

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)2149/06-07
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/PL/PLW/1

Panel on Planning, Lands and Works

**Minutes of special meeting
held on Tuesday, 29 May 2007 at 10:45 am
in the Chamber of the Legislative Council Building**

- Members present** : Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBM, GBS, JP (Chairman)
Prof Hon 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
Dr Hon LUI Ming-wah, SBS, JP
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon Bernard CHAN, GBS, JP
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP
Hon Mrs Sophie LEUNG LAU Yau-fun, SBS, JP
Hon WONG Yung-kan, JP
Hon Miriam LAU Kin-yee, GBS, 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
- Members attending** : Hon CHAN Yuen-han, JP
Hon WONG Kwok-hing, MH
- Members absent** : Hon CHOY So-yuk, JP
Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, GBS, JP
Hon LI Kwok-ying, MH, JP

Public officers attending : Agenda item I

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 MA Lee-tak, JP
Project Manager (Hong Kong Island and Islands)
Civil Engineering and Development Department

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

Ms Phyllis LI
Chief Town Planner/Special Duties
Planning Department

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

Mr WAN Man-leung
Deputy Project Manager/Major Works 2
Highways Department

Agenda item II

Mrs Rita LAU NG Wai-lan
Permanent Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands
(Planning and Lands)

Miss WONG Yuet-wah
Principal Assistant Secretary for Housing, Planning and
Lands (Planning and Lands) 2

Miss Patricia SO Pui-sai
Assistant Commissioner for Tourism 4
Economic Development and Labour Bureau

Miss Winky SO Yuen-ling
Principal Assistant Secretary for Economic Development
and Labour (Port, Maritime & Logistics)

Miss Janet WONG Chin-kiu
Principal Assistant Secretary for Home Affairs
(Recreation & Sport)

Mr Michael CHAN Chun-fung
District Planning Officer (Sai Kung and Islands)
Planning Department

Mr MA Lee-tak
Project Manager (Hong Kong Island and Islands)
Civil Engineering and Development Department

Mrs Christina KWONG LAU Po-yuk
Deputy Project Manager (Hong Kong Island and Islands)
Civil Engineering and Development Department

Dr WONG Fook-ye
Assistant Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and
Conservation (Country and Marine Parks)

Mr Eric CHAN Sui-wai
Assistant Director of Environmental Protection
(Conservation)

Mr CHENG Ting-ning
Project Manager
(Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge Hong Kong)
Highways Department

Mr Byron LAM Saint-kit
District Officer (Islands District Office)
Home Affairs Department

Mr Eddy YAU Kwok-yin
Assistant Director of Leisure and Cultural Services
(Leisure Services) 3

Dr Louis NG Chi-wa
Assistant Director of Leisure and Cultural Services
(Heritage and Museums)

Mr CHENG Hung-leung
Chief Engineer/Traffic Engineering
(New Territories East)
Transport Department

Attendance by invitation : **Agenda item I**

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

Mr K Y LEUNG, JP
Chairman

Maunsell Consultants Asia Limited

Mr Eric MA
Executive Director

EADAW 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

Miss Clara LO
Legislative Assistant (1)3

I Wan Chai Development Phase II Review - Recommended Outline Development Plan and proposed amendments to relevant Outline Zoning Plans

- (LC Paper No. CB(1)1723/06-07(01) -- Information paper provided by the Administration
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1723/06-07(02) -- Background brief on "Wan Chai Development Phase II Review" prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1742/06-07(01) -- Letter dated 15 May 2007 from Society for Protection of the Harbour)

As the Administration had failed to provide the paper for the agenda item five clear days before the meeting, the Chairman consulted members on whether the Panel should discuss the agenda item at the present meeting.

2. While expressing support for discussing the agenda item at the present meeting, Mr LEE Wing-tat pointed out that some other committees of the Legislative Council (LegCo) also faced the same problem of late submission of papers by the Administration. He would write a letter to reflect the situation to the House Committee. He sought an explanation on why the Administration could not provide the paper for the agenda item on time.

3. Mr CHAN Kam-lam considered that as the planning review in question involved important long-term planning which could not be easily amended afterwards, the Administration should be allowed sufficient time to prepare the paper and members should be given sufficient time to peruse the Administration's paper. He thus suggested that the subject could be further discussed at future meetings if needed.

4. Dr KWOK Ka-ki shared the view that the Administration had failed to provide meeting papers in a timely manner for other LegCo committees as well. He considered that such a practice of the Administration was disrespectful to LegCo and non-conducive to enhancing the relationship between the Administration and the legislature.

5. Mr Alan LEONG also pointed out that many other committees faced the same situation of late submission of papers by the Administration. He indicated that Ms Audrey EU, Chairperson of the Civic Party, had written a letter to the Chairman of the House Committee on the matter. Nevertheless, he expressed support for discussing the agenda item at the present meeting.

6. The Chairman suggested and members agreed that the agenda item should be discussed at the present meeting and the Administration should be reminded to provide papers promptly for future meetings.

7. The Deputy Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands) 1 (DS/P&L1) apologized for the late submission of the papers for this meeting, and indicated that the Administration would endeavour to submit papers for future meetings in a timely manner.

8. The Project Manager (Hong Kong Island and Islands) of the Civil Engineering and Development Department (PM/CEDD) and the Chief Town Planner/Special Duties of the Planning Department (CTP/PlanD) delivered a Powerpoint presentation to brief members on the details of the Administration's proposals, including the background of the project, the need for the Central-Wan Chai Bypass (CWB), the Report on Cogent and Convincing Materials to demonstrate Compliance with the Overriding Public Need Test (CCM Report), the Recommended Outline Development Plan, proposed amendments to the relevant Outline Zoning Plans, overall planning considerations and major land uses. The Recommended Outline Development Plan and the CCM Report had been submitted to the Town Planning Board for consideration on 3 April 2007. The Administration planned to gazette the draft Outline Zoning Plans, the proposed reclamation and all CWB-related road schemes in July 2007, and submit the financial proposal to the Public Works Subcommittee for consideration in May 2008. The works were expected to commence in end of 2008 or early 2009.

(Post-meeting note: The softcopy of the presentation materials (LC Paper No. CB(1)1805/06-07(01)) was issued to members on 31 May 2007.)

Reclamation issues

9. Dr KWOK Ka-ki queried why the extent of reclamation proposed by the Administration had kept changing, though it was purported to be the minimum extent of reclamation required each time. He recalled that some few years ago, the proposed extent of reclamation area was over 20 hectares (ha). It was 15 ha in last year's proposal, and was now reduced to 12.7 ha. He opined that the Administration should strive for a "zero reclamation" option. He asked what the Administration had done to ensure that the proposed reclamation could meet the overriding public need test and whether the Administration would commission any independent assessment in this regard.

10. In response, PM/CEDD explained that different extents of reclamation would be required under different options for constructing CWB, and as more comprehensive and in-depth studies on the construction options for CWB had been carried out, a more precise estimate of the extent of reclamation could be worked out. The CCM Report confirmed that Tunnel Option Variation 1 would require the minimum extent of reclamation of 12.7 ha.

11. Mr LEE Wing-tat considered that the extent of reclamation should be as small as possible. He asked how much of the 12.7 ha of proposed reclamation would be used for constructing the bridge piers of CWB and whether some of the

reclaimed land would be designated for commercial use. He considered that waterfront enhancement works between Wan Chai North and Causeway Bay could be carried out without reclamation.

12. In response, PM/CEDD explained that CWB would be constructed using the tunnel option. Whether reclamation was required at a location would depend on the depth of the tunnel at that location. If the tunnel was under the seabed, no reclamation would be required. Seawalls would be required to offer protection if the tunnel was above the seabed. The strategy adopted by the consultants was to keep the tunnel under the seabed as far as possible. A minimum of 12.7 ha of reclamation would be required for constructing the tunnel, seawalls and connection points with the Island Eastern Corridor (IEC), and there would be an additional 0.4 ha of affected water area due to the construction of new flyover structures for connection to the IEC. No reclamation would be carried out for the purpose of providing land for waterfront enhancement whilst the Administration had pledged that land formed incidental to the construction of CWB would be used for waterfront enhancement. Chapter 7 of the CCM Report contained the details of the assessment of the minimum reclamation required for the construction of CWB. DS/P&L1 emphasized that reclamation would be undertaken for the construction of CWB only and a very small portion of the waterfront land formed for the construction of the CWB would be designated for "Other Specified Uses (Waterfront Related Commercial and Leisure Uses)" so as to create a vibrant waterfront for the public. CTP/PlanD added that only about 0.34 ha of the 12.7 ha of reclaimed land would be for such uses and the developments would be low-rise and low-density.

13. Mr WONG Kwok-hing queried whether any reclamation under the Wan Chai Development Phase II (WDII) project was aimed at creating land for sale for commercial use. He also queried whether the five character precincts were just pretense for reclamation. He considered the reclamation off the coast of Harbour Heights unnecessary. He said that residents in Eastern District and North Point objected to the reclamation at North Point and queried whether such a large extent of reclamation was required for the construction of the tunnel portal. They also objected to the location of the ventilation building and were concerned that the exhaust air would affect the air quality and the health of the residents. If the purpose of the reclamation was to create a continuous waterfront, methods which would not require reclamation, such as constructing boardwalks, should be considered. The Eastern District Council had passed a motion expressing objection to the reclamation at North Point. The Administration was misleading in saying that it had consulted all relevant District Councils because it might give an impression that all those District Councils supported the Administration proposal. Although the extent of reclamation had been reduced, the question of whether reclamation was necessary remained unanswered. He was also worried that the breakwater near North Point might affect tidal flow into and out of the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter.

14. In response, PM/CEDD affirmed that the extent of reclamation was entirely based on a technical analysis with reference to the depth of the tunnel at various locations and all the reclaimed land would be put to public use. Locating the tunnel portal at North Point would provide good connectivity to the existing road networks and require the least extent of reclamation. As regards the design of the tunnel portal, there would be a landscaped deck to minimize visual and noise impacts. Two consultation sessions on the location of the ventilation building had been held by the Highways Department and the Civil Engineering and Development Department with local residents on 14 and 15 April 2007 and the concerns of the residents had been taken note of. Under the current proposal, the exhaust vent would be separated from the ventilation building, with the former for expelling exhaust air and the latter solely for air intake. The exhaust vent would be located at the northern end of the eastern breakwater of the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter, and the ventilation building would be a solid structure without openings except for the air intake vent.

15. As regards the breakwater near North Point, Mr Eric MA, Executive Director of Maunsell Consultants Asia Limited, clarified that it was an existing one and reclamation at North Point would not affect tidal flow into and out of the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter. DS/P&L1 said that the CCM Report contained details about how the WDII project could meet the overriding public need test. She had taken note of the Eastern District Council's views on reclamation at North Point and pointed out that the Administration would maintain dialogue with the Eastern District Council in following up the matter.

16. Ir Dr Raymond HO commented that the Administration had spent a lot of efforts in substantially reducing the extent of reclamation to 12.7 ha. He considered the request for constructing CWB with "zero reclamation" unreasonable because it did not have any theoretical basis and did not take into consideration engineering requirements, such as provision of land for connection between CWB and other road infrastructures and construction of seawalls to protect the tunnel.

17. Noting that it was not feasible to construct CWB with "zero reclamation", Prof Patrick LAU was concerned about how the Administration could reduce the extent of reclamation as far as possible. He asked whether the extent of reclamation could be reduced near the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre (HKCEC), and between the seawalls and the tunnel. He enquired whether water features could be provided above the tunnel on the reclaimed land so as to reduce the visual impact of reclamation. He also asked whether cross-sectional plans were available to provide a better understanding of the depth of the tunnel.

18. In response, Mr Eric MA, Executive Director of Maunsell Consultants Asia Limited, said that using minimum reclamation as a target, the extent of reclamation had already been reduced substantially after conducting many detailed technical studies on the horizontal and vertical alignments of CWB. As the tunnel

would be above seabed near HKCEC, a seawall would be required and the technical requirement was that it had to be at a minimum distance of some 30-odd metres from the tunnel. There was no unnecessary reclamation. As regards the provision of water features, the public and the relevant District Council had been consulted and there was a view that as the project area was already by the sea, it would be desirable to provide more open space and greening instead. PM/CEDD added that Annex O to the CCM Report contained all the relevant cross-sectional plans, alignment plans of the CWB and plans of the seawalls. The consultants had conducted detailed studies and concluded that the proposed extent of reclamation of 12.7 ha was the minimum required for construction of CWB.

19. Ms Miriam LAU said that after over 10 years of extensive research and discussions, it was time to implement CWB. The Liberal Party did not support reclamation, but it would not object to reclamation if it was required for the provision of necessary facilities provided that the extent of reclamation would be kept to the minimum. She welcomed the reduction in the extent of reclamation and urged the Administration to make every effort in minimizing the extent of reclamation in implementing CWB.

20. Referring to the overriding public need test mentioned in the relevant judgment of the Court of Final Appeal and an alternative proposal from Swire Properties Limited at Annex H to the CCM report, Mr Alan LEONG queried whether the reclamation at some of the locations could meet the test, such as that between HKCEC and the Royal Hong Kong Yacht Club where there were patches of land zoned for "Other Specified Uses" (OU) and facilities like waterfront alfresco dining and sculpture walk would be provided. He asked whether the water body near the Wan Chai Ferry Pier could be retained by constructing a breakwater to protect the CWB tunnel. He was unconvinced that reclamation at that location could meet the overriding public need test if there was an alternative to reclamation.

21. In response, PM/CEDD emphasized that the Administration considered that the CWB would meet the overriding public need test. The Administration had to prove that the extent of reclamation required for its construction was the minimum. The construction strategy was for CWB to remain under the seabed as far as possible so as to avoid permanent reclamation. However, where this was infeasible due to constraints such as the presence of the tunnel of the Mass Transit Railway (MTR) Tsuen Wan Line and the need for constructing slip roads and seawalls for protecting the CWB tunnel, reclamation would be required. In order to put the reclaimed land to the best use for the public, harbourfront enhancement proposals had been put forward for public discussion. The facilities mentioned by Mr LEONG were some of the facilities covered by the proposals. The provision of those facilities in itself would not meet the overriding public need test but the construction of CWB would.

22. PM/CEDD further explained that as the CWB tunnel would be above the sea surface near the Wan Chai Ferry Pier, constructing a breakwater to protect the CWB tunnel to reduce reclamation would create two water bodies, one between the breakwater and the CWB tunnel and the other between the CWB tunnel and the shoreline. As several rainwater drainage culverts would discharge into the stagnant water bodies, environmental problems would result. The consultants thus recommended that reclamation should be carried out at that location, and HEC had discussed the issue twice and accepted that recommendation. In considering what constituted a reasonable alternative, all circumstances should be considered, including the economic, environmental and social implications of each alternative. DS/P&L1 added that there had been three stages of public consultation and the Administration had considered all the relevant economic, environmental and social implications.

Traffic issues

23. Mr Albert HO queried the fundamental issue of whether there was an overriding public need for the CWB. He queried that based on the same rationale, reclamation might again be required for constructing additional roads after CWB had become saturated. He was worried that if litigation was brought against the WDI project, the Administration would find it difficult to defend its position if it did not have information on the effectiveness or otherwise of traffic management measures implemented in other places such as London and Singapore. He disagreed to the view that traffic management measures, such as electronic road pricing (ERP), should not be further pursued. The Administration should have provided updated information to demonstrate the effectiveness or otherwise of implementing ERP in London and should not be biased by claiming that implementing ERP in Hong Kong would affect commercial interests. The Administration should also have provided quantitative data on the estimated reduction in traffic flow resulting from the implementation of various traffic management measures, such as restricting private vehicles from entering the Central Business District (CBD), providing more bus interchange arrangements, and rationalizing bus routes and the usage of the cross-harbour tunnels, to convince Members and the public that CWB was indispensable in solving traffic congestion. The Administration should not assume that District Councils would necessarily object to rationalization of bus routes because the public's mentality on protecting the harbour had changed.

24. In response, the Deputy Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works (Transport) 1 (DS/T1) said that various traffic management measures had already been in place to reduce traffic flow. For instance, the rationalization of bus routes over the past few years had resulted in a 17% drop in the number of buses entering the CBD area. Although the Administration would review the bus routes each year, any proposed changes had to undergo consultation with and be accepted by the public. Discussion on rationalization of the usage of the cross-harbour tunnels was already in progress but before any substantial achievements could be attained, CWB would still play an important role. CWB was the last link of the

strategic road network along the northern shore of the Hong Kong Island. It was indispensable because the volume to capacity ratio of the Connaught Road Central/Harcourt Road/Gloucester Road Corridor (the Corridor) had exceeded 1.2, indicating serious traffic congestion. With CWB in place, the ratio would only be 0.7 by 2016. PM/CEDD added that the Expert Panel on Sustainable Transport Planning and Central-Wan Chai Bypass (Expert Panel) had considered and confirmed the need for CWB and the details of traffic forecasts and effects of traffic management measures were provided in Annex E to the CCM Report.

25. The Chief Engineer/Traffic Engineering (Hong Kong) of the Transport Department (CE/TD) supplemented that among the vehicles entering CBD, about one-third were private vehicles, one-third were taxis and the remaining one-third were other vehicles. Restricting vehicles from entering CBD would affect loading and unloading activities and commercial operations and the Expert Panel had already considered this suggestion. The Administration had conducted quantitative traffic modelling to test various scenarios and the results indicated that CWB was required even if the proposed developments in Central Reclamation Phase III were removed. The volume to capacity ratio of the Corridor would be greater than 1.2, indicating that traffic would be higher than the planned capacity of the Corridor. The Administration had taken on board the Expert Panel's recommendation that a basket of traffic management measures should be adopted in parallel with the construction of CWB.

26. Ms Miriam LAU said that as implementing ERP would require an alternative route, CWB could serve the purpose and provide the requisite condition for implementing ERP. Without an alternative route, ERP would not be effective in alleviating traffic congestion.

27. Mr LEE Wing-tat was unconvinced of the Administration's claim that adjusting the usage of the cross-harbour tunnels would have little effect on alleviating traffic congestion in the area. The \$20 billion for constructing CWB could be used for providing a daily subsidy of \$40 to 40 000 vehicles for using the Western Harbour Crossing for 50 years. Alternatively, the Administration could save \$8 billion by buying back the Western Harbour Crossing at a cost of \$12 billion. Spending \$20 billion for constructing CWB would only provide a solution for about 15 years. Using the same amount as subsidy would provide a solution for 50 years. Buying back the Western Harbour Crossing would provide a long-term solution. Traffic management measures, such as alternate-day driving could be implemented in parallel to solve traffic congestion. If the traffic congestion problem could be resolved using these alternative measures, spending \$20 billion for constructing CWB would just be a waste of public funds. He however objected to the idea of restricting buses from entering CBD because the provision of public transport would reduce the number of private vehicles.

28. In response, CE/TD explained that even if the usage of the Western Harbour Crossing could be raised, many of those vehicles using this tunnel would still have to pass through CBD before reaching their destinations and thus there would be little effect in alleviating traffic congestion. Traffic management measures such as restricting loading and unloading activities in CBD and rationalization of bus routes had been implemented and the number of bus trips passing through the area had been reduced in the past years. However, such measures alone could not solve traffic congestion in the long run and CWB, together with other traffic management measures such as restricted road usage, would offer a long-term solution. DS/T1 reiterated that the Administration had already adopted a basket of traffic management measures to alleviate traffic congestion in the area.

Sites zoned for Other Specified Uses

29. Mr WONG Kwok-hing sought clarification on why there were three sites designated for "OU (Waterfront Related Commercial and Leisure Uses)" near the Wan Chai Ferry Pier if the reclaimed land was for the construction of CWB, and enquired about the uses of those OU sites. He was concerned that the total area of all the "OU" sites amounted to 17.01 ha, representing 24.03% of the area covered by the Recommended Outline Development Plan.

30. Making reference to the proposed hotel and office developments near Two International Finance Centre, Mr Alan LEONG queried whether the "OU" sites in the project area would be used for commercial developments.

Admin 31. Expressing a similar concern, Dr KWOK Ka-ki was concerned about the uses of the "OU" sites. He requested the Administration to provide the number of "OU" sites that had been rezoned for commercial use over the past 5 to 10 years.

32. Mr Albert CHAN also expressed concern on the uses of the OU sites in the relevant Outline Zoning Plans and was worried that the Administration would change the uses of those sites discreetly.

33. In response, CTP/PlanD clarified that most of the OU sites shown in the Recommended Outline Development Plan represented existing uses such as the HKCEC and the Extension, the Royal Hong Kong Yacht Club and the Police Officers' Club. Except for the three "OU(Waterfront Related Commercial and Leisure Uses)" sites near the Wan Chai Ferry Pier, all new OU sites would be for public facilities such as a helipad, a ferry pier, railway ventilation buildings and station facilities and amenities areas. The three "OU(Waterfront Related Commercial and Leisure Uses)" sites would only amount to 0.34 ha and they would be for low-rise and low-density waterfront related commercial and leisure uses to enhance the vibrancy and attractiveness of the waterfront. As the area of the waterfront space from Wan Chai to North Point would be over 10 ha, the waterfront would lack vibrancy if the whole area was designated as a park. The permitted uses of the "OU(Waterfront Related Commercial and Leisure Uses)"

sites were clearly specified in Column 1 and Column 2 of the Notes of the Draft Wan Chai North Outline Zoning Plan. There were also restrictions on gross floor area and building heights. The planning intention and scale of development were clearly specified and would not be changed discreetly.

Appointment of consultants

Admin

34. Dr KWOK Ka-ki was worried that the consultants, Maunsell Consultants Asia Limited, appointed for both the WDII project and the CWB project would have conflict of interest. As the Administration might be seen as not meeting the overriding public need test and litigation might arise, the lack of independent consultants would be problematic. He requested the Administration to provide information on the amount of consultancy fees paid to Maunsell Consultants Asia Limited for undertaking various Government consultancy projects over the past 10 years and the consultancy fees it would receive in future if the projects in relation to WD II were approved to substantiate its claim that the consultants had no conflict of interest.

35. In response, DS/P&L1 said that the Administration respected the relevant judgment of the Court of Final Appeal and would strictly comply with the legal requirements and handle the issue with extreme prudence to avoid any unnecessary litigation. As regards appointment of consultants, PM/CEDD explained that in view of the complexity of the projects and resource constraints, the Administration would usually engage consultants for such kinds of projects. The consultants were appointed through an open and fair tendering process and they were required under the consultancy brief to demonstrate that their recommendations would meet the overriding public need test. The Administration had provided the relevant consultancy brief to this Panel in early 2007. The consultancy fees for the design and monitoring of works would not be dependent on the scale of the construction works. The independence and professionalism of the consultants should not be queried.

36. Ir Dr Raymond HO commented that engaging consultants when necessary was an established practice because the Administration had to contain its staffing establishment. The tender exercise was open and fair and consultants from all over the world could participate.

Waterfront enhancement

37. Mr Albert CHAN welcomed a reduction in the extent of reclamation. He however was disappointed at the planning because it had failed to inject a new look for the waterfront. The planning lacked characteristics and was just an over-juggling of components without any macroscopic design concepts. He considered that the planning and consultation were analogical to political pie-sharing aimed at preserving vested interests. Some of his previous suggestions, such as allowing the breakwater near the Royal Hong Kong Yacht Club for public use by providing a bridge connection, had not been included in the

present proposal. He had strongly objected to the idea of providing water features because the area was already by the sea. He urged the Administration to organize an open competition to identify a design for the new waterfront which Hong Kong people would support and be proud of.

38. As regards the proposed ornamental ponds with fountain show in the Water Park Precinct and the helipad in the Arts and Culture Precinct, Ms Miriam LAU asked whether the implementation or otherwise of the proposals would be based on the survey results presented in the Public Engagement Report for the Realization Stage. She had reservations on the proposed ornamental ponds. As those survey results could only reflect the public's preference on the original suggestions in the Concept Plan, she asked how the Administration would handle alternative ideas on those proposals.

39. In response, DS/P&L1 said that the Administration and HEC had conducted three stages of public consultation and considered Mr Albert CHAN's views on the provision of water features. Mr K Y LEUNG, Chairman of HEC Sub-committee on Wan Chai Development Phase II Review, explained that as the proposals in the Concept Plan were formulated based on the public views collected during the Envisioning Stage, it was not surprising that the public had a higher acceptance of the proposals. There was a consensus on using the site for the Water Park Precinct as a park. The difference in views was only whether water features should be used as the theme. Designating a theme for the park was more of a design issue than a planning issue and the exact theme could be further considered at the detailed planning and design stage of the harbourfront enhancement proposals. PM/CEDD added that the current proposals had reflected the views of the public as far as possible. The Administration noted that there had been divergent views on the use of water features as the theme for the Water Park Precinct. The Administration would review the popularity of the current facilities during the detailed planning and design stage of the harbourfront enhancement proposals and there would be further consultation on the matter.

Public consultation

40. Dr KWOK Ka-ki considered that there was insufficient public consultation and the Administration could not claim that a consensus had been reached based on such limited consultation. He considered that HEC had not fulfilled its responsibility in protecting the harbour. He sought information on the number of participants of the consultation activities, the channels through which the Administration had publicized the consultation activities and whether there were any models for public display.

41. In response, DS/P&L1 said that the Administration and HEC had conducted three stages of public consultation and a Sub-committee on Wan Chai Development Phase II Review was specifically formed under HEC to carry out the Harbour-front Enhancement Review - Wan Chai, Causeway and Adjoining Areas. The public consultation exercises had won praises and support from some quarters

of the community and the Administration was grateful to HEC for their hard work. Professional organizations and relevant District Councils were collaborators of the Administration and information about the consultation exercises was disseminated through this extensive network to the public so as to encourage their participation. Many submissions, including those from Legislative Council Members, had been received during the consultation exercises. Mr K Y LEUNG, Chairman of HEC Sub-committee on Wan Chai Development Phase II Review, added that during the Realization Stage of the said review, activities such as two harbour walks and two community workshops were conducted with over 100 participants each time. A model for the Concept Plan was on display to the public during roving exhibitions held in Government buildings and MTR stations in Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Admiralty from 6 October 2006 to 2 November 2006, and a total of 388 view collection forms had been received.

42. Ir Dr Raymond HO commented that the Administration had conducted extensive and in-depth public consultation, with participants from various sectors of society. Many local residents wanted the Administration to implement the WDII and CWB projects as soon as possible to enhance the waterfront and alleviate traffic congestion. Without CWB, Hong Kong's economy and the people's livelihood would be affected.

General planning issues

43. Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming commented that the subject had been discussed for many times and it was an improvement that the extent of reclamation had been reduced. He hoped that the extent of reclamation could be as small as possible. He considered the layout for the five character precincts acceptable. However, he pointed out that swapping the location of the Harbour Road Sports Centre and Wan Chai Swimming Pool with that of the Wan Chai North Public Transport Interchange after their reprovisioning was unsatisfactory if the Exhibition Station of the Shatin to Central Link could not materialize, because the sites for sports facilities would become separated. In this regard, he enquired about the progress of the planning for the Shatin to Central Link. As regards coach parking facilities, he asked whether they would also be provided near the Golden Bauhinia Square so that visitors did not have to return to the coach park located to the east of Wan Chai Sports Ground after visiting the Golden Bauhinia Square.

44. In response, DS/T1 said that the proposal for the Shatin to Central Link would be submitted to the LegCo within six months after the completion of the legislative process for the proposed merger of the MTR and Kowloon-Canton Railway systems. Cross-harbour transport needs would be taken into consideration. The Exhibition Station would be an important consideration in the planning for the Shatin to Central Link and its location was based on transport needs and public needs for accessing HKCEC. The provision of various kinds of facilities would be examined in the detailed planning stage with a view to minimizing inconvenience to the public. In relation to coach parking facilities, PM/CEDD said that in order to avoid congestion, there would only be drop-off and

pick-up points near the Golden Bauhinia Square and coach drivers could use the proposed coach parks nearby at Convention Avenue and to the east of Wan Chai Sports Ground. In response to Mr CHEUNG's further enquiry, Mr Eric MA, Executive Director of Maunsell Consultants Asia Limited, added that there would be nine parking spaces at the coach park located to the east of Wan Chai Sports Ground.

45. Mr CHAN Kam-lam commented that the substantial reduction in the extent of reclamation was the result of a lot of hard work. He asked whether any drawings on the vertical profile of CWB was available to demonstrate the depth of the tunnel at various locations and whether the change in the gradient of the tunnel arising from the need to avoid existing structures would affect the smoothness of the traffic. As regards the provision of open space, noting that there would also be open space at the Tamar site to the west of Wan Chai, he wondered whether there would be too much open space under the project area. Consideration could be given to designating some of the open space for an exhibition hall, for displaying reunification gifts for instance, as an additional tourist attraction.

46. In response, PM/CEDD said that Figure 4.14 of Annex G to the CCM Report presented a detailed vertical profile of the CWB tunnel. He assured members that the design of the tunnel would meet engineering and transport standards and a maximum allowable gradient of 3% would be adopted for descending into the tunnel and ascending to ground level so to reduce the extent of reclamation. Instead of providing bland open space, there would be five character precincts with different land uses where facilities for various kinds of activities would be provided, with the western end of the project site designated as an art and culture precinct. Opportunities for the provision of various kinds of facilities would be further considered in the detailed planning and design stage of the harbourfront enhancement proposals.

47. Mr Abraham SHEK was pleased to see the current proposal under which the extent of reclamation was reduced. He asked whether there would be any open competitions to allow architects to design the waterfront without any constraints. In relation to the area near the Royal Hong Kong Yacht Club and Police Officers Club, he wondered why the pedestrian link was interrupted and asked whether the Administration would consider resuming part of the land so that there would be a continuous and comfortable pedestrian link from Wan Chai to North Point. He queried why the CWB administration building had to be located on the "OU" sites near Oil Street. He considered that the sites for the reprovioned Wan Chai North Public Transport Interchange and the reprovioned Wan Chai Swimming Pool should be used as open space so as to provide a continuous stretch of open space in that area.

48. In response, PM/CEDD said that the public would have the opportunity to further comment on the details of the facilities during the detailed planning and design stage. A bottom-up planning approach had been adopted for the project and the ideas of many parties had been incorporated into the current proposal. The idea for organizing an open competition would be considered during the detailed planning and design stage. He clarified that there was a continuous pedestrian link through the area near the Royal Hong Kong Yacht Club and Police Officers Club, and the Administration would widen the narrowest part of the pedestrian link without the need for further reclamation.

49. Ir Dr Raymond HO commented that ERP should not be reconsidered because no alternative route was available. As regards the proposed helipad, he asked whether it would be for the Government's exclusive use and whether it would also provide cross-boundary helicopter services. He also asked whether there were any plans to show the layout of the project area and the ridgeline with the proposed developments in place as viewed from the harbour.

50. In response, CTP/PlanD said that the helipad would mainly be used for Government flying services and emergency services. It could also be used by commercial operators of domestic helicopter services provided that emergency services would not be affected. Provision for cross-boundary helicopter services had been planned at the proposed heliport at Kai Tak. She displayed plans which showed the layout of the project area, the building height profile of the proposed developments and the ridgeline as viewed from the harbour. She emphasized that the proposed developments would blend in well with the surrounding environment.

Dr KWOK Ka-ki's proposed motion

51. It was 1:02 pm when the Chairman invited Dr KWOK Ka-ki to move a motion for which he had given notice earlier during the appointed meeting time. The terms of Dr KWOK's motion, submitted in writing by Dr KWOK and copied to all members present, were as follows-

"本事務委員會促請政府，恪守《保護海港條例》下不准在海港進行填海的推定，進一步大幅減低灣仔發展計劃第二期填海，並應重新規劃中環二、三期填海區，大幅削減商業發展規模，增加綠化及休憩用地，還港於民。"

Translation

"That this Panel urges the Government to hold fast to the presumption specified in the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance against reclamation in the harbour and further reduce substantially the extent of reclamation under Wan Chai Development Phase II, and that the Government should also plan anew Central Reclamation Phases II and III, reduce substantially

the scale of the commercial developments, as well as increase greening and open spaces, so as to return the harbour to the public."

52. Mr Vincent FANG raised a point of order on whether the motion should be dealt with because the appointed meeting time had passed and many members had left. He suggested that the Panel deal with the motion at the next meeting.

53. Dr KWOK Ka-ki considered that as he had given notice of his motion and the Chairman had informed members of this within the appointed meeting time, the Panel should deal with his motion.

54. Ir Dr Raymond HO pointed out that as the period of extension of the meeting prescribed by the Chairman had passed, no voting should be conducted.

55. Mr Alan LEONG commented that as the Chairman had already informed members during the appointed meeting time that Dr KWOK Ka-ki would move a motion, members knew at that time that the Panel would have to deal with the motion. According to his observation, no member had left the meeting venue since that time. Therefore, he was of the view that it would be in order to deal with the motion. Nevertheless, he would respect the Chairman's decision.

56. The Chairman said that as he had earlier indicated that the meeting would be extended to 12:50 pm, he suggested that a prudent approach be adopted and a special meeting be arranged to be held as soon as possible to deal with Dr KWOK Ka-ki's motion and discuss the item on "The Revised Concept Plan for Lantau".

57. Dr KWOK Ka-ki considered that as members had been informed by the Chairman of his notice to move a motion, if members had alternative views on how to deal with the motion, they should have done so when the Chairman announced that the meeting would be extended or when the Chairman indicated that there was a motion to be dealt with. Nevertheless, he agreed to the Chairman's suggestion.

(Post-meeting note: Dr KWOK Ka-ki indicated after the meeting that he did not intend to pursue his motion.)

II The Revised Concept Plan for Lantau

- (LC Paper No. CB(1)1723/06-07(03) -- Information paper provided by the Administration
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1723/06-07(04) -- Background brief on "Concept Plan for Lantau" prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1742/06-07(02) -- Submission dated 22 May 2007 from Green Lantau Association

LC Paper No. CB(1)1742/06-07(03) -- Email dated 25 May 2007 from
Ms Gwyneth
MACCORMICK)

58. In view of time constraints, members agreed at 12:02 pm that the discussion of the item on "The Revised Concept Plan for Lantau" would be deferred to another meeting.

III Any other business

59. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 1:05 pm.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
23 July 2007