

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)2072/05-06
(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
Monday, 3 April 2006, at 4:30 pm
in the Chamber of the Legislative Council Building**

- Members present** : Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBM, GBS, JP (Chairman)
Hon WONG Yung-kan, JP
Hon CHOY So-yuk, JP
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, JP
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon LEE Wing-tat
Hon LI Kwok-ying, MH
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
- Members attending** : Dr Hon YEUNG Sum
Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP
Hon WONG Kwok-hing, MH
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung
- Members absent** : Hon Albert HO Chun-yan
Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, GBS, JP
Hon Daniel LAM Wai-keung, BBS, JP

- Public officers attending** :
- Mr Robin IP
Deputy Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands
(Planning & Lands)
 - Mrs MAK LOK Suet-ling, Susan, JP
Deputy Director of Administration
 - Mr Sidney CHAN
Assistant Director of Administration
 - Ms Phyllis LI
Chief Town Planner (Special Duties)1
Planning Department
 - Mr Peter YUEN
Project Director
Architectural Services Department
 - Mr Elvis AU
Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)
Environmental Protection Department
 - Mr LEUNG Pak-ming, Raymond
Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Air Science)
Environmental Protection Department
 - Mr Lawrence KWAN
Chief Engineer/Traffic Engineering (Hong Kong)
Transport Department
- Attendance by invitation** :
- Individual
 - Ir Prof William H K LAM
 - Citizen Envisioning@Harbour
 - Dr NG Mee-kam
Member
 - The Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
 - Mr K H YU
Vice President
 - Mr Paul HO
Chairman of Quantity Surveying Division

Individual

Ms Vicki LUKINS

Action Group on Protection of The Harbour

Mr LEE Wing-kin
Representative

Central & Western District Council

Ms CHENG Lai-king
Vice-Chairman
Food, Environmental Hygiene and Works Committee
Central & Western District Council

Mr YUEN Bun-keung
Member
Central & Western District Council

The Hong Kong Institution of Engineers

Ir Dr Greg C Y WONG
President

Individual

Mr Colin DAWSON

The Hong Kong Institute of Architects

Professor Bernard LIM
President

Designing Hong Kong Harbour District/
The Experience Group, Limited

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

Individual

Dr Bill BARRON

Save Our Shorelines

Ms YIP Yan-yan
Member

Individual

Mr Winston Ka-sun CHU
(Represented by Mr Dennis LI)

Civic Exchange

Ms Christine LOH
Chief Executive Officer

Dr Jimmy FUNG
Spokesperson

Clear The Air

Ms Annelise CONNELL
Chairperson

Dr Michael LEUNG Kwok-hi
Research Assistant Professor
Department of Mechanical Engineering
The University of Hong Kong

Society For Protection Of The Harbour

Mr LOK Kung-chin, Hardy
Director
(Represented by Ms Christine LOH)

WWF Hong Kong

Mr Markus SHAW
Chairman

Individual

Mr John BATTEN

Individual

Mr Norman de BRACKINGHE

Friends of The Harbour

Miss Mandy WONG
Representative

Individual

Dr Adrian RAPER
(Represented by Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN)

Individual

Mr CHAN Yiu-fai, Steve
Member
Wan Chai District Council

Friends of the Earth (HK)

Mrs Mei NG
Director

Hong Kong Construction Industry Employees General Union

Mr CHOI Chun-wa
Chairman

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

Staff in attendance : 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 Traffic and environmental issues arising from the current planning for the Central Waterfront and the Tamar development project

- (LC Paper No. CB(1)1201/05-06(01) -- Views of deputations on traffic and environmental issues submitted to the Subcommittee and the Administration's response (position as at 31 March 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
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1201/05-06(02) -- Administration's response to the requests for information and questions raised at the meeting on 7 March 2006)

Briefing by the Administration

The Deputy Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning & Lands) briefed members on the following major points –

- (a) the Administration had briefed the Panel on Planning, Lands and Works on the planned land uses for the reclamation area under Central Reclamation Phase III (CRIII) on 25 October 2005;
- (b) the Administration had explained in detail the planned land uses for CRIII and the Tamar development project in response to the concerns of members and interested organizations/individuals;
- (c) the planned land uses for CRIII had undergone the necessary statutory planning procedures including extensive public consultation and consideration of objections and public views;
- (d) there would be a mix of different land uses for CRIII with about half of the reclaimed land designated as "Open Space" and 14% as "Comprehensive Development Area", and there would be some waterfront-related commercial and leisure uses;
- (e) the Planning Department would undertake an urban design study to refine the existing urban design framework and to prepare planning/design briefs

Action

for key development sites on the Central reclamation to provide more detailed guidelines for the future developments;

- (f) a detailed traffic impact assessment covering the Central and Wan Chai reclamation areas had been conducted in 2002 which indicated that the new road network, including Road P2, to be completed in 2008 could meet the traffic flow arising from the Tamar and other developments, and an updated traffic impact assessment conducted in 2005 re-affirmed the results;
- (g) elevated walkways, pedestrian decks and at-grade signal controlled pedestrian crossings would provide easy access to the Central waterfront;
- (h) the environmental impact assessment (EIA) report for CRIII had been endorsed by the Environmental Advisory Committee and approved by the Environmental Protection Department in 2001;
- (i) the EIA report, which covered existing and planned developments including the Tamar development project, indicated that the predicted concentration of air pollutants would meet the relevant standards; and
- (j) the EIA report remained valid because there were no changes in the planned land uses for CRIII.

2. The Deputy Director of Administration re-affirmed that all documents directly related to the Tamar development project from 1997/1998 onwards had been provided, and documents relating to the consultancy study commissioned in 1990 on private sector participation in the redevelopment of the Central Government Offices (CGO) West Wing had also been submitted to the Subcommittee as requested. Cost-effectiveness assessments in the consultancy study were based on 1990 preliminary estimates. As the Administration did not accept the ideas put forward in the consultancy study, the Administration had not verified the consultant's preliminary estimates nor the assessment contained in the study. The current Tamar development project would be a public works programme. Hence, it would not require private sector participation in funding. The consultancy study was conducted some 16 years ago when the Tamar site was not yet formed and the circumstances, figures and data were already outdated. As such, it would not be appropriate to make any speculations on the details and cost comparisons contained in the consultancy study.

Presentation by deputations and discussion

3. At the request of Dr KWOK Ka-ki, the Chairman suggested and members agreed that each deputation would be given four minutes for their oral presentations. The Chairman then invited the deputations to present their views on the traffic and environmental issues related to the current planning for the Central Waterfront (including the Tamar Site). The deputations made their presentations. The sequence of the presentations was as follows –

Action

- (a) Mr CHAN Yiu-fai, Steve;
- (b) Hong Kong Construction Industry Employees General Union, presented by Mr CHOI Chun-wa;
- (c) Ir Prof William H K LAM;
- (d) Citizen Envisioning@Harbour, presented by Dr NG Mee-kam;
- (e) The Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors, presented by Mr Paul HO;
- (f) Ms Vicki LUKINS;
- (g) Action Group on Protection of The Harbour, presented by Mr LEE Wing-kin;
- (h) Central & Western District Council, presented by Ms CHENG Lai-king and Mr YUEN Bun-keung;
- (i) The Hong Kong Institution of Engineers, presented by Ir Dr Greg C Y WONG;
- (j) Mr Colin DAWSON;
- (k) Designing Hong Kong Harbour District/The Experience Group, Limited, presented by Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN;
- (l) Dr Bill BARRON;
- (m) Save Our Shorelines, presented by Ms YIP Yan-yan;
- (n) Clear The Air, presented by Dr Michael LEUNG Kwok-hi;
- (o) Civic Exchange, presented by Dr Jimmy FUNG;
- (p) Society For Protection Of The Harbour, presented by Ms Christine LOH;
- (q) Mr Winston Ka-sun CHU (represented by Mr Dennis LI);
- (r) WWF Hong Kong, presented by Mr Markus SHAW;
- (s) Mr John BATTEN;
- (t) Mr Norman de BRACKINGHE;
- (u) Friends of The Harbour, presented by Miss Mandy WONG;
- (v) Dr Adrian RAPER (represented by Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN);

Action

(w) Friends of the Earth (HK), presented by Mrs Mei NG; and

(x) The Hong Kong Institute of Architects, presented by Professor Bernard LIM

4. After the deputations had presented their views, members raised questions for response by the Administration.

5. The index of proceedings of the meeting was at the **Appendix**.

Motion

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

“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。”

(Translation)

“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.”

7. 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.

II The way forward

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1078/05-06(01) -- Letter dated 7 March 2006 from Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki)

8. Members agreed that the Administration should be asked to provide a written response to the views of the deputations. Dr KWOK Ka-ki suggested that after having discussed environmental and traffic issues, the Subcommittee should discuss other issues relevant to the planning for the Central waterfront. Members agreed that the next meeting would be held in May 2006 after the Administration had submitted the information requested by the Subcommittee.

Action

III Any other business

9. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 7:15 pm.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
28 July 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 Monday, 3 April 2006, at 4:30 pm
in the Chamber of the Legislative Council Building

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
000000 – 000356	Chairman	Opening remarks	
000357 – 001235	Administration	Briefing by the Administration	
001236 – 001554	Chairman	Time limit for presentation by deputations	
001555 – 001932	Mr Steve CHAN	Presentation of views Should have a fundamental change in mindset and strategy in order to improve air quality and reduce traffic problems A comprehensive review of the future development of Hong Kong was needed	
001933 – 002321	Hong Kong Construction Industry Employees General Union (HKCIEGU)	Presentation of views (LC Paper No. CB(1)1249/05-06(11))	
002322 – 002741	Ir Prof William LAM	Presentation of views (LC Paper No. CB(1)1199/05-06(01))	
002742 – 003150	Citizen Envisioning@Harbour (CEH)	Presentation of views (LC Paper No. CB(1)1249/05-06(13))	
003151 – 003331	The Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors (HKIS)	Presentation of views (LC Paper No. CB(1)1201/05-06(03))	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
003332 – 003559	Ms Vicki LUKINS	<p>Presentation of views</p> <p>High unemployment rate in the construction sector should not be a primary consideration for the Tamar development project</p> <p>Tamar should not be considered in isolation, but as an integral part of the Central waterfront</p> <p>The Government should consider other alternatives for the accommodation requirement of the Government Secretariat</p> <p>Air pollution in Hong Kong was serious affecting the citizens' quality of life significantly. Any development should take account of the impact on air quality</p> <p>There should be easy access to the waterfront, especially for physically disabled persons, the elderly and children</p>	
003600 – 003725	Action Group on Protection of the Harbour (AGPH)	<p>Presentation of views (LC Paper No. CB(1)1249/05-06(01))</p>	
003726 – 004136	Central & Western District Council (C&WDC)	<p>Presentation of views</p> <p>The areas along the Central waterfront should be revitalized and beautified</p> <p>There should be more open space and greening at the Tamar site, and a civic place where citizens could hold gatherings and other activities freely</p> <p>Consideration should be given to designating the whole Tamar site as Open Space</p> <p>The ridgeline and the view of the harbour should be protected</p>	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		<p>The Central & Western District Council had passed a motion to urge the Government to substantially reduce the amount of area for commercial uses in CRIII; prohibit the use of the reclaimed land for any commercial developments such as office premises and hotels and rezone the relevant sites to Open Space and designate all reclaimed land for public use</p> <p>The Central & Western District Council was concerned about the traffic load in the future</p> <p>There should be easy access to the waterfront. The new Central Government Complex (CGC) might block the public's access to the waterfront</p> <p>There was concern about the future use of the existing sites of CGO and Murray Building</p> <p>Consideration should be given to preserving the heritage buildings near CGO</p>	
004137 – 004523	The Hong Kong Institution of Engineers (HKIE)	<p>Presentation of views</p> <p>Agreed to the overall conceptual requirements and arrangements for the Tamar development project and CRIII. The proposed building height limit was compatible with the surrounding buildings and the plot ratio was reasonable</p> <p>Car-parks could be built underground to enable the space above to be used by the public and there should be more greening</p> <p>Reservation on the Design and Build</p>	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		<p>(D&B) approach. It was desirable to carry out the design and construction of the project in separate phases</p> <p>Should utilize mass transit systems to reduce the impact on road traffic</p> <p>Should consider using automatic people movers to connect the Tamar site with the waterfront and the transportation nodes</p>	
004524 – 004717	Mr Colin DAWSON	<p>Presentation of views</p> <p>Creating job opportunities through the Tamar development project could only provide short-term relief to the unemployment situation of the construction sector</p> <p>The Tamar site should be used for the construction of cultural facilities to attract tourists and local people</p> <p>The Government might consider using vacant office space elsewhere, such as the Cyberport, to meet its accommodation needs instead of using the Tamar site</p> <p>Should consider adjusting the fees for the cross-harbour tunnels to bring about more balanced usage</p>	
004718 – 005207	Designing Hong Kong Harbour District (DHKHD)	<p>Presentation of views (LC Paper Nos. CB(1)1210/05-06(01) and CB(1)1249/05-06(14))</p>	
005208 – 005653	Dr Bill BARRON	<p>Presentation of views (LC Paper Nos. CB(1)1249/05-06(02) and CB(1)1249/05-06(03))</p>	
005654 – 010103	Save Our Shoreline (SOS)	<p>Presentation of views (LC Paper Nos. CB(1)1249/05-06(04) and CB(1)1249/05-06(05))</p>	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
010104 – 010518	Clear The Air (CTA)	Presentation of views (LC Paper No. CB(1)1199/05-06(03))	
010519 – 010955	Civic Exchange (CEX)	Presentation of views (LC Paper Nos. CB(1)1249/05-06(06) and CB(1)1249/05-06(07))	
010956 – 011444	Society For Protection Of The Harbour (SPTH)	Presentation of views (LC Paper Nos. CB(1)1249/05-06(08) and CB(1)1249/05-06(09))	
011445 – 011909	Mr Winston Ka-sun CHU (represented by Mr Dennis LI)	Presentation of views (LC Paper No. CB(1)1210/05-06(02))	
011910 – 012248	WWF Hong Kong (WWF)	<p>Presentation of views</p> <p>Apart from costing billions of dollars for construction, the Tamar development project involved perhaps the most valuable piece of land. There should not be massive developments there. The Tamar site should be put to other uses which would create on-going jobs</p> <p>There was concern about the future use of the current CGO site. It was doubtful whether the Administration had made the case to the satisfaction of members</p>	
012249 – 012713	Mr John BATTEN	Presentation of views (LC Paper No. CB(1)1249/05-06(10))	
012714 – 013053	Mr Norman BRACKINGHE	Presentation of views (LC Paper No. CB(1)1199/05-06(02))	
013054 – 013313	Friends of The Harbour (FTH)	<p>Presentation of views</p> <p>The current planning for the Central waterfront would not provide vibrant activities, nor enhance the quality of life of citizens and attract tourists to stay in Hong Kong</p>	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		<p>High density developments at the Central waterfront and the Tamar site would lead to increased pedestrian and vehicular traffic and air pollution</p> <p>There should be comprehensive planning of the Central waterfront and a review of the planned roadway provision in the area</p> <p>If the existing sites of CGO and Murray Building were used for commercial development in the future, the traffic generated from the development would add to the traffic load and air pollution in Central</p>	
013314 – 013745	Dr Adrian RAPER (represented by Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN)	<p>Presentation of views</p> <p>There were other alternatives proposed by various parties in addition to the Administration's planning for the Central waterfront. These possibilities should be explored and there should be a comprehensive review of the planning for the Central waterfront</p> <p>The planned roadway provision and the use of footbridges far apart would prevent uninterrupted connection with the waterfront. There should be traditional pedestrian facilities and street-level activities in the new reclamation area</p>	
013746 – 014131	Friends of the Earth (HK) (FEHK)	<p>Presentation of views</p> <p>Reviving the outstanding leisure and cultural services projects of the former municipal councils would bring more employment opportunities than carrying out the Tamar development project</p> <p>There was grave concern about deterioration in air quality and</p>	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		<p>visibility in Hong Kong. Pollutants from traffic were one of the major reasons for air pollution and low visibility. Choosing the Tamar site for CGC was not a wise move as the development would cause significant deterioration of air pollution in Admiralty and Central</p> <p>Should adopt a scientific development perspective in choosing a site and planning for CGC</p>	
014132 – 014623	The Hong Kong Institute of Architects (HKIA)	<p>Presentation of views</p> <p>Supported the Tamar development project in principle. The site should not be used for large commercial developments. Designating the entire site as open space was also inappropriate</p> <p>An integrated design for CGC, Legislative Council Complex, Civic Place and Waterfront Promenade was very important</p> <p>There should be three-dimensional models to allow the public to better understand the scale of the buildings under the current planning</p> <p>Had reservation on adopting the D&B approach. An open international design competition should be held so that the community could have knowledge of the options available before deciding on an appropriate design</p> <p>There should be planning principles which should be followed</p> <p>Should ensure that the height and width of the buildings would not affect air flow</p>	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		Should provide north-south pedestrian walkways to the waterfront, ensure a good connection with the Admiralty Mass Transit Railway Station and reduce vehicular traffic to the Tamar area	
014624 – 015141	Dr KWOK Ka-ki Administration	<p>Redevelopment of CGO West Wing alone would provide more floor area than developing CGC at the Tamar site</p> <p>The Administration did not provide a list of documents as requested</p> <p>The Tamar development project would aggravate traffic congestion</p> <p>The Administration did not provide information on space requirements of CGC and information on the future use of CGO and Murray Building</p> <p>No updated EIA was conducted</p> <p>Dr KWOK moved a motion</p> <p>The Administration's response –</p> <p>(a) a list containing 11 relevant documents had already been provided at the last meeting and some of the documents provided contained information on environmental and traffic impact assessments; and</p> <p>(b) the updating of user requirements for the new CGC was in progress and the updated figures would be provided to the Panel before its meeting on 25 April 2006</p>	
015142 – 020044	Mr LEE Wing-tat Administration	Designating the existing sites of CGO and Murray Building for commercial use in the future would likely be opposed by the community	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		<p>Should conduct a comprehensive town planning study for Central, covering in particular traffic issues and pedestrian access to the waterfront</p> <p>Should control vehicular access to the Tamar site</p> <p>Although not a statutory requirement, the Administration could still conduct an in-depth EIA to identify ways to minimize the impact of the Tamar development project on the environment</p> <p>The Administration's response –</p> <p>(a) land uses for CR III had undergone the necessary statutory planning procedures and extensive public consultation, the Administration had to abide by the approved Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) which could not be changed through administrative procedures;</p> <p>(b) elevated walkways, at-grade and elevated pedestrian decks and at-grade signal controlled pedestrian crossings would provide easy access to the waterfront;</p> <p>(c) EIA for CR III had been conducted in 2001 and endorsed by the Advisory Council on the Environment;</p> <p>(d) the future use of the existing sites of CGO and Murray Building had not been decided yet; and</p> <p>(e) the Administration would take public needs and aspirations, and prevailing social and economic circumstances and other relevant</p>	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		<p>considerations into account in deciding the future use of the sites, and a comprehensive assessment taking into account land use needs; traffic, environmental and infrastructural impacts; historic value of the sites and their surroundings; tree preservation; protection of the ridgeline; and urban design guidelines, etc would be conducted. The necessary statutory planning procedures would be followed and the community would be engaged</p>	
020045 – 021034	Miss CHOY So-yuk Administration	<p>Query on whether the Administration agreed to the following –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the principle of bringing people to the harbour and bringing the harbour to the people; (b) there should be facilities conducive to vibrancy to attract people to the waterfront; (c) there should be easy access to the waterfront; and (d) the North Island Line should be constructed <p>The Administration’s response –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the Administration had put in a lot of efforts in enhancing the harbour, including the establishment of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC); (b) the work of HEC included, among others, enhancing the waterfront and advising on the planning, design and development issues of the waterfront areas; (c) HEC drafted and promulgated the 	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		<p>Harbour Planning Principles, implemented the West Kowloon Waterfront Promenade project and organized public forums to collect views on how to enhance the area around the Central piers;</p> <p>(d) the Administration and the public shared the same principles in planning for the harbour-front areas;</p> <p>(e) the CRIII was in compliance with the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance. The planning of the land uses for CRIII followed sustainable development principles, and the Vision and Goals for Victoria Harbour and the Harbour Planning Principles promulgated by the Town Planning Board and Harbour-front Enhancement Committee respectively. It provided for a diversity of land uses to meet the economic and social needs. There would be ample open and recreational space, minimal commercial development and some waterfront-related commercial and leisure uses to add vibrancy and attraction of the waterfront;</p> <p>(f) apart from the Central - Wan Chai Bypass which would run in tunnel, there would only be one new road, Road P2, running from east to west in the area, and it would be submerged near the Tamar site with a 50m to 60m wide landscaped deck above to form an at-grade connection to the waterfront;</p> <p>(g) there would be a comprehensive pedestrian network comprising a</p>	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		<p>combination of elevated walkways, at-grade and elevated pedestrian decks and at-grade signal controlled pedestrian crossings to bring people to the harbour; and</p> <p>(h) CRIII would be served by multi-modal transport. Land had been reserved for the North Island Line, the implementation of which, according to the latest assessment based on population growth and planned developments, would be deferred to after 2016</p>	
021035 – 021549	Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung	<p>The Administration did not mention any compensatory measures for damages to the environment arising from the Tamar development project</p> <p>Promoting environmental protection industries would provide 100 000 employment opportunities</p> <p>There was no guarantee from the Administration on not demolishing CGO</p>	
021550 – 022140	Mr Alan LEONG Administration	<p>As the public's expectation and demands on planning matters had changed over the years, a responsible Government should change its mindset and convince the public that its planning was better based on objective data and reasoning</p> <p>The Administration had yet to provide a detailed breakdown of the existing and future space provisions for various bureaux and the corresponding staff numbers for easy comparison</p> <p>The Administration's response –</p> <p>(a) land use for CRIII had undergone</p>	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		<p>the necessary statutory process and extensive public consultation, and the Administration had to abide by the approved OZP; and</p> <p>(b) details of the existing and future space provisions for various bureaux and the updated projection on number of staff to be accommodated in the new CGC would be submitted to the Panel</p>	
022141 – 022357	Mr Albert CHAN	<p>A lot of excuses were used as justifications for the Administration's planning without any pledge on protecting the harbour</p> <p>The use of the Tamar site should be decided by the community</p>	
022358 – 022553	Chairman	Processing of motion moved by Dr KWOK Ka-ki	
022554 – 023149	Chairman Dr KWOK Ka-ki Mr Albert CHAN Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung Administration	<p>The Administration should provide a written response to the views of the deputations</p> <p>Suggested holding a meeting in May 2006 after receiving further information from the Administration</p> <p>Date of next meeting</p>	The Administration was requested to provide the relevant information