

**立法會**  
***Legislative Council***

LC Paper No. CB(1)1320/05-06(04)

Ref : CB1/PS/1/05

**Panel on Planning, Lands and Works**

**Meeting on 25 April 2006**

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

**Purpose**

This paper summarizes the deliberations of the Subcommittee to Review the Planning for the Central Waterfront (including the Tamar Site) on issues relating to the proposed Tamar development project.

**Background**

2. In April 2002, the Government announced that it would proceed to develop the 4.2-hectare Tamar site for a new Central Government Complex (CGC) together with a new Legislative Council (LegCo) building and other compatible community facilities including an exhibition gallery and a 2-hectare civic place. The relevant funding proposal was endorsed by the Public Works Subcommittee on 7 May 2003. At that time, the estimated total cost for the design and construction of the above components was \$5,031.1 million in September 2002 prices and \$4,679.3 million in money-of-the-day prices. The Administration proposed to tender out the majority of the works through a design-and-build (D&B) contract. The construction works were planned to start in early 2004 for completion in 2007.

3. On 26 May 2003, the Administration announced that it would put on hold the funding submission to the Finance Committee amidst the outbreak of SARS. In November 2003, the Administration announced the decision to defer the project, having regard to its financial position and the political climate. Despite the deferment of the project, the Administration stated that developing the Tamar site into Hong Kong's prime civic core remained the Government's long-term commitment; and that the Tamar site should continue to be reserved for the Tamar project pending a decision on the timing for re-launch.

4. In October 2005, the Chief Executive announced the re-launch of the Tamar development project. The LegCo Panel on Planning, Lands and Works (the Panel) was briefed on the re-launch of the project in November 2005. In the light of the growing concern about the impact of the Tamar development on the Central waterfront, the Panel convened a special meeting on 17 December 2005 to receive public views. Some 30 groups/individuals, including representatives from District Councils, professional bodies of the real estate and construction sectors, green groups etc. attended the meeting. Many of them were of the view that since the Tamar site was a prime site along the Central waterfront, its use should be reviewed in conjunction with the overall planning for the Central waterfront.

5. At the meeting on 17 December 2005, the Panel passed the following motion<sup>1</sup> –

“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 2005 and the motion passed by this Panel on 25 October 2005 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 that this Panel shall establish a subcommittee to review the planning for the Central waterfront (including the development of the Tamar site).”

(Translation)

---

<sup>1</sup> The terms of the original motion passed are as follows –

“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<sup>1</sup>所作出的建議及履行本事務委員會於2005年10月25日<sup>2</sup>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)。”

註釋：

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。”

## The Subcommittee

6. A Subcommittee to review the planning for the Central waterfront including the Tamar site was thus formed under the Panel. Hon LAU Wong-fat was elected the Chairman of the Subcommittee and the membership list of the Subcommittee is in **Appendix I**. Since its establishment in January 2006, the Subcommittee has held four meetings and interested organizations and individuals were invited to attend two of these meetings to present views and exchange views with members. A list of the organizations and individuals that have submitted views on the subject to the Panel and/or the Subcommittee is at **Appendix II**.

7. The Subcommittee is tasked to review the planning for the Central waterfront including the Tamar site. As the Subcommittee is aware of the Administration's plan to submit the funding proposal for the Tamar site to the Finance Committee for approval in the second quarter of 2006, it has therefore decided to focus its deliberations first and foremost on issues directly related to the Tamar development project, in particular the justifications for providing a CGC on the Tamar site. Notwithstanding this decision, the Subcommittee has listened to views from interested groups and individuals on wider planning issues and is aware of the need to consider the project in a wider planning context that covers the Central waterfront or even the entire Central district.

## The Tamar development project

8. The Tamar site was formed in 1997. With an area of about 4.2 hectares, the site comprised 2 hectares of land zoned "Open Space" ("O") and 2.2 hectares zoned "Government, Institution or Community (4)" ("G/IC(4)") on the approved Central District (Extension) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H24/6 which is currently in force. A chronology of the relevant events between the inception of the Tamar development project and the Government's announcement of its decision to defer the Tamar development project in November 2003 is set out in **Appendix III**.

### The project proposal in 2003

9. According to the Administration's proposal submitted to the Public Works Subcommittee in May 2003, the scope of the project comprised the design and construction of –

- (a) a CGC, with a total construction floor area (CFA) of 136 200 square metres ( $m^2$ );
- (b) a LegCo Complex (LCC), with a total CFA of 36 000  $m^2$ ;

- (c) an Exhibition Gallery, with a total CFA of 24 000 m<sup>2</sup>;
- (d) a Civic Place, with a total area of about 2 hectares, which will be designed as a passive recreational space for the public;
- (e) 590 carparking spaces and other ancillary facilities such as loading and unloading areas and mechanical plant rooms (with a total CFA of 49 500 m<sup>2</sup>) for the CGC, LCC and the Exhibition Gallery; and
- (f) two covered pedestrian footbridges connecting the Tamar development with other developments in the vicinity.

#### Revised scope of project

10. On 22 November 2005, the Administration briefed the Panel on the re-launch of the Tamar development project. According to the Administration, the CGC, LCC and civic place will remain the core components of the project. In view of the public aspiration for preserving as much open view as possible to the prominent ridgeline and the Harbour, and restricting the intensity of building development at Tamar, the Exhibition Gallery will be excised from the project. The Government will separately identify other suitable sites for the development of the Exhibition Gallery. The D&B approach would continue to be adopted to implement the project and a pre-qualification exercise would be conducted to shortlist applicants for the D&B contract.

11. To protect the views to the ridgeline and the Harbour, the Administration has also decided to tighten up the height restriction, from 180 metres above Principal Datum (mPD) as stipulated on the Central District (Extension) OZP, to 130mPD – 160mPD. This is to ensure a 20% building-free zone under the ridgeline and preserve as much open view as possible to the ridgeline and the Harbour.

12. On 20 December 2005, the prequalification exercise for the proposed D&B contract commenced. By the deadline for application at noon 14 March 2006, the Administration had received a total of four applications for prequalification. The Administration will complete the prequalification exercise by the second quarter of 2006.

#### **Deliberations of the Subcommittee**

13. In reviewing the planning for the Central waterfront including the Tamar site, the Subcommittee has so far examined the following major issues in conjunction with the Administration and deputations-

- (a) the need for reprovisioning the Government Secretariat currently accommodated mainly in the Central Government Offices (CGO) and Murray Building and possible locations for the reprovisioning;
- (b) development intensity and height of the buildings under the Tamar development project and the implementation approach for the project; and
- (c) the traffic and environmental issues arising from the current planning for the Central waterfront and the Tamar development project.

14. The Subcommittee notes that there are diverse views on whether the Tamar site should be used for providing the new CGC and LCC. The real estate sector and the construction industry as well as the local professional bodies in the relevant fields are in general supportive of this proposed use of the site. Some of them however have raised concerns on the density and height of the future buildings under the Tamar development project and the appropriateness of adopting the D&B approach to deliver the project. Some other deputations including the green groups and groups with particular concerns over the protection of the Harbour have expressed strong reservation over the proposal. They demand that the use of the Tamar site as proposed by the Government should be critically reviewed in the context of the overall planning for the Central district especially the waterfront area. While raising grave concerns about the possible adverse visual, traffic and environmental impacts arising from the Tamar development project and other planned new developments in Central waterfront, these deputations also emphasize that the designated use(s) of the Tamar site and the adjacent waterfront area, which were formed by harbour reclamation, should provide the greatest opportunities for public enjoyment and the planning should comply with sustainability principles.

15. The Subcommittee also notes the view of the Hong Kong Construction Industry Employees General Union that the Government should press ahead with the implementation of the project for creation of timely employment opportunities for the construction industry, which is still facing a high unemployment rate.

#### Proposed use of the Tamar site

16. Some deputations such as the Hong Kong Institute of Architects and the Hong Kong Institution of Engineers in principle consider the development plan currently proposed by the Administration appropriate as it is conducive to achieving balanced land uses in the waterfront area. There are however complaints from some deputations that there has not been any formal public consultation on the Tamar development project, nor has the project been reviewed by the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee in accordance with of

the Harbour Planning Principles. They opine that in the light of increasing concerns about the environment and particularly the protection of the Harbour, the whole project needs to be re-considered and there should be public participation in the exercise. They do not see strong reasons for the Government to rush through the project.

17. Some deputations are of the view that alternative uses of the Tamar site should be explored, such as turning Tamar into an arts facility where open air concerts, plays and gatherings can be held; leaving Tamar as a public open space for cultural, recreational and exhibition purposes; and transforming Tamar and the adjacent waterfront area into a landscape that can compete with the harbour cities of Sydney and San Francisco. There is also a specific joint proposal from the Civic Exchange and the Society For Protection Of The Harbour Limited for creation of a Central Park – a green lung along the harbour-front (including the Tamar site) connecting with existing green lungs of the city such as the Hong Kong Park, the Zoological and Botanical Gardens, the Government House gardens via an enhanced network of pathways. However, some deputations such as the Hong Kong Institute of Architects consider it inappropriate to use the entire Tamar site as open space.

18. In response to these suggestions, the Administration's response is that ample open space provision has been planned in the area. The Tamar development includes a 2-hectare Civic Place, which will be an open space with abundant greening and soft landscaping for public enjoyment. In addition, the harbour-front adjoining the Tamar site will also provide some 8.8 hectares of open space mainly in the form of a waterfront promenade. The Administration considers that the development concept of the Tamar and its adjoining waterfront promenade, together with the green lung effect thus produced, would be comparable to the development concepts of renowned harbour cities. On the other hand, the proposal to provide for open space only would not meet the planning and design objective to create a vibrant and attractive Central waterfront with diversity of activities.

19. The Administration also points out that the Tamar site was zoned "G/IC" and "O" on the draft Central District (Extension) OZP No. S/H24/1 which was gazetted on 29 May 1998. The zonings of the site basically have remained the same on the current OZP No. S/H24/6. The Administration considers that the existing zonings of the Tamar site, i.e. half for "G/IC" use and half for "O" use, have gone through extensive public consultation. Public views have also been duly considered under the provisions of the Town Planning Ordinance before the approval of the OZP by the Chief Executive in Council in 2000 pursuant to the recommendation of the Town Planning Board. During the exhibition of OZP No. S/H24/1, 70 valid objections were received but the Tamar site was not the subject of any objection. In parallel, the Administration also consulted various bodies to gauge their views and explained to them the proposed use of the Tamar site on the OZP. After the announcement of the Tamar development project in April

2002, the Administration also conducted briefings and consultations. At that time, the Central and Western District Council, LegCo Panel on Planning, Lands and Works and Public Works Subcommittee all supported the proposal. The relevant details provided by the Administration are set out in **Appendix IV**.

20. Some members however point out that nowadays, there is much higher public expectation and demand for increased participation in land-use planning matters. As the Tamar site is a valuable site in Central which provides an excellent view to the Harbour and the ridgeline on the Kowloon side, they urge the Administration to adopt an open attitude and take heed of deputations' views. According to the Administration, it has been listening to the views of the public and deputations on the land use planning on the Central waterfront and the Tamar site at the Panel meetings and on other occasions. The Town Planning Board, in considering a few rezoning requests related to the Central Reclamation Phase III in August 2005 and a rezoning application related to the Tamar site in March 2006, has reconfirmed that the current zonings on the OZP are appropriate. Notwithstanding, as requested by the Town Planning Board in August 2005, the Administration will undertake an urban design study to refine the existing urban design framework and to prepare planning/design briefs for key development sites on the Central reclamation to provide more detailed guidelines for the future developments. Relevant stakeholders in the community will be fully engaged in the study.

#### The need for reprovisioning CGC and LCC

21. The Subcommittee notes that quite a number of deputations question the need to reprovision the existing LegCo Building and CGO. According to these deputations, the existing buildings are well located and can be refurbished to accommodate more users and new facilities. To enable an objective assessment of the merits and demerits of the options, the Subcommittee has sought details of the maintenance cost of the existing buildings and the cost of in-situ redevelopment vis-à-vis the capital and recurrent costs of constructing a new CGC and LCC.

22. According to the Administration, the Government Secretariat and LegCo are facing an acute shortage of office space and have to lease premises in commercial office buildings. The LegCo Building is a declared monument, whereas CGO and Murray Building are over 45 and 35 years old respectively. There are significant technical constraints and lack of space on the expansion or refurbishment of the existing buildings. The maintenance cost of the CGO and Murray Building amounts to \$30 million in total per annum. A preliminary estimate of the capital expenditure for the Tamar development project is in the region of \$4,900 million, and recurrent expenditure is estimated to be around \$50 million per annum. The Administration has therefore come to the view that to pursue the development at Tamar is a better option than in-situ redevelopment of the CGO and Murray Building. Moreover, interim

reprovisioning would seriously disrupt the operation of the Government Secretariat.

23. To better ascertain whether the Tamar development project is justified, members of the Subcommittee have requested the Administration to provide details of the project including a breakdown of the space requirements for offices and facilities, the number of staff to be accommodated in the proposed CGC, and a cost and benefit analysis for the project. The Administration has explained that according to the estimate in 2003, the number of staff involved should be around 3 200. The Administration is still in the process of updating the space requirements which may have changed over time. As undertaken to the Panel at the meeting on 22 November 2006, the updated information should be available towards the end of April 2006. The Administration has confirmed that only the core units of bureaux and relevant offices of the Government Secretariat which are performing policy-making functions will be relocated to Tamar.

#### Proposed location for the development of a new CGC

24. The Subcommittee notes that some professional institutes support the development of a new CGC of an appropriate scale at the Tamar site. However some other deputations have queried the need for relocating the Government headquarters to the Tamar site primely located at the harbour-front. They submit that the harbour-front would be less vibrant as Government offices will be closed at night, not to mention the security arrangements that may be implemented. The Subcommittee also notes the criticism made by some deputations that the decision to reprovision the Government Secretariat to the Tamar site has been made in a haphazard and ill-conceived manner, as evidenced by the Government's change of mind time and again over the zoning and specific use of the site since a decision was made to reclaim the site in 1992.

25. In response to these views and queries, the Administration has explained that the former Tamar Basin was first incorporated into the draft Central District OZP and zoned for commercial use in 1994 before the land was formed in 1997. The Government announced in January 1998 to withdraw the site from land sale programme and reserve the Tamar site for reprovisioning of the Government headquarters. The site was included in the draft Central District (Extension) OZP gazetted on 29 May 1998 and rezoned to "G/IC" and "O". Since then, the Government had kept all relevant considerations under review. In April 2002, the Executive Council took into account several major considerations, including the impact on demand and supply of Grade A office premises in Hong Kong, in arriving at the decision to launch the Tamar development project, with the new CGC, new LCC and the Civic Place as core development components.

26. As to how the Tamar development project would fulfill the planning objective of developing the site into an iconic prime civic core of Hong Kong,

the Administration has advised that the proposed CGC, LCC and Civic Place would form a prime civic core. The new development would more firmly position Hong Kong as a cosmopolitan city and Asia's world city. It would be a requirement in the future D&B tender document that the design scheme for the project should as a whole be responsive to the urban fabric of the Central District as well as the natural context of the waterfront setting. The distinct identities of the new CGC and new LCC should be duly reflected taking into account the respective constitutional roles of the Executive and the Legislature.

27. On the question of alternative sites, the Administration has submitted that other site options proposed by the public have yet to be examined and go through the necessary feasibility studies and planning process, whereas these have been completed for the Tamar site. It also considers that the proposed development fulfils the planning objective of the Central District. As the Government Secretariat and the LegCo have been long faced with an acute shortage of office space, early implementation of the Tamar project will address the problem. Moreover, the project will create some 2 600 jobs, thereby giving timely relief to the construction sector that is hard hit by high unemployment.

Past studies on reprovisioning options and in-situ redevelopment or extension of existing CGO and Murray Building

28. Based on the information provided to LegCo between the announcement of the decision to proceed with the Tamar development project in April 2002 and the announcement to re-launch the project, the Subcommittee notes that the Administration had examined only two options to meet the long-term accommodation requirements of the Government Secretariat, namely building a new CGC on the Tamar site and in-situ redevelopment of the existing CGO and Murray Building. The Subcommittee has therefore questioned whether the Administration has conducted a thorough examination of other possible options before deciding to pursue the Tamar development project. In this regard, the Subcommittee passed a motion on 9 February 2006 urging the Administration to provide the Subcommittee with all the original reports or information on the feasibility studies relating to the provision of a new CGC and the extension or reconstruction of the existing CGO.

29. According to the Administration, the major considerations of the Executive Council in deciding on the use of the Tamar site have been set out in the LegCo Brief on "Use of the Tamar site for the development of the Central Government Complex" issued on 30 April 2002. In short, the major considerations included the provision of sufficient floor areas, the favourable planning considerations for a prime civic core, insignificant impact on the demand and supply of Grade A office premises, improvement to be brought to the operational efficiency of the Government Secretariat and the need of LegCo for long-term accommodation. The Tamar development project was considered a better option than the in-situ redevelopment option.

30. In response to the motion passed by the Subcommittee on 9 February 2006, the Administration provided in early March 2006 a set of documents, listed in **Appendix V**, regarding the decision to develop the proposed CGC and LCC at Tamar (including studies on the site options for the proposed CGC and LCC). Referring to the documents, some members have queried why the Administration did not provide those documents prepared before 1997 including a consultancy report, which has been reported in the media, on the in-situ redevelopment of CGO and Murray Building. The Administration reiterated that since the Tamar site was only formed in 1997, the documents directly related to the decision to pursue the Tamar development project would therefore be from 1997/1998 onwards.

31. The Subcommittee was of the view that the Administration should also provide the documents on past relevant studies carried out before 1997 and a motion to this effect was passed by the Subcommittee at the meeting on 7 March 2006. In response, the Administration provided in late March 2006 two documents submitted by the consultant commissioned by the Government in 1990 to carry out a consultancy study on the redevelopment of the West Wing of the Central Government Offices. The Administration pointed out that the documents set out possible options for private sector participation in the redevelopment of the CGO West Wing, and the focus was on the mode of public-private partnership and financing, rather than technical feasibility.

32. According to the Administration, if technologically-advanced facilities of modern standards are to be installed in the existing CGO buildings and Murray Building, massive renovation works such as structural improvement works would have to be carried out, together with the realignment and redistribution of the various systems. Also, there is not enough space to meet the dire need for expansion. In response to members' request for elaboration on the technical constraints involved and the renovation works required, the Administration has provided the supplementary information in **Appendix VI**.

#### Development intensity and height of buildings under the Tamar development project

33. The Subcommittee shares the concern of some deputations about the density and height of the future buildings on Tamar. Some members consider that the revised height limit of 130mPD to 160mPD for the project may still obstruct the views to the ridgeline and the Harbour. In this regard, the Administration has explained that in the context of the Tamar site, developments that may intersect the sightline from the closest vantage point at Tsim Sha Tsui Cultural Complex to Mount Gough would need to be controlled, if the 20% building-free zone below the peak within the view fan is to be maintained. Taking into account the varying ridgeline profile rising from east to west, a maximum height range of 130mPD - 160mPD is recommended to allow variation in building heights while respecting the ridgeline profile. The Administration

has assured members that it is committed to minimizing the development intensity at the Tamar site. The design scheme for the Tamar project would follow the Urban Design Guidelines under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines. The Administration has also undertaken to explore the possibility of utilizing underground space to further reduce the heights of the buildings. Members suggest that to allay worries of the public, some 3-dimensional models and more drawings should be produced to enable the public to better visualize the future buildings on the Tamar site.

#### Quality of Open Space within the Tamar site

34. Taking note of deputations' concern on the quality of the Open Space under the Tamar development project, the Subcommittee has sought explanation on how the future design of the Open Space would facilitate the use and enjoyment of the public and ensure that there would be no barrier to public access to the Open Space. The Administration's explanation is that it has been the Government's plan to develop the Civic Place as an open space for leisure and enjoyment of the public. The Civic Place will be designed to cater for multi-purpose needs, and will be safe and easily accessible by the public. In the D&B tender document, the Government will encourage the tenderers to adopt special design features such as fountains and landscaped garden to provide a pleasing and leisure atmosphere with a sense of spaciousness for the public and greening of the city. Tenderers would also be required to propose designs of the Civic Place linking primary pedestrian circulation and walkway systems with the adjoining waterfront promenade to form an integrated open space/ pedestrian network. Overall, the Civic Place will form part of the integrated open space network at the waterfront as it would be connected with the adjoining future waterfront promenade through an open space deck with a width of 50 – 60 metres.

#### Design-and-build approach

35. Some local professional bodies are of the view that the D&B approach is unlikely to produce quality design or an iconic building because cost is the predominant consideration. The Hong Kong Institution of Engineers has suggested that in view of the complexity and significance of the project, it is desirable to carry out the design and construction of the project in separate phases. 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. After deciding the detailed design, tendering may then be conducted. Tenderers should be required to follow the specifications in the detailed design. The Hong Kong Institute of Architects has suggested that an open international design competition should be held to solicit the best design and to allow public participation in the design process.

36. The Administration holds the view that from the experience of the previous prequalification exercise in 2003, the D&B approach has proven to be effective in attracting both internationally and locally renowned architects for the project. Moreover, the D&B approach will take a shorter lead-time and can minimize the interface problems between the design and construction stages, as the designer architect and the building contractor can work hand-in-hand to make best use of the latest technical advancements. The Administration has also informed the Subcommittee that to meet public aspiration for a quality design for this landmark project, it has exceptionally included “design capability” as one of the assessment criteria in prequalifying applicants, in order to achieve a good balance in assessing their technical, financial, managerial and design capabilities. The Administration has also undertaken to explore the possibility of allowing the public to view the proposed designs, taking into consideration the legal advice on the implications on the fairness and integrity of the tender process.

Holistic approach for planning the future uses of the existing CGO and Murray Building sites

37. Some members share the view of some deputations that the future use of the existing CGO and Murray Building sites should be considered in conjunction with the overall land-use planning for the Central district. In particular, they do not subscribe to the Administration’s view that it is premature to determine the uses of the sites at this stage. They demand that as the future uses of these two large sites would have significant implications on the vehicular traffic and the environment of Central, the Administration should provide the details of the relevant plans.

38. The Administration has advised that the existing use of the CGO and Murray Building as “G/IC” use has been taken into account in assessing the future traffic flow and environmental situation of the Central District. If there is any change to the existing G/IC use that warrants an amendment to the OZP, the statutory planning procedures under the Town Planning Ordinance will be followed. These include consideration and agreement of the zoning amendments by the Town Planning Board, and consideration of public comments and representations by the Board. The revised OZP will have to be approved by the Chief Executive in Council.

39. The Hong Kong Institute of Planners has suggested that the Government should consider designating the area from Robinson Road and north of Hong Kong Zoological and Botanical Gardens to St. John’s Cathedral and Murray Building as Hong Kong’s “cultural heritage” zone. Noting the proposal, and the Administration has advised that when it plans and considers the future use of the existing CGO and Murray Building or their sites, it would carry out a comprehensive assessment of the future use of the sites, taking into account the land use needs; the traffic, environmental and infrastructural impacts; the historic

value of the sites and their surroundings; tree preservation; protection of ridgelines; and the urban design guidelines, etc. The relevant stakeholders in the community will be engaged in the process.

Traffic and environmental impacts of the Tamar development project

40. Members share the concern of most deputations that the Tamar project may aggravate the traffic congestion and air pollution in Central, and note the deputations' demand that the Tamar development project should not be approved until an environmental impact assessment based on updated data and a comprehensive traffic impact assessment have been undertaken.

*Traffic impact*

41. Regarding the additional traffic generated by the Tamar development, the Administration has advised that the total traffic attraction and generation per hour for the new CGC and LCC in the morning and afternoon peak periods will be 1 924 passenger car units<sup>2</sup> (pcu) and 1 286 pcu respectively. Based on TD's 2004 Annual Traffic Census and projecting to 2016, traffic flow per hour in the Central Business District (CBD) during peak hours will be around 57 000 pcu. Hence, the traffic flow generated from the new CGC and LCC in the morning and afternoon peak periods will be 3.4% and 2.3% respectively of the CBD's total traffic flow. On average, it will be about 3%. The above projection is made under the assumption of a maximum permissible gross floor area development for the new CGC/LCC. As the scale of development for the new CGC/LCC would be much lower in actuality, the traffic thus generated is expected to be around 1% of the CBD's traffic flow.

42. A deputation has observed that as indicated in a paper submitted to the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee by the Transport Department (TD), even with the completion of Central-Wan Chai Bypass (CWB) and Road P2, the traffic at some of the road intersections in Central and Wan Chai areas will still be saturated by 2016. The volume to capacity ratio (V/C ratio) of the section of west-bound inner Gloucester Road near Excelsior Hotel will reach 1.08 during peak hours. In addition, the traffic volumes at six other road sections, including the sections of east-bound Connaught Road near Exchange Square and west-bound Harcourt Road near Admiralty Centre, are also very close to the maximum capacity (the relevant V/C ratios range from 0.87 to 0.97). Moreover, according to the TD's submission to the Expert Panel on Sustainable Transport Planning and Central-Wan Chai Bypass in August 2005, the inner sections of certain roads in Wan Chai (such as inner Gloucester Road, east-bound Connaught

---

<sup>2</sup> Passenger car unit is the unit of road traffic equivalent for capacity purposes to one normal private car. Other vehicles are converted to the same unit by a factor that depends on their type and circumstances. For instance, a light goods vehicle has a pcu factor of 1.5. A bus has a pcu factor of 3 under normal circumstance but has a pcu factor of 4 at hilly terrain.

Road near Exchange Square, west-bound Harcourt Road) will experience traffic congestion by 2016.

43. In response to the comments, the Administration has explained that a V/C ratio equals to or less than 1.0 means that a road has sufficient capacity to cope with the volume of vehicular traffic under consideration and the resultant traffic will flow smoothly. A V/C ratio above 1.2 indicates more serious congestion with traffic speeds deteriorating progressively with further increase in traffic. If the CWB and Road P2 are built and with the planned developments in Central and Wan Chai reclamation areas, the V/C ratio of the section of west-bound inner Gloucester Road near Excelsior Hotel will be 1.08 during peak hours by year 2016. Other roads in Central and Wan Chai will have V/C ratio range from 0.54 to 0.97, which is still less than 1.2. Therefore, roads in Central and Wan Chai will not be heavily congested by 2016.

44. Some deputations are concerned that the Government's current plan gives highways and roads priority, leading to heightened congestion and air pollution in Central, and that the plan is likely to preclude, or at least make it far more difficult and expansive, the subway extension provided in the Railway Development Strategy No. 2, such as the North Island Line. They suggest that the Government should consider putting in rail ahead of roads. The Administration has explained that Central, Wan Chai and Tamar are already well served by the MTR Central, Wan Chai and Admiralty Stations. Land reservation has been made on the OZP for the planned North Island Line and a possible station near Tamar. The planned Shatin to Central Link will provide the area with one more rail station, near the present Hong Kong Convention & Exhibition Centre.

*Environmental impact assessment for and air quality impact of the Tamar project*

45. Some deputations have pointed out that the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report (July 2001) for the Central Reclamation Phase III (CRIII) did not take the "street canyon effect" into account and thus had under-estimated the pollution levels. The deputations urge the Government to conduct a new EIA for air quality and use a proper model that includes the "street canyon effect" of buildings so as to ascertain more accurately the extent of pollution caused by the Tamar project and other planned developments on the Central waterfront.

46. A deputation has drawn the Subcommittee's attention that Tamar is only one block from Queensway, one of the most congested and polluted bus routes in Hong Kong. At present, the wind from Tamar blows through Harcourt Garden to help reduce the pollution on Queensway. If anything is built on Tamar blocking the wind, the pollution levels will shoot up. Moreover, the air pollution from the vehicle exhaust will be sucked down into the MTR trains and sucked

into the buses. Hence, it is deeply concerned that the plan to develop Tamar will significantly worsen the air pollution in Admiralty.

47. According to the Administration, the Tamar project is an office-type development with associated open space, amenity, footbridges, etc. within a commercial/urban environment. This type of development will not cause long-term adverse environmental impacts and hence, not a “Designated Project” under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (EIAO) for which EIA is required. Notwithstanding, the Administration conducted a preliminary environmental review in 1998 to assess the environmental implications of the Tamar project. The review confirmed that there would be no long-term adverse environmental impacts arising from the proposed Tamar development project. The Administration however will consider requiring the tenderers to conduct an Air Ventilation Assessment to ensure air ventilation effects, and to prevent the Tamar development from creating a wall effect.

48. As regards the EIA Report for CRIII, the Administration’s position is that the EIA Report was approved under the EIAO in August 2001. The EIA concluded that the predicted cumulative air quality impacts at the existing and planned air sensitive receivers including the Tamar development would be within established standards. Given that there is no change in the land use in CRIII, the EIA findings are still valid and no updating is required to be carried out.

49. On the criticism that the EIA for CRIII had not taken into account the new developments planned for the new reclamation area, the Administration has clarified that the EIA in fact covered existing and planned developments including the proposed Tamar development. The air quality assessment was conducted in accordance with established assessment methodologies accepted in Hong Kong and internationally. It had already taken into account the effects of the buildings on the predicted air quality and had not underestimated the impact of Tamar project on air quality.

## **Latest position**

50. At the last meeting of the Subcommittee on 3 April 2006, the Subcommittee heard the views of deputations on the traffic and environmental issues arising from the current planning for the Central waterfront and the Tamar development project. Some members were of the view that the Administration’s responses at that and previous meetings of the Subcommittee have neither provided sufficient justifications for the Tamar project, nor have adequately addressed various concerns raised. The following motion<sup>3</sup> moved by

---

<sup>3</sup> The terms of the original motion passed are as follows –

“在政府未能清楚交代現時政府總部未來的安排與規劃、為添馬艦發展計劃重新進行具公信力的環境影響評估，以及清楚解釋於添馬艦舊址興建政府總部的迫切性及需要之前，本小組委員會並不支持在添馬艦舊址興建新政府總部。”

Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki was passed by the Subcommittee –

“That, as the Government has yet to give a clear account of the future arrangements and planning for the existing central government offices, conduct afresh an environmental impact assessment of credibility for the Tamar development project and explain in clear terms the urgency and need for a new central government complex at the Tamar site, the Subcommittee does not support the development of a new central government complex at the Tamar site.” (Translation)

51. The Administration will consult the Panel on the updated details of the Tamar development project on 25 April 2006. Subject to the outcome of the Panel’s discussion of the project, the Subcommittee will consider the way forward for its study in due course.

### **Advice sought**

52. Members are requested to note the deliberations of the Subcommittee on the Tamar development project and the related issues.

Council Business Division 1  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
24 April 2006

## **Appendix I**

### **Panel on Planning, Lands and Works**

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

#### **Membership list**

**Chairman** Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBM, GBS, JP

**Members**

Hon Albert HO Chun-yan  
Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai, S.B.St.J., JP  
*(up to 12.2.2006)*  
Hon WONG Yung-kan, 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 Daniel LAM Wai-keung, BBS, JP  
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC  
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki  
Hon Patrick LAU Sau-shing, SBS, JP  
*(up to 16.2.2006)*

**Clerk** Ms Anita SIT

**Legal Adviser** Ms Bernice WONG

**Date** 17 February 2006

## **Appendix II**

### **Panel on Planning, Lands and Works**

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

#### **List of individuals/organizations that have made oral presentation/ written submissions to the Panel and/or the Subcommittee**

1. Action Group on Protection of The Harbour
2. Central & Western District Council
3. Citizen Envisioning @ Harbour
4. Civic Exchange
5. Clear The Air
6. Dr Adrian RAPER
7. Dr Bill BARRON
8. Mr David FRIEDLAND
9. Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
10. Friends of the Earth (HK)
11. Friends Of The Harbour
12. Harbour Business Forum
13. Hong Kong Construction Industry Employees General Union
14. Ir Prof William H K LAM
15. Margaret and Nicholas BROOKE, Professional Property Services Limited
16. Mr Adrian FUNG
17. Mr Anthony MACKAY
18. Mr Colin DAWSON
19. Mr Chris WATTS
20. Mr Gerry KIPLING
21. Mr John BATTEN
22. Mr Norman de BRACKINGHE
23. Designing Hong Kong Harbour District/The Experience Group, Limited
24. Mr Peter MILLWARD
25. Mr Rob PENDLETON
26. Mr Peter WOOD
27. Mr Steve CHAN, Wan Chai District Council Member
28. Mr Tian TSE
29. Mr Tim STEINERT
30. Mr Winston K S CHU
31. Ms Bethan GREAVES
32. Ms Michelle GARNAUT
33. Ms Karen POLSON

34. Ms Michelle VOSPER, Hong Kong Representative, Asian Cultural Council
35. Ms Rachel PLECAS
36. Ms Santa RAYMOND
37. Ms Taura EDGAR
38. Ms Vicki LUKINS
39. Ms Winnifred Che-yeng WONG
40. Save Our Shorelines
41. Society For Protection Of The Harbour
42. Sustainable Development Forum
43. The Hong Kong Construction Association Ltd
44. The Hong Kong Institute of Architects
45. The Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
46. The Hong Kong Institute of Planners
47. The Hong Kong Institute of Real Estate Administration
48. The Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
49. The Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
50. The Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
51. WWF Hong Kong

**Tamar development project****Chronology of events  
from April 2002 to November 2003**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Event</b>	<b>References</b>
30 April 2002	The Administration decided to proceed with the development of the Tamar site for a new Central Government Complex, a new Legislative Council building and other community facilities.	The Legislative Council Brief on "Use of the Tamar site for the development of the Central Government Complex" issued on 30 April 2002 (File Ref: PLB(CR) 21/36(2001) Pt.7) <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr01-02/english/panels/plw/papers/plb(cr)21_36(2001)pt.7(eng).pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr01-02/english/panels/plw/papers/plb(cr)21_36(2001)pt.7(eng).pdf</a>
31 May 2002	The Administration briefed the PLW Panel on the project.	Information paper provided by the Administration LC Paper No. CB(1)1828/01-02(02) <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr01-02/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0531cb1-1828-2e.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr01-02/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0531cb1-1828-2e.pdf</a>  Minutes of meeting <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr01-02/english/panels/plw/minutes/pl020531.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr01-02/english/panels/plw/minutes/pl020531.pdf</a>
August – December 2002	On 16 August 2002, the Administration published the prequalification document and invited applications for prequalification for participation in the subsequent tendering exercise for the design and construction of the project.	Press release of the Government on “Application for prequalification of tenderers for Tamar starts today” <a href="http://www.info.gov.hk/gia/general/200208/16/0816073.htm">http://www.info.gov.hk/gia/general/200208/16/0816073.htm</a>  Press release of the Government on “Prequalified tenderers for Tamar development project” <a href="http://www.info.gov.hk/gia/general/200212/18/1218151.htm">http://www.info.gov.hk/gia/general/200212/18/1218151.htm</a>

Time	Event	References
	On 18 December 2002, the Administration announced that five applicants were prequalified.	
4 April 2003	On 4 April 2003, the Administration briefed the PLW Panel on the proposal to upgrade the Tamar development project to Category A.	Information paper provided by the Administration LC Paper No. CB(1)1245/02-03(03) <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr02-03/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0404cb1-1245-3e.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr02-03/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0404cb1-1245-3e.pdf</a>
7 May 2003	The funding proposal for the Tamar development project was considered and endorsed by the Public Works Subcommittee.	PWSC(2003-04)16 <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr02-03/english/fc/pwsc/papers/p03-16e.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr02-03/english/fc/pwsc/papers/p03-16e.pdf</a>
26 May 2003	The Administration announced its decision to temporarily put the Tamar development project on hold in order to review its spending priorities.	Press release of the Government on “Tamar Development Project put on hold temporarily” <a href="http://www.info.gov.hk/gia/general/200305/26/0526174.htm">http://www.info.gov.hk/gia/general/200305/26/0526174.htm</a>
27 May 2003	A joint meeting of the Panel on Transport and Panel on Security was originally scheduled for 27 May 2003 to discuss the security considerations in the planning of the new development at Tamar vis-à-vis the alignment of the Shatin to Central Link and other public transport services in the vicinity. The meeting was subsequently cancelled.	Information paper provided by the Administration <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr02-03/english/panels/tp/papers/tpcb1-1741-1e.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr02-03/english/panels/tp/papers/tpcb1-1741-1e.pdf</a>

<b>Time</b>	<b>Event</b>	<b>References</b>
6 June 2003	The PLW Panel discussed the Administration's decision to temporarily put the Tamar development project on hold.	Paper provided by the Administration LC Paper No. CB(1)1831/02-03(04) <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr02-03/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0606cb1-1831-4e.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr02-03/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0606cb1-1831-4e.pdf</a>
19 November 2003	The Government announced its decision to defer the Tamar development project and to terminate the procurement exercise for the design and build contract for the project.	Press release of the Government on "Tamar development project deferred" <a href="http://www.info.gov.hk/gia/general/200311/19/1119080.htm">http://www.info.gov.hk/gia/general/200311/19/1119080.htm</a>

## Appendix IV

### Briefings and consultations conducted by the Administration on the Central District (Extension) Outline Zoning Plan and the Tamar development project

29.5.1998	The draft Central District (Extension) OZP No. S/H24/1 was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (TPO). Half of the Tamar development site was proposed to be zoned for “Open Space” use, and the remaining for “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) use.
June/July 1998	Briefing sessions with the Hong Kong Institute of Planners, Hong Kong Institution of Engineers, Liberal Party, Democratic Alliance for Betterment of Hong Kong, and Democratic Party on the draft OZP No. S/H24/1.
18.6.1998	Consultation with the then Central & Western Provisional District Board (PDB) on the draft OZP No. S/H24/1.
7.7.1998	Consultation with the Standing Committee of the then Provisional Urban Council on the draft OZP No. S/H24/1.
15.7.1998	Consultation with the Planning Sub-Committee of the Land and Building Advisory Committee on the draft OZP No. S/H24/1.
21.7.1998	Consultation with the then Wan Chai PDB on Central Reclamation Phase III (CRIII) proposed reclamation and roadworks.
23.7.1998	Consultation with the then Central and Western PDB on CRIII proposed reclamation and roadworks.
12.11.1998	Information paper for LegCo Panel on Planning, Lands and Works (PLW Panel) the planning parameters, scope and programme.

10.6.1999	The Administration and a delegation of the Town Planning Board presented the amendment plan, together with the Board's draft vision and goals for the Victoria Harbour, to the PLW Panel.
20.7.1999	Briefing sessions with the Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong and professional institutes (Hong Kong Institution of Engineers, Hong Kong Institute of Planning, Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects, Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors and Hong Kong Institute of Architects) on the proposed amendments to the draft OZP.
22.7.1999	Consultation with the Environment & Works Committee of the then Central & Western PDB on the proposed amendments to the draft OZP.
31.5.2002	Consultation with the PLW Panel on launching the Tamar development project.
10.10.2002	Consultation with the Central & Western District Council on the details of the Tamar project.
4.4.2003	Consultation with PLW Panel on the funding application for the Tamar project.
7.5.2003	Consultation with the Public Works Subcommittee on the funding application for the Tamar project.
21.10.2005	Post-Policy Address briefing for PLW Panel on the re-launch of the Tamar project.
22.11.2005	Consultation with the PLW Panel on the details of the re-launched Tamar project.
17.12.2005	Special PLW Panel meeting for discussions with deputations.
9.2.2006	PLW Panel Subcommittee meeting for discussions with deputations.

## Appendix V

### **List of major documents provided by the Administration on 3 March 2006 regarding the decision to develop the proposed Central Government Complex and Legislative Council Complex at Tamar**

<b>Item no.</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Document</b>
1.	October 1997	Proposals for Central Government Complex
2.	December 1997	Proposals for Central Government Complex and LegCo Annex
3.	April/May 1998	Fieldwork Report : For Ground Investigation and Laboratory Testing <b>(Note: Due to the exceedingly large volume, appendixes/tables to the report would only be available upon request)</b>
4.	October 1998	Preliminary Environmental Review for Proposed Central Government Offices at Tamar
5.	December 1998	Preliminary Traffic Impact Assessment for the Proposed Central Government Complex at Tamar
6.	September 2000	Proposals for Central Government Complex
7.	April 2002	Legislative Council Brief : Use of the Tamar Site for the Development of the Central Government Complex
8.	March 2003	Ground Investigation Report : Land Contamination Report <b>(Note: Due to the exceedingly large volume, appendixes/tables to the report would only be available upon request)</b>
9.	March 2003	Ground Investigation Report : Final Fieldwork Report <b>(Note: Due to the exceedingly large volume, appendixes/tables to the report would only be available upon request)</b>

<b>Item no.</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Document</b>
10.	September 2005	Chapter 4 of Transport Department's Submission to the Expert Panel Forum on Sustainable Transport Planning and Central-Wan Chai Bypass
11.	September 2005	Report on Sustainability Assessment : Re-launch of Tamar Development Project

## **Appendix VI**

### **Supplementary information provided by the Administration on the technical constraints involved and the renovation works required for installing technologically-advanced facilities in the existing Central Government Offices (CGO) and Murray Building**

Details of the information technology (IT), telecommunications and electronics requirements for the proposed Central Government Complex (CGC) have yet to be finalised. However, we will likely incorporate in the new buildings centralised and expandable IT and telecommunications networks which have a built-in capacity for expansion and upgrading without the need to recourse to change of the whole system or network in future. In addition, we will adopt more effective and energy-efficient electrical, mechanical and building services systems such as elevators of better performance, air-conditioning systems with better air quality control and filtering capacity as well as temperature control, etc. The existing CGO buildings and Murray Building are 45 and 35 years old respectively. Many of the facilities are not meeting the present-day standards. For example, the CGO buildings cannot meet fire safety standards of present days. It is desirable to add more fire exits and sprinkler system. As to the technological requirements, the cable trunks, network rooms and server rooms are reaching their maximum capacity. However, there is no physical space for their expansion in the existing buildings. The existing network rooms and server rooms are not able to satisfy the modern standards of provisions as specified in the preceding paragraph. Given the drastic developments of technologies in the past years, the cable trunks are overcrowded and the cables are not systematically arranged and segregated.

To enable additional network capabilities as technologies evolve in the years ahead (e.g. collapsing voice, data and video into a single platform at the maturity of telephony, etc.), significant renovation works would have to carry out to improve the situation. In this connection, expansion of the network capacity would be very difficult given the lack of space. Apart from the necessary temporary relocation of offices and equipments to make way for renovation works causing disruption to the normal operation of the Government Secretariat, the low ceilings of the CGO and the aging of the buildings are posing serious structural constraints that would hamper provision of flexible power and data outlets. Ad hoc renovations works to address the existing problems would render comprehensive planning for continued inter-operability between present and future technologies, and better efficiency difficult.

In implementing the Tamar development project, we will require the tenderers to propose designs that are efficient and effective in use of space, and highly adaptive

to meet future changes and advancement in technology. The building design should also be able to accommodate future alteration and expansion with built-in flexibility to facilitate changes in office layouts, IT systems and other office facilities.