

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)1391/05-06
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref: CB1/PS/1/05

Panel on Planning, Lands and Works

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

**Minutes of the meeting on
Tuesday, 7 March 2006, at 4:30 pm
in the Chamber of the Legislative Council Building**

- Members present** : Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBM, GBS, JP (Chairman)
Hon Albert HO Chun-yan
Hon WONG Yung-kan, JP
Hon CHOY So-yuk, JP
Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, GBS, 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
- Member attending** : Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP
- Members absent** : Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, JP
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
- Public officers attending** : Mr Robin IP
Deputy Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands
(Planning & Lands)
- Ms Phyllis LI
Chief Town Planner (Special Duties)
Planning Department

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

Mr Sidney CHAN
Assistant Director of Administration

Mr Elvis AU
Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)
Environmental Protection Department

Mr KWAN Chi-wai, Lawrence
Chief Engineer/Traffic Engineering (HK)
Transport Department

Mr Peter YUEN
Project Director
Architectural Services Department

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

Staff in attendance : Ms Pauline NG
Assistant Secretary General 1

Ms Bernice WONG
Assistant Legal Adviser 1

Mr WONG Siu-yee
Senior Council Secretary (1)7

Ms Christina SHIU
Legislative Assistant (1)7

Action

- I Confirmation of minutes of meeting**
(LC Paper No. CB(1)1015/05-06 -- Minutes of meeting on 9 February 2006)

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 February 2006 were confirmed.

Action

II Tamar development project and related issues

- (LC Paper No. CB(1)1014/05-06(01) -- Information paper provided by the Administration in response to the questions and requests for information raised at the meeting on 9 February 2006
- LC Paper No. CB(1)855/05-06(01) -- Summary of views on the Tamar Development Project raised by deputations and in submissions to the Panel on Planning, Lands and Works and Director of Administration's response
- LC Paper No. CB(1)855/05-06(02) -- Summary of views on the planning for the Central Waterfront raised by deputations and in submissions to the Panel on Planning, Lands and Works and the Administration's response)

Briefing by the Administration

2. The Deputy Director of Administration (DD of Adm) highlighted the salient points of the Administration's response to the questions and requests for information raised at the meeting on 9 February 2006.

Discussion

3. Members raised questions for response by the Administration.
4. The index of proceedings of the meeting was at the **Appendix**.

Motion

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

“本小組委員會對於政府未能根據本小組委員會於2006年2月9日通過之議案，交出所有有關現時政府總部的擴建及改建，以及擬建新政府總部的所有文件，表示極度失望及遺憾，並要求政府根據上次小組委員會通過之議案，於下次小組委員會會議前交出所有文件及其清單。”

(Translation)

“That this Subcommittee expresses great disappointment and strong regret that the Government has failed to submit all documents relating to the extension and reconstruction of the existing central government offices and the provision of a new central government complex in the light of the motion passed by the Subcommittee on 9 February 2006, and urges the Government to provide before the next Subcommittee meeting all such documents and a full list of the

Action

documents in accordance with the motion passed by the Subcommittee at the said meeting.”

6. Mr LEE Wing-tat seconded Dr KWOK Ka-ki’s motion. Members agreed to proceed with the motion. The Chairman then put the motion to vote. Except for the Chairman who did not exercise his voting right, of the three members present, all voted for Dr KWOK Ka-ki’s motion. The Chairman declared that Dr KWOK’s motion was carried.

Follow-up actions to be undertaken by the Administration

7. Members requested the Administration to take the following follow-up actions:

- (a) To provide the information and reports requested in the motion passed at the meeting.
- (b) To provide further details on the estimated time scale for in-situ redevelopment of the Central Government Offices (CGO) and Murray Building.
- (c) To elaborate on the technical constraints involved in the renovation works required for installing technologically-advanced facilities in the existing CGO and Murray Building.
- (d) To provide as soon as possible a detailed breakdown of the area required for the offices and facilities and the number of staff to be accommodated in the proposed new Central Government Complex (CGC) and cost and benefits analyses for the Tamar development project.
- (e) To confirm whether the Administration had considered alternative uses of the Tamar site in 2000 and if so, the outcome of the consideration.
- (f) To explain why the proposed Tamar development project and other planned developments in Central were concordant with the expectations and aspirations of the public; to confirm whether the Administration had any plan regarding the future use(s) of the existing CGO buildings and the Murray Building and their sites after the existing offices had been reprovisioned to the proposed new CGC at Tamar; and to confirm whether the Administration would provide assurance to allay worries about the environmental and traffic impacts of the future uses of or developments on the sites.
- (g) To confirm whether the public would be given the opportunity to view and comment on the design proposals submitted by bidders of the Design-and-Build (D&B) contract; and to reconsider the option of holding a design competition for the project with a view to soliciting the best design and to allow maximum public participation in the design process.

Action

- (h) To explore the possibility of better utilizing underground space to further reduce the heights of the buildings.
- (i) To explain how the future design and configuration of the Open Space at the Tamar site would facilitate its use and enjoyment by the public and that there would be no barrier to public access to the Open Space.

III Any other business

Next meeting

8. Members agreed that the date of the next meeting would be arranged by the Chairman and the Clerk. Members also agreed that the Subcommittee would discuss the environmental and traffic issues arising from the current planning for the Central waterfront and the proposed Tamar development project. Deputations which had previously submitted views on these issues should be invited to attend the next meeting.

Membership

9. The Chairman reported that Ir Dr Raymond HO and Mr Patrick LAU had withdrawn their membership and the number of members of the Subcommittee had been reduced from 14 to 12.

10. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 6:30 pm.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
28 April 2006

Panel on Planning, Lands and Works

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

**Proceedings of the meeting
on Tuesday, 7 March 2006, at 4:30 pm
in the Chamber of the Legislative Council Building**

| Time marker | Speaker | Subject(s) | Action required |
|--------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| 000000 – 000245 | Chairman | Confirmation of minutes of the meeting held on 9 February 2006 (LC Paper No. CB(1)1015/05-06) | |
| 000246 – 000611 | Administration | Briefing by the Administration (LC Paper No. CB(1)1014/05-06(01)) | |
| 000612 – 001136 | Mr LEE Wing-tat Administration | <p>Enquiry on the reason for not providing documents prepared before 1997 including a consultancy report on in-situ renovation of CGO and Murray Building</p> <p>Query on whether the Administration was making the most efficient use of Murray Building having regard to the presence of some departments which could be housed away from Central</p> <p>The Administration's response was that –</p> <p>(a) the Administration withdrew the site from Land Sale Programme in 1998 and announced the intention to reserve the site for development of a new CGC. The documents provided were directly relevant to the decision on choice of the site and supporting studies; and</p> <p>(b) a consultancy study was commissioned in the early 1990's through open tendering. It was an assessment of the interest and possible mode of private sector participation in the in-situ redevelopment of the CGO. The</p> | The Administration was requested to provide the relevant information |

| Time marker | Speaker | Subject(s) | Action required |
|-----------------|---------------------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>study was done before the Tamar site was formed and was not relevant to the eventual decision of implementing the Tamar development project. Moreover, the Tamar development project was a public works project that would not require financing by the private sector. The Administration would ascertain the legal position in respect of the release of the consultancy report</p> <p>The Administration explained that the new CGC would only house offices/policy bureaux that performed policy-making function and hence certain departments and offices in the existing Murray Building would not be moved into the new CGC</p> | |
| 001137 – 001739 | Dr KWOK Ka-ki Administration | <p>Whether the Administration had provided all the relevant documents</p> <p>The rationale for the space requirement of the new CGC</p> <p>Whether a good harbour view and signification of the Government's authority were major considerations in the decision of choosing the Tamar site</p> <p>Requested the Administration to provide a list of relevant documents including documents prepared before 1998 and the consultancy report</p> <p>The Administration's explanation –</p> <p>(a) it considered the Tamar site as the option for a new CGC only in 1998 and as such relevant documents prepared since 1997 were provided; and</p> | The Administration was requested to provide the relevant information |

| Time marker | Speaker | Subject(s) | Action required |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | | (b) other possible options including in-situ redevelopment had been considered as the assessment of the options were presented in the documents provided; and the Tamar site was chosen after considering all relevant factors | |
| 001740 – 002450 | Mr LEE Wing-tat Administration | <p>Requested the Administration to provide a list of relevant documents</p> <p>Considered that the consultancy report could be provided after blacking out sensitive commercial information and other information not suitable for disclosure</p> <p>Query on why no detailed breakdown on areas to be occupied by bureaux at CGC was available</p> <p>The Administration's response –</p> <p>(a) directly relevant documents had already been provided. The consultancy report, although outdated and not directly relevant, could be provided if it was found appropriate to do so after seeking legal advice; and</p> <p>(b) the updating of user requirements for the new CGC was in progress and the updated figures with breakdown would be provided to the Panel at its next meeting on 25 April 2006</p> | The Administration was requested to provide the relevant information |
| 002451 – 003128 | Mr Alan LEONG Administration | Requested the Administration to provide the document or analysis based on which the Administration had arrived at the conclusion that the in-situ redevelopment option would require a longer implementation period, i.e. 4 additional years, compared to the Tamar option | The Administration was requested to provide the relevant information |

| Time marker | Speaker | Subject(s) | Action required |
|-----------------|--------------------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>Considered that the Administration should plan the use of the Tamar site in the context of the overall planning for Central, and the future use of the CGO and Murray Building and their sites</p> <p>The Administration's response –</p> <p>(a) a table showing the long implementation programme of in-situ redevelopment would be made available;</p> <p>(b) the planning for Central Reclamation Phase III had been reported to the Panel at the Panel meeting on 25 October 2005; and</p> <p>(c) the CGO and Murray Building would not be vacated until after project completion in 2010, any amendment to the existing zoning of the sites would require comprehensive planning and other assessments and need to undergo the relevant statutory town planning procedures</p> | |
| 003129 – 003902 | Mr Albert HO Administration | <p>What kind of advanced technologies could not be provided at CGO and Murray Building</p> <p>Whether demolition of Murray Building was required and what were the difficulties in phased redevelopment of CGO</p> <p>Why creation of employment opportunities should be a major consideration for pursuing the Tamar project</p> <p>The need for a new CGC when the establishment of the Government was on the decrease</p> | The Administration was requested to provide the relevant information |

| Time marker | Speaker | Subject(s) | Action required |
|-----------------|---------------------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>The Administration's explanation –</p> <p>(a) there were structural constraints at CGO and Murray Building such as the structural lay-out of the building and the low height of the ceiling; and</p> <p>(b) while the overall establishment of the Government had been on the decrease, there had been little change in the number of staff of the policy bureaux and other central Government units to be housed at the new CGC, and the updated estimate would be available in April 2006</p> | |
| 003903 – 004430 | Dr KWOK Ka-ki Administration | <p>Query on whether all relevant documents, including those prepared before 1998, had been provided</p> <p>The Administration's response that all relevant documents leading to the decision of using half of the Tamar site for building a new CGC and Legislative Council Complex had been provided</p> | The Administration was requested to provide the relevant information |
| 004431 – 005037 | Mr Alan LEONG Administration | <p>Whether there were any other relevant documents in addition to the consultancy report</p> <p>Concern about the impact on the traffic situation in Central if the new CGC was constructed at the Tamar site and the CGO and Murray Building sites were redeveloped into residential areas</p> <p>Considered that the Administration should provide a clear indication of the future use of the CGO and Murray Building sites before applying for funding for the Tamar development project</p> | The Administration was requested to provide the relevant information |

| Time marker | Speaker | Subject(s) | Action required |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>The Administration's response –</p> <p>(a) all relevant documents had been provided. In the public's interest, internal minutes and correspondences would not be disclosed according to established practice;</p> <p>(b) it was premature to decide on the future use of the CGO and Murray Building sites. Should there be any change of the existing "Government, Institution or Community" (G/IC) use, it would have to go through the statutory town planning procedures including the necessary public consultation process; and</p> <p>(c) traffic and environmental assessments demonstrated that the Tamar development project would have no adverse effects</p> | |
| 005038 – 005654 | Mr LEE Wing-tat Administration | <p>Requested detailed cost and benefits analyses of the Tamar development project</p> <p>Concern on the preservation of Murray Building</p> <p>The Administration's explanation that –</p> <p>(a) there were other considerations in addition to maintenance costs of GGO and Murray Building such as the acute shortage of office space faced by the Government Secretariat and the Legislative Council, the aging of the buildings and saving of rentals for renting commercial premises; and</p> <p>(b) further details would be provided to the Panel in April 2006</p> | The Administration was requested to provide the relevant information |

| Time marker | Speaker | Subject(s) | Action required |
|-----------------|---------------------------------|---|--|
| 005655 – 010333 | Dr KWOK Ka-ki Administration | <p>Whether the Administration had considered alternative uses of the Tamar site in 2000 and the then considerations</p> <p>Whether there was any internal assessment on the future use of the CGO and Murray Building sites</p> <p>The Administration’s response –</p> <p>(a) the current designated uses of the Tamar development site, i.e. about half of the site for “Open Space” use and the remaining half for “G/IC” use had remained unchanged since 1998; and</p> <p>(b) at present, there was no decision on the future use of the two sites yet. The future use would have to take into account relevant considerations such as the land use requirements, site characteristics, traffic and environmental considerations and public views, etc. Any changes to the zoning of the two sites in the future would require comprehensive planning and other assessments and need to undergo the relevant statutory town planning procedures, including the necessary public consultation, consideration of public views and representations</p> | The Administration was requested to provide the relevant information |
| 010334 – 010849 | Mr Albert HO Administration | <p>Whether there would be over-provision of office space at the new CGC</p> <p>Concern on environmental problems if the CGO and Murray Building were demolished</p> <p>The Administration’s response –</p> <p>(a) the Administration was updating</p> | |

| Time marker | Speaker | Subject(s) | Action required |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | <p>the estimated area requirements of the new CGC. The area required would include space for press conference rooms, multi-purpose hall, conference rooms, computer equipment rooms, plant rooms, management offices, reception areas, public areas, circulation areas, etc in the new CGC; and the remaining area would be used as office space. Only those staff involved in policy formulation would be accommodated in the CGC;</p> <p>(b) established Government standards for space provision for staff at various ranks would be adhered to; and</p> <p>(c) there was no decision made to demolish the CGO and Murray Building at present</p> | |
| 010850 – 011742 | Mr LEE Wing-tat Administration | <p>Query that the Tamar site was not particularly good among the sites considered except for its harbour view</p> <p>Concern about the greater distance of the Tamar site from transportation nodes when compared with the existing CGO</p> <p>Concern about depriving the public's enjoyment of the Tamar site permanently in trying to minimize inconvenience to Government officials arising from in-situ redevelopment</p> <p>The Administration's explanation –</p> <p>(a) there were many other factors for consideration in choosing the most suitable site, such as the civic core planning concept, site area, site constraints and timing;</p> | |

| Time marker | Speaker | Subject(s) | Action required |
|-----------------|---------------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>(b) while in-situ redevelopment was not impossible, it would require more time, face more technical difficulties, incur a higher cost and, most importantly, cause disruption to the operation of the Government; and</p> <p>(c) half of the Tamar site was designated as open space which would be well integrated with the natural environment of the waterfront setting and other recreational and open space along the Central waterfront</p> | |
| 011743 – 013023 | Dr KWOK Ka-ki Administration | <p>Referred to a press report and pointed out that the Administration had considered changing part of the Tamar site for commercial use in 2000 and requested the Administration to provide the then considerations</p> <p>Considered that choosing Kai Tak for the new CGC or in-situ redevelopment of CGO and Murray Building would have a smaller impact on the harbourfront</p> <p>Enquiry on the relative importance of a respectable CGC to signify the Government's status and administration and an excellent view to the harbour in affecting the choice of a site for the new CGC</p> <p>Query on why a range of 130m PD to 160m PD was specified instead of a fixed height and how the 20% building-free zone under the ridgeline was defined</p> <p>Concern about the quality and accessibility of the open space to be provided at Tamar</p> | The Administration was requested to provide the relevant information |

| Time marker | Speaker | Subject(s) | Action required |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>Concern about the degree of public participation under the D&B approach</p> <p>The Administration's response that –</p> <p>(a) it had considered many other factors and the pros and cons of the possible options;</p> <p>(b) the ridgeline had a varying profile and in maintaining a 20% building-free zone under the ridgeline, the height limits of the buildings would vary accordingly; and the specific heights of the buildings to address this requirement would be proposed by the bidders and assessed at the tender stage; and</p> <p>(c) the designated open space at Tamar would be connected with the waterfront promenade by a 50m to 60m wide deck, and integrated with the design of the Central harbourfront</p> | |
| 013024 – 013517 | Mr Alan LEONG | <p>Commented that there should be long-term holistic planning for Central including the Mid-levels and the CGO and Murray Building sites, without which he would not support the funding proposal for the Tamar development project</p> <p>Whether building the new CGC at the Tamar site was concordant with the public's expectations and aspirations</p> | |
| 013518 – 014509 | Mr LEE Wing-tat Administration | <p>Concern on the quality of the open space to be provided at the Tamar site</p> <p>Whether the Administration would explore the possibility of better utilizing underground space to further reduce the heights of the buildings</p> | <p>The Administration was requested to explore the possibility of better utilizing underground space to further</p> |

| Time marker | Speaker | Subject(s) | Action required |
|-----------------|---------------------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>Whether further environmental assessments had been conducted after completing the preliminary environmental assessment for the Tamar development project</p> <p>The Administration's response –</p> <p>(a) consideration could be given to include, at the tender stage, the requirement of better utilizing underground space by placing some facilities underground;</p> <p>(b) although the Tamar development project was not a designated project under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance and no statutory environmental impact assessment was necessary, a preliminary environmental assessment had been conducted which indicated that the Tamar development project would have no long-term adverse effects on the environment; and</p> <p>(c) the Transport Department had conducted an updated traffic impact assessment in September 2005 showing that the Tamar project would cause no significant impact on the total traffic flow of the Central Business District</p> | <p>reduce the heights of the buildings</p> |
| 014510 – 015259 | Dr KWOK Ka-ki Administration | <p>Whether the Administration had considered the future use of the CGO and Murray Building sites</p> <p>Whether the public could participate under the D&B approach to minimize the impact on the environment and to ensure their enjoyment of the open space</p> <p>Whether there would be an open design competition</p> | |

| Time marker | Speaker | Subject(s) | Action required |
|-----------------|--|---|-----------------|
| | | <p>The Administration's response –</p> <p>(a) further research would be conducted when necessary on the future use of the CGO and Murray Building sites and there would be comprehensive and thorough consideration of various factors such as the public's expectations and heritage elements;</p> <p>(b) there was a need to seek legal advice regarding public participation given that the tendering was governed by the World Trade Organization Agreement on Government Procurement; and</p> <p>(c) the D&B approach could attract renowned local and overseas architects to produce a world-class design</p> | |
| 015300 – 015520 | Mr LEE Wing-tat Administration | <p>Local architects should be given an opportunity to participate in an open design competition to design landmark buildings for Hong Kong</p> <p>The Administration responded that the D&B approach would be more appropriate and previous experience indicated that organizing an open design competition would not necessarily guarantee an appropriate design for implementation</p> | |
| 015521 – 015843 | Dr KWOK Ka-ki Mr LEE Wing-tat Administration | <p>Dr KWOK Ka-ki moved a motion</p> <p>Proposed to discuss environmental and traffic issues and invite deputations that had given relevant views to attend the next meeting</p> <p>Proposed to hold another meeting in April 2006 after receiving further</p> | |

| Time marker | Speaker | Subject(s) | Action required |
|--------------------|--|---|---|
| | | details on the Tamar development project from the Administration | |
| 015944 – 020208 | Chairman Clerk Mr LEE Wing-tat Administration | Processing of motion moved by Dr KWOK Ka-ki The Administration advised that it planned to consult the Panel on 25 April 2006 prior to seeking approval from the Public Works Subcommittee and the Finance Committee on the funding proposal for the Tamar development project in end of May 2006 and end of June 2006 respectively Date of next meeting Membership of the Subcommittee | The Administration was requested to provide the information and reports requested in the motion |