HPL(P&L)1 reiterated that there was indeed a compelling and present need to construct CWB, and the Expert Panel and Sub-committee on WDII Review supported the construction of CWB to alleviate traffic congestion in the area and along the Corridor. The Administration would be very prudent in ensuring that any reclamation would satisfy the “overriding public need test”.

34. As regards traffic demand, DS/ETW(T)1 pointed out that according to the Expert Panel, CWB with the slip roads in Wan Chai and Road P2 were required even if there were no new developments in WDII and Central Reclamation Phase III. After completion of CWB and assuming that all the planned developments in the area were materialized, the volume to capacity ratio of the Corridor would only be 0.9 by 2016, which would be much lower than the unacceptable level of 1.2 when serious traffic congestion would occur.

35. Dr KWOK Ka-ki commented that the Administration should further gauge the public’s views on reducing the intensity of new developments, various measures to tackle traffic congestion, and the desirability of constructing CWB by reclamation. He considered that a scientific survey should be conducted by an independent party to gauge the public’s views in an objective way.

36. In reply, Proj Mgr/CEDD explained that there would be further public participation because the HER Project had three stages of public engagement. The Envisioning Stage had been completed and the Realization Stage was to follow. The Administration had consulted the District Councils, Town Planning Board (TPB) and Legislative Council. After consolidation of the views received, the Consultants would be given directive on the way forward. The Consultants would prepare a Concept Plan for public engagement during the Realization Stage through activities such as workshops and public forums.

37. DS/HPL(P&L)1 added that the views of the public had been solicited on various occasions. At the public forums, most attendees did not favour an elevated road option as it would bring adverse visual impact to the waterfront but preferred a tunnel option. At the community charrettes, the participants realized that if building CWB proved to be the most practicable solution in solving traffic congestion, some reclamation might be necessary.

38. Ms Iris TAM, Managing Director of City Planning Consultants Limited, further added that in the road-side survey conducted independently by The University of Hong Kong, the respondents were asked whether they would still

support the construction of CWB if reclamation was needed, and only 9% said that they would rather tolerate traffic congestion than construct CWB with reclamation.

39. Mr Alan LEONG asked whether the traffic to be generated by possible future redevelopment of the sites of the Central Government Offices and Murray Building for high-density commercial and/or residential developments had been taken into account in determining whether and how CWB should be built. He asked whether the future road network with CWB could cope with the additional traffic arising from such developments, and whether an application to TPB for rezoning the sites for high-density commercial or residential developments would be rejected if future traffic impact assessment revealed that the road network could not cope with such developments.

40. DS/HPL(P&L)1 said that the Administration had not yet decided on the future use of the sites. If there was a need to change the current “Government, Institution or Community” zoning of the sites, the Administration would conduct a detailed study. Rezoning of the sites would have to go through the necessary statutory planning process and the impact on traffic would certainly be assessed.

41. DS/ETW(T)1 added that if the current outline zoning plan for the sites had to be amended, the Transport Department would need to assess the results of a detailed traffic impact assessment and its comments together with the results of the traffic impact assessment would be presented to TPB for consideration. TPB would take into account, inter alia, whether the proposed rezoning would have a serious impact on traffic before making its decision. The current estimate was that CWB, which would be a dual three-lane trunk road, would still have spare capacity by 2016. The extent of impact on traffic would depend on many factors, such as the number of commercial premises, shopper traffic, number of flats, number of residents, time schedule of the works, time of completion of the developments and economic forecasts. Without the actual data on the possible future developments at the sites, no assessment could be made at this point in time.

42. In reply to Mr Patrick LAU’s enquiry, the Chief Engineer/Traffic Engineering (HK) of the Transport Department (Ch Eng/TD) said that CWB would have about 30% spare capacity by 2016 in meeting long term traffic needs that might arise from future developments in areas including but not limited to Central.

Admin 43. Mr Alan LEONG requested the Administration to provide the assumptions used in arriving at the forecast that the CWB would still have about 30% spare capacity by 2016.

#### Harbourfront enhancement

44. In relation to the work of the HEC, Dr KWOK Ka-ki expressed doubt on whether the HEC was able to achieve its objectives and sought clarification on whether the Administration planned to dissolve the HEC. He criticized that the

Administration had not carried out enough enhancement works to waterfront areas and much of the land was left idle and not put to better use. He was worried that the construction of CWB was only an excuse for carrying out reclamation. What he objected to was reclamation, not the construction of CWB.

45. DS/HPL(P&L)1 said that the HEC had been providing a platform for promoting dialogues with and participation by the public in harbour-related planning matters. The engagement of the public in the planning process would increase their acceptance of the final outcome. The current membership of the HEC would last until 30 June 2007 and the Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands had indicated recently that the HEC had a lot of work yet to be completed. In order to preserve continuity, the Administration had no plan to dissolve the HEC.

46. Mr Patrick LAU commented that providing good pedestrian access to the waterfront should proceed in parallel with the construction of CWB. In reply, Ch Eng/TD said that the Administration had formulated plans to provide easy access to the waterfront through new footbridges and at-grade pedestrian crossings. For instance, the footbridge at Pedder Street would be extended to Man Yiu Street to provide the public with easy access to the waterfront. There would be more pedestrian links to the waterfront in the future.

47. Mr LEE Wing-tat considered that the current land use of many waterfront areas was not concordant with the surrounding environment and the public's access to the waterfront should be enhanced. He asked what measures the Administration would take to improve the situation. He commented that the Administration should not focus only on the construction of CWB, adequate attention should be given to enhancement of the waterfront areas. He said that the Administration should set a timeframe and expedite the enhancement works of the waterfront areas.

48. In reply, DS/HPL(P&L)1 said that the HEC had placed much emphasis on how to identify methods of enhancing the waterfront and facilitating the public's access to the waterfront. The HEC had formulated the Harbour Planning Principles which served as guidelines for the planning of the waterfront areas. Based on the advice of the HEC, the Administration had carried out enhancement works to provide the waterfront promenade in the West Kowloon Reclamation and studies on enhancement works for the waterfront in Central. The Sub-committee on WDII Review of the HEC was identifying enhancement opportunities for the waterfront areas in Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and adjoining areas through the HER Project.

49. The Chief Town Planner/Special Duties (1) of the Planning Department added that in considering the construction of CWB, the Administration had also taken the opportunity to identify ways to enhance the waterfront areas. Based on the outcome of the Envisioning Stage of the HER Project, a Concept Plan would be prepared for further public engagement at the Realization Stage. Based on the consensus arrived at during the Realization Stage, a Recommended Outline

Development Plan and the relevant draft revised Outline Zoning Plans would be prepared. She assured members that the Administration would adopt an integrated land use and transport planning approach to draw up a coherent planning framework for the waterfront and adjoining areas in Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and North Point. In the interim, the site of the ex-Wan Chai Public Cargo Working Area would be enhanced so that the area could be used by the public, while other measures to improve pedestrian access to the waterfront would also be considered.

50. Mr LEE Wing-tat commented that those measures that did not hinge on the construction of CWB should be carried out as soon as possible. Proj Mgr/CEDD advised that the Administration had consulted the Wan Chai District Council on the proposed short term enhancement works for the ex-Wan Chai Public Cargo Working Area including the details of the design.

51. Apart from public access to the waterfront, Mr LEE Wing-tat considered that the pedestrian links along the waterfront should also be enhanced. At present, the pedestrian links were interrupted at many places. He requested the Administration to provide information on measures to enhance the continuity of the pedestrian links along the northern shore of the Hong Kong Island as well as measures to enhance the accessibility to the harbourfront of the Hong Kong Island for the general public. Dr KWOK Ka-ki concurred with Mr LEE's view and suggested that this subject be discussed at a future meeting of the Panel.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)2022/05-06(01)) providing relevant information was issued to members on 20 July 2006.)*

52. Members subsequently agreed that the above subject raised by Mr LEE be scheduled for discussion by the Panel in July 2006.

## **II Any other business**

53. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 12:50 pm.