

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)943/06-07
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/PL/PLW/1

Panel on Planning, Lands and Works

Minutes of meeting
held on Tuesday, 28 November 2006 at 2:30 pm
in Conference Room A of the Legislative Council Building

Members present : Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBM, GBS, JP (Chairman)
Prof Patrick LAU Sau-shing, SBS, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Hon James TIEN Pei-chun, GBS, JP
Hon Albert HO Chun-yan
Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai, SBS, S.B.St.J., JP
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon Bernard CHAN, GBS, JP
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP
Hon Miriam LAU Kin-ye, GBS, JP
Hon CHOY So-yuk, JP
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, JP
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon Vincent FANG Kang, JP
Hon LEE Wing-tat
Hon Daniel LAM Wai-keung, SBS, JP
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming, SBS, JP

Member attending : Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP

Members absent : Dr Hon LUI Ming-wah, SBS, JP
Hon Mrs Sophie LEUNG LAU Yau-fun, SBS, JP
Hon WONG Yung-kan, JP
Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, GBS, JP
Hon LI Kwok-ying, MH, JP

**Public officers
attending**

: Agenda item IV

Mrs Rita LAU, JP
Permanent Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands
(Planning and Lands)

Ms Annie TAM Kam-lan, JP
Deputy Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands
(Planning and Lands) 1

Mr Philip YUNG, JP
Deputy Secretary for the Environment, Transport and
Works (Transport) 1

Ms Sharon HO
Principal Assistant Secretary for the Environment,
Transport and Works (Transport) 5

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

Mr LAM Sing-kwok
Chief Engineer/Hong Kong (2)
Civil Engineering and Development Department

Mr Anthony LOO, JP
Assistant Commissioner for Transport/Urban

Mr Andy YAU
Chief Engineer/Traffic Engineering (Hong Kong)
Transport Department

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

**Attendance by
invitation**

: Agenda item IV

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

Mr K Y LEUNG, JP
Chairman

Maunsell Consultants Asia Limited

Mr Eric MA
Executive Director

EDAW City Planning Limited

Mr Derek SUN
Director

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

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

Ms Christina SHIU
Legislative Assistant (1)7

Action

I Confirmation of minutes and matters arising
(LC Paper No. CB(1)361/06-07 -- Minutes of meeting on
24 October 2006)

The minutes of the meeting held on 24 October 2006 were confirmed.

2. In relation to the suggestion made by some members at the special meeting on 14 November 2006 that the subject on "Land administration issues arising from the case involving a site under short-term tenancy in Kwun Yam Shan, Sha Tin" should be further discussed, the Chairman advised that the Public Accounts Committee was studying the Director of Audit's Report released on 15 November 2006 and conducting the related hearing. In order not to duplicate the work of the Panel with the Public Accounts Committee (PAC), the Chairman solicited members' views on the suggestion that the Panel should suspend the discussion of the subject, pending PAC's completion of its report. Thereafter, the Panel would then consider whether and how it should further follow up the matter.

3. Dr KWOK Ka-ki said that he had no particular view on the suggestion and asked whether there were any precedents from which to draw reference.

4. The Clerk said that as the Rules of Procedure and the House Rules were silent on the matter, it would be up to the Panel to make appropriate arrangements. In a previous case involving the Harbour Fest, the Panel on Financial Affairs had coordinated with PAC to avoid discussing the same issues.

5. Mr Albert CHAN said that he had previously been a member of PAC and all along, there had been an understanding that when a subject matter that was being examined by a Panel was covered in a newly issued report of the Director of Audit and the concerns of the two committees were similar, PAC should investigate the matter first because PAC's consideration of the subject matter was a statutory procedure and PAC was a standing committee and hence had the power to summon persons concerned to testify and give evidence.

6. Mr Abraham SHEK said that as PAC was conducting the relevant hearing and studying the Director of Audit's report on the subject, the Panel could follow up the relevant policy issues after PAC had completed its report.

7. Members agreed to suspend the further discussion of the subject on "Land administration issues arising from the case involving a site under short-term tenancy in Kwun Yam Shan, Sha Tin".

II Information papers issued since last meeting

(LC Paper No. CB(1)269/06-07(01) -- Letter dated 1 November 2006 from Civic Exchange enclosing its publications "The User's Guide to the Town Planning Process" and "Guide for Town Planning Board Members"

LC Paper No. CB(1)339/06-07(01) -- Information paper on "47WS -- Uprating of Salt Water Supply to Northwest Kowloon" provided by the Administration

LC Paper No. CB(1)341/06-07(01) -- Information paper on "126CD -- Drainage improvement in East Kowloon -- Package B phase 2" provided by the Administration

LC Paper No. CB(1)343/06-07(01) -- Information paper on "120CD -- Drainage improvement in Sai Kung" provided by the Administration

LC Paper No. CB(1)346/06-07(01) -- Information paper on "Capital Works Reserve Fund Block Allocations for 2007-08" provided by the Administration)

8. Members noted the information papers issued since last meeting.

III Items for discussion at the next meeting

(LC Paper No. CB(1)360/06-07(01) -- List of outstanding items for discussion

LC Paper No. CB(1)360/06-07(02) -- List of follow-up actions)

9. As the Administration did not have any proposed items for discussion for the regular meeting scheduled for 18 December 2006, members suggested the following possible items for discussion –

- (a) proposals to lower the compulsory sale threshold for specified classes of lots under the Land (Compulsory Sale for Redevelopment) Ordinance;
- (b) review on the measures to promote green features in building developments;
- (c) progress of the work of the Urban Renewal Authority;
- (d) review on the current boundaries of country parks with a view to relieving the crowded living environment of a majority of the population.

The Clerk said that proposed item (a) was discussed at the special meeting on 11 May 2006 and the Administration advised at the special meeting on 20 October 2006 that it would first report to the Panel on the outcome of the consultation exercise and then submit a legislative proposal. The Chairman instructed the Clerk to liaise with the Administration to see if it was ready to discuss the above items with the Panel.

(Post-meeting note: The Administration has proposed to discuss items (a), (b) and (c) in the second quarter of 2007, early 2007 and February/March 2007 respectively and the three items had been included in the list of outstanding items for discussion. The Administration has also advised that item (d) is not under the purview of the Panel. Accordingly, the Chairman has advised that the regular meeting in December 2006 should be cancelled.)

IV Wan Chai Development Phase II -- Concept Plan

(LC Paper No. CB(1)360/06-07(03) -- Information paper provided by the Administration

LC Paper No. CB(1)360/06-07(04) -- Background brief on "Wan Chai Development Phase II Review" prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat

LC Paper No. CB(1)231/06-07(01) -- Submission dated 2 October 2006 from Designing Hong Kong Harbour District)

10. The Permanent Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands) (PSPL) briefed members on the Wan Chai Development Phase II (WDII) project. She pointed out that a public engagement approach had been adopted for the planning; the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee had organized many public engagement activities and the Administration had conducted consultations with the relevant District Councils to solicit their views on the Concept Plan. She affirmed that the Concept Plan had been drawn up on the premise that it must comply with the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (Cap. 531) and meet the "overriding public need test", and emphasized that most of the land that would be made available by reclamation under WDII would be used as open space to meet public aspirations.

11. Mr K Y LEUNG, Chairman of the Sub-committee on Wan Chai Development Phase II Review (Subcommittee on WDII Review) of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee, said that the Sub-committee on WDII Review had endorsed the adoption of Tunnel Option Variation 1 for the Central-Wan Chai Bypass (CWB) as a basis for preparing the Concept Plan at its meeting on 13 June 2006. The views of the Town Planning Board and four relevant District Councils had been sought during August to October 2006. Public engagement activities including roving exhibitions, harbour walks and community workshops had been conducted in October 2006. The Sub-committee on WDII Review, with the assistance of the Consultants for the harbour-front enhancement review, was analyzing the views collected whereas the WDII Consultants of the Government were studying the technical feasibility of the proposals in the Concept Plan. The Sub-committee would make recommendations to the Administration after considering the findings of the two Consultants.

12. Mr Eric MA, Executive Director of Maunsell Consultants Asia Limited, delivered a Powerpoint presentation to brief members on the details of the proposals in the Concept Plan.

Waterfront enhancement

13. Mr Albert CHAN commented that the planning was haphazard with too many different elements juggled together in a disorganized manner. He considered that as the area was already by the harbourfront, there was no need for so many water features as currently planned. He pointed out that there should be overall planning to coordinate the characteristics of various precincts to avoid duplication and different themes should be adopted for the developments in different districts. He also opined that the greening works should be carefully planned, in particular caution should be taken not to block the sea view.

14. Ms Miriam LAU said that she supported the implementation of the WDII project as it would enable the construction of CWB, which was long overdue. However, she had reservation on the proposed water features in the Water Park Precinct and doubted whether water features such as fountains could attract people to the waterfront. For the Heritage Precinct, she considered that there should be sufficient attractions and facilities to bring people to the area.

15. Ms Audrey EU said that what people most wanted to have at the new waterfront was a natural and open environment where one could stroll along to enjoy the harbour view, take a rest and relax. She therefore considered that there was no need to intentionally place heritage buildings or monuments there.

16. In response, PSPL explained that the water features and the greening measures illustrated were only conceptual ideas and the detailed design would be considered at a later stage. There would be much room for creativity in the design. As for coordination of the planning for various precincts, the Administration would revisit the planning to try to minimise duplication. In relation to the Heritage Precinct, she clarified that it would not be an area for displaying any specific heritage buildings or monuments. Rather, it would be an area where activities held in olden days would be reinstated if the water quality at the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter could be improved to meet the required standard. She agreed to the idea that the design of the new waterfront should aim at providing a naturally pleasant environment.

17. Ir Dr Raymond HO expressed concern about whether the construction works of CWB would affect the public's use of leisure and recreational facilities to be provided in the waterfront and considered that there should be good coordination between the CWB construction works and the waterfront enhancement works. In response, PSPL assured members that there would be a good programme interface and a high level coordination mechanism to ensure that various works projects would proceed smoothly with minimum disturbance to the public.

18. Miss CHOY So-yuk said that the Eastern District Council had a view that the Waterfront Park should be extended from City Garden to Lei King Wan. In response, PSPL said that although the relevant outline zoning plans to be amended under the present proposal would not include Lei King Wan, the Planning Department and other relevant departments would also consider waterfront enhancement proposals which did not fall within the present study area.

19. Mr Abraham SHEK supported the implementation of CWB as soon as possible. He commented that there should be comprehensive planning in waterfront enhancement works and the Wan Chai Sports Ground and the whole of Victoria Park should be included in the study area. He considered that planning matters should not be politicized and pointed out that the public might bring out their aspirations without having concrete ideas on how to achieve those

aspirations. The Administration should adopt an out-of-the-box thinking in planning and invite architects to participate in a design competition to produce a good design for the waterfront without any pre-constraints.

20. In response, PSPL thanked Mr Abraham SHEK for his support for the project and said that there were different ways to achieve the objective of producing the best possible good design. The Administration would continue to liaise with professional bodies such as The Hong Kong Institute of Architects on design matters after finalizing the land use matters. Under the relevant amended outline zoning plans, there would be a lot of room for producing creative designs.

21. Prof Patrick LAU commented that the planning should take into consideration that it was planning for waterfront areas instead of inland areas. The planning should focus on the relationship between the sea and the land. He welcomed the idea of organizing a design competition and suggested that the Administration should put in additional efforts on the design aspects of the project. He commented that the relevant District Councils could have more discussions on their visions of the waterfront promenade. PSPL assured members that the Administration would adopt an open approach in inviting creative ideas for the design of the new harbourfront.

22. Mr LEE Wing-tat also supported the idea of organizing a design competition for the new harbourfront. He expressed concern on the odour at the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter and enquired about the plan to address the problem. Ms Miriam LAU pointed out that the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter was dirty and unattractive at present. Ms Audrey EU considered that the water quality of the harbour should be enhanced because water quality was of prime importance for the harbourfront areas and asked whether there would be any measures to improve the water quality in the harbour. Mr James TO also expressed concern on the odour at the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter and commented that the study area boundary should not include private facilities such as the Royal Hong Kong Yacht Club, as the current study area boundary might give a wrong impression that the facility would be available for public use in future.

23. In response, the Project Manager (Hong Kong Island & Islands) of the Civil Engineering and Development Department (PM/CEDD) said that environmental impact assessment was one of the focuses of the work of the Consultants. Measures such as creating an opening in the breakwater to increase water flow, cleaning up the sediments at the bottom of the sea bed, controlling up-stream pollution and regulating the use of the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter would be considered. Reclamation for treating the odour at the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter might not be able to satisfy the "overriding public need test" because there might be alternative solutions. At this stage, the Administration was inclined to adopt methods which did not require reclamation. PSPL added that phases one and two of the Harbour Area Treatment Scheme were already in progress and the Administration would continue its efforts on enhancing the water

quality of the harbour, especially for the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter. As regards the study area boundary, PM/CEDD clarified that it was for the purpose of illustrating the connectivity of various areas with the hinterland only.

Traffic issues

24. Mr Albert CHAN supported constructing CWB using the Tunnel Option and urged the Administration to implement the project as soon as possible so as to alleviate traffic congestion, provided that the project could comply with legislative requirements.

25. Dr KWOK Ka-ki considered that spending \$20 billion for the construction of CWB would be wasteful because it could not solve traffic congestion and the trunk road would probably be saturated by 2016. The Administration should reduce planned commercial developments in Central Reclamation Phase III and adopt a basket of traffic management measures to address the traffic congestion problem, such as adjusting the tolls of the cross-harbour tunnels to rationalize their usage. He considered that there should be a cost-and-benefits analysis for the CWB project to demonstrate that public funds would be well spent. Expressing a similar concern, Mr LEE Wing-tat also queried whether the \$20 billion would be well spent taking into consideration that CWB would be saturated by 2016. He asked whether the Administration had conducted any updated transport need assessment to support the construction of CWB. As regards the cross-harbour tunnels, Miss CHOY So-yuk suggested that the Administration should actively consider buying back the cross-harbour tunnels.

26. Ir Dr Raymond HO pointed out that from his experience in attending many relevant meetings, there was already a general consensus within the community on the CWB project, and he urged the Administration to implement the project as soon as possible. CWB could relieve traffic congestion and bring intangible benefits, such as improvements to the quality of life of Hong Kong people. Emphasizing that electronic road pricing was not a feasible solution given the lack of an alternative route, he urged the Administration to be decisive in implementing the CWB project.

27. In response, the Deputy Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works (Transport) 1 (DS/T1) informed the Panel that according to the Government's latest estimates, the volume to capacity ratio for CWB would be about 0.7 by 2016, i.e. CWB would still have 30% spare capacity by then. In making the forecast, factors such as population growth, economic changes, increase in the number of vehicles, planned developments and possible new railway projects had already been taken into account. The Administration had earlier provided information on the transport need assessment. He explained that the Administration had already been adopting a basket of transport management measures in solving traffic congestion in the area, such as rationalization of bus routes which had reduced the number of buses passing through the area by 17%,

and imposing restrictions on loading and unloading. The Administration was pursuing with the possibility of rationalizing usage among the cross-harbour tunnels. The measures to be adopted should be in the interest of the public, protect the value of public assets, be fair to taxpayers and comply with legal and contractual obligations. The construction of CWB was one of the measures under a multi-pronged approach to address the traffic congestion problem and it was a necessary measure. There were diverse views on electronic road pricing, but the Administration would continue to study its feasibility. The Administration would continue its efforts in further enhancing various transport management measures.

28. In relation to measures to alleviate traffic congestion and improve air quality in the area, Ms Audrey EU enquired whether the construction of an underground bus interchange could be considered. Expressing a similar view, Miss CHOY So-yuk also hoped that the Administration would provide a bus interchange so as to reduce traffic flow and improve the air quality.

29. In reply, DS/T1 said that there might be geological and technical constraints in constructing an underground or at-grade bus interchange and a detailed study would be required. PM/CEDD further explained that the alignment of the Shatin to Central Link and that of North Hong Kong Island Line and the construction of the railway station would impose restrictions on the provision of a bus interchange. DS/T1 added that the Administration would continue its efforts in rationalizing bus routes to reduce surface traffic and CWB would be a long-term solution to traffic congestion.

30. Dr KWOK Ka-ki considered that there had not been adequate consultation and queried how many members of the public knew that the construction of CWB would cost \$20 billion and require reclamation. In response, PSPL said that the Administration had tried its best in adopting an outreach approach in engaging the public for the project, including gauging public views by conducting questionnaire and road-side surveys, and consulting relevant District Councils and the Panel on Planning, Lands and Works. Surveys results showed that most of the respondents were aware of the project. The Administration had used various possible channels for conducting consultation and the entire consultation process was open and transparent. She disagreed that the consultation was unsatisfactory and emphasized that it was concrete consultation work.

Pedestrian access to the new waterfront

31. In relation to pedestrian access to the new waterfront, Mr Albert CHAN urged the Administration to ensure barrier-free access for disabled persons, provide drop-off zones and implement measures to avoid conflicts between pedestrian and bicycle traffic. In response, PSPL assured members that there would be barrier-free access for disabled persons and appropriate traffic arrangements. As regards managing pedestrian and bicycle traffic, she said that relevant departments including the Leisure and Cultural Services Department would implement appropriate measures in this regard.

32. Pointing out that the utilization rate of the waterfront would depend on the ease of access, Ms Miriam LAU suggested that large landscaped decks should be provided as far as possible instead of using simple footbridges for providing access to the waterfront. She also expressed concern about the accessibility of the proposed Waterfront Park in North Point given the presence of many flyovers in the area.

33. Miss CHOY So-yuk considered that there should be direct access to the waterfront near the Police Officers' Club and to the west of the Victoria Park. The secondary pedestrian circulation to the east of the Victoria Park should be expanded and the pedestrian access to the waterfront near Grand Hyatt Hotel should also be enhanced.

34. Expressing a similar view, Ms Audrey EU considered that apart from providing new pedestrian facilities, the Administration should improve the existing pedestrian facilities to provide easy access to the waterfront, especially the access facilities connecting the Victoria Park and the waterfront.

35. In response, PSPL agreed that accessibility was an important factor affecting the utilization rate of the waterfront and the Administration would provide sufficient pedestrian connections to further improve the accessibility of the waterfront. There would be landscaped decks for providing easy access to the waterfront, such as the one at Victoria Park which would be some 30 metres wide. In North Point, at-grade pedestrian access to the waterfront would be enhanced following a review on the planning of the Oil Street site. The Administration would provide as many connections to the waterfront as practical and the feasibility of further improving access to the waterfront would be considered.

36. Although there would be landscaped decks, Mr James TO urged the Administration to give further thoughts to enhancing pedestrian access to the waterfront, such as providing shopping streets leading to the waterfront so as to create a lively environment. He also expressed concern about the narrow pavement and the exhaust air from vehicles in the area near the Police Officers' Club, and asked whether it would be possible to widen the pavement by constructing boardwalks.

37. In response, PM/CEDD said that there would be easy access to the waterfront from the hinterland and the landscaped decks would be some 30 metres wide. The Administration would give further thoughts to the incorporation of shops and leisure facilities into the pedestrian connections during the detailed design stage. Unlike the area near the Victoria Park where the seawall was sloping, the seawall near Hung Hing Road fronting Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter was vertical. Providing boardwalks at that location to widen the pedestrian pavement would be subject to confirmation that the proposal would comply with the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance.

38. Referring to the utilization rate and accessibility of the waterfront near the Central Ferry Piers, Mr LEE Wing-tat had reservation on how the Administration could convince him that there would be easy access to the Wan Chai waterfront after completion of the enhancement works under WDII. He pointed out that some of the existing pedestrian connections to the waterfront in Wan Chai were under-utilized and urged the Administration to improve the existing pedestrian connections to raise the utilization rates of the waterfront areas. He further pointed out that good pedestrian connections alone would not be sufficient to attract people to the waterfront.

39. In response, PSPL pointed out that easy access would be conducive to increasing people flow, and the Administration would consider measures to expedite the enhancement works to existing connections. However, the most important factor affecting people flow was whether people had the incentive to go to a particular place for certain purposes. After the facilities at the waterfront had been enhanced, more people would be attracted to the waterfront. The future waterfront would be spacious and there would be a variety of activities to attract people to the waterfront. Unlike the Central waterfront where pedestrian flow would be low after office hours, Wan Chai had many residents and the Administration considered that with the provision of various kinds of facilities, people would be attracted to the Wan Chai waterfront. After tackling the environmental problems at the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter, the Administration would try to promote the reinstatement of olden day activities there to attract people to the waterfront, such as providing dining facilities on vessels. The Administration would also explore the feasibility of providing boardwalks which would not contravene the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance.

Reclamation issues

40. Dr KWOK Ka-ki expressed concern about whether the reclamation in the WDII project would meet the "overriding public need test". Expressing a similar concern, Ms Miriam LAU asked whether the proposed area of reclamation could be further reduced. Ms Audrey EU asked whether the proposed reclamation area was already the minimum. Prof Patrick LAU enquired about the depth of the CWB tunnel and commented that cross-sectional illustrations in addition to plans from an aerial perspective would provide a better understanding of the configurations of the various existing and planned infrastructure facilities at/along the waterfront, and this in turn would help assessing whether the proposed area of reclamation was indeed the minimum.

41. In response, PSPL said that the Administration would ensure that the project would meet the "overriding public need test". There was a present need for constructing CWB and the proposed area of reclamation of about 15 hectares was already the minimum extent of reclamation subject to further detailed assessment by the consultants. She agreed that cross-sectional illustrations would be helpful and they would be provided when needed. As regards the depth of CWB, PM/CEDD explained that the tunnel structure of CWB would be above sea bed

when it passed over the tunnel structure of the Mass Transit Railway Tsuen Wan line to the west of the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre and the top of the tunnel structure would be above water surface during low tide. It would then descend and pass under the tunnel structure of the Cross-Harbour Tunnel at a depth of -30 mPD. The CWB tunnel structure would remain under the seabed when it passed through the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter. At the eastern end of the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter, it would rise to connect with the Island Eastern Corridor at an appropriate gradient.

Other planning issues

42. Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming enquired about the purpose of the Harbour Education Centre and the reason for swapping the locations of the Indoor Games Hall and Training Pool and the Wan Chai North Public Transport Interchange after their reprovisioning.

43. In response, PSPL said that the Harbour Education Centre was aimed at providing a venue for organizing exhibitions on topics such as oceanography and marine navigation. It was just a concept at present and the Administration would only implement the project if the public supported the idea. As regards the swapping of the locations of the Indoor Games Hall and Training Pool and the Wan Chai North Public Transport Interchange, PM/CEDD explained that the facilities had to be reprovisioned in order to provide a site for the Exhibition Station (Station) of the Shatin to Central Link and the North Hong Kong Island Line of the Mass Transit Railway. The Consultants recommended that the facilities should be reprovisioned in-situ so as to minimize using land on the waterfront. The Wan Chai North Public Transport Interchange would be temporarily relocated to the waterfront during the construction of the Station, thus vacating the site for the construction works of the western part of the Station, above which the Indoor Games Hall and Training Pool would be reprovisioned. The original site of the Indoor Games Hall and Training Pool would then be used for the construction of the eastern part of the Station, above which the Wan Chai North Public Transport Interchange would be reprovisioned. Under this arrangement, the reprovisioned facilities would be completed first before the original facilities were affected. The areas of the facilities would not be reduced after they had been reprovisioned.

44. Miss CHOY So-yuk suggested that the proposed Ventilation Building near Watson Road should be relocated to a place further away from the residential areas. She was worried that the noise generated by the Ventilation Building would affect nearby residents because she considered that the environmental impact assessment requirements for noise level was too lenient. She suggested that the Ventilation Building should be moved further out towards the harbour side. She also suggested that the portal of the CWB tunnel should be relocated to a place further to the east, such as Tai Koo Shing.

45. In response, PSPL explained that the Ventilation Building would only be 25 mPD high and the noise and air current it generated would not adversely affect the residents. She emphasized that environmental impact assessment requirements would be complied with. PM/CEDD further explained that the Ventilation Building would accommodate the facilities to provide fresh air into the tunnel of CWB and extract exhaust air from the CWB tunnel. As such, its location would be dependent on the alignment of the tunnel and it should be as near to the tunnel as possible. The Administration would implement measures to reduce various impacts on residents, such as visual and noise impacts. As regards the location of the portal, DS/T1 said that the proposed location of the portal would enable the construction of CWB to proceed as soon as possible. PM/CEDD added that the location of the CWB tunnel portal was proposed so that CWB could connect with the Island Eastern Corridor. Relocating the portal further to the east would unnecessarily duplicate the road infrastructure and more reclamation would be required.

V Any other business

46. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 4:45 pm.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
12 February 2007