

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)1954/06-07
(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, 7 May 2007, at 8:30 am
in the Chamber of the Legislative Council Building**

- Members present** : Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBM, GBS, JP (Chairman)
Hon Albert HO Chun-yan
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP
Hon CHOY So-yuk, JP
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, JP
Hon LEE Wing-tat
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
- Members absent** : Hon WONG Yung-kan, JP
Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, GBS, JP
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon Daniel LAM Wai-keung, SBS, JP
Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming, SBS, JP
- Public officers attending** : **Agenda item III**

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

Mr LAU Ka-keung
Deputy Commissioner for Transport/
Planning & Technical Services

Action

Mr CHAN Chung-yuen
Senior Engineer/Housing & Planning
Transport Department

**Attendance by
invitation**

: Agenda item III

Designing Hong Kong Harbour District

Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN
Convenor

Individual

Mrs Margaret BROOKE

Save Our Shorelines

Ms Annelise CONNELL
Spokesperson

Society for Protection of The Harbour Limited

Mr Winston K S CHU
Adviser

Friends of The Harbour

Mr Dennis K W LI
Representative

The Conservancy Association

Mr LI Siu-man, Peter
Campaign Manager

Action Group on Protection of the Harbour

Mr Winfield CHONG Wing-fai
Member

Individual

Dr Bill BARRON

Action

Central & Western District Council

Mr LAM Kin-lai
Central & Western District Councillor

Mr YUEN Bun-keung
Central & Western District Councillor

The Hong Kong Institute of Architects

Mr Ivan HO
Member, Planning & Lands Committee

Mr Freddie HAI
Member, Planning & Lands Committee

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

Staff in attendance : Ms Pauline NG
Assistant Secretary General 1

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

Ms Christina SHIU
Legislative Assistant (1)7

Action

- I Confirmation of minutes**
(LC Paper No. CB(1)1401/06-07 -- Minutes of meeting on 8 March 2007)

The minutes of the meeting held on 8 March 2007 were confirmed.

- II Planning issues relating to the Tamar development project**
(LC Paper No. CB(1)1366/06-07(01) -- Letter dated 3 April 2007 from Hon LEE Wing-tat
LC Paper No. CB(1)1366/06-07(02) -- Letter dated 4 April 2007 from Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
LC Paper No. CB(1)1498/06-07(01) -- Letter dated 30 April 2007 from the Administration

Action

LC Paper No. CB(1)1498/06-07(02) -- Information paper on "Coordination between Tamar Development Project and Central Waterfront Promenade" provided by the Administration)

2. The Subcommittee deliberated (index of proceedings attached at **Annex**).

3. The Chairman informed members that the Administration had advised in its letter dated 30 April 2007 (LC Paper No. CB(1)1498/06-07(01)) that to avoid prejudicing the fairness and integrity of the tender process of the Tamar development project and to avoid any perception of Government favouring any particular tenderer or misrepresenting any tender details, the Government had to refrain from any discussion of tender submissions. As such, the Administration would not be able to attend the meeting to discuss the item. However, the Administration had provided an information paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)1498/06-07(02)) to address members' concern about the coordination between the Tamar development project and the future Central waterfront promenade. He advised that as no representatives from the Administration were present, members would discuss the item among themselves and the views and concerns raised during the discussion would be forwarded to the Administration and The Legislative Council Commission for information.

4. Mr LEE Wing-tat considered that many questions concerning the Tamar development project remained unanswered although the Administration was displaying some information about the four design proposals submitted by the prequalified tenderers in a public exhibition. He agreed that the Administration and Members should not comment on the design proposals in order not to affect the integrity and fairness of the tender exercise, but what he wanted was just more factual information about the project, such as whether a public observation gallery would be provided in the Central Government Complex (CGC), environmental protection measures to be adopted, design features to promote air ventilation, whether the inclusion of Government land outside the Tamar site under some design proposals would pose any problems in the tendering process because approval from the Town Planning Board would be required, and whether the public could raise comments on or objections to such inclusion. He was disappointed that the Administration had even refrained from attending this meeting and thus members did not have an opportunity to seek clarification on factual information about the project. The Administration's approach was like "black-box operation" which had severely limited the public's access to information about the project. As Members would be future users of the new Legislative Council Complex, he suggested that the Chairman should request The Legislative Council Commission to convene a meeting and invite all other Members to attend in order to provide a forum for Members to seek clarification from the Administration and the prequalified tenderers if possible, in respect of the information on the new Legislative Council Complex already in the public domain.

Action

5. Dr KWOK Ka-ki said that given the public's demand for a quality waterfront, his main concern was whether there would be public facilities, such as an observation gallery, in the CGC and how the planning for the new Central waterfront would be affected by the Tamar development project. He could not see how the discussion of these matters would affect the integrity and fairness of the tender exercise for the Tamar development project. The Administration was disrespectful to Legislative Council Member by refusing to attend this meeting. He suggested that another meeting should be held to discuss the subject, and the Administration should be asked to attend.

6. Mr Alan LEONG said that having regard to the extent of opportunities given to the public to participate in the Tamar development project, he was unconvinced of the Administration's claim that the project was a project for the public. He was also unconvinced that the Administration would change its mentality and recognize public wisdom. While the public was invited to give views on the design proposals, the Administration had never stated how those public views would be assessed. The public might think that their views would be heeded and used as an important basis for choosing a design proposal, but in fact the Special Selection Board had absolute authority in determining the weighting of the public views. This arrangement was not in line with the principle of planning with the public. He further pointed out that the public had no idea that two of the design proposals involved the use of land zoned as "Open Space" under the relevant Outline Zoning Plan and the successful tenderer would have to apply to and obtain approval from the Town Planning Board for such a design. He was puzzled about the Administration's non-attendance at this meeting and queried whether the Administration considered that it was no longer answerable to the Legislative Council after having obtained funding approval for the project. Indeed, many questions had been raised in the community over the information displayed in the public exhibition. He personally had questions about the access between different parts of the CGC, environmental protection measures, natural light utilization etc. He queried if even Legislative Council Members did not have an opportunity to obtain the necessary information, what other channels would be available to address questions raised in the community relating to the design proposals.

7. With reference to the Annex to LC Paper No. CB(1)1498/06-07(02), Mr LEE Wing-tat was concerned that the tender for the Tamar development project would be awarded by the end of 2007, i.e. before the completion of the Central Reclamation Urban Design Study in early 2008. He was concerned whether the design of the Central waterfront promenade would be affected by the design of the Tamar development project. He asked whether in considering the tenders for the project, the Special Selection Board would take into account the public's expectation that there should be continuous open space along the Tamar site and the Central waterfront promenade. Mr LEE said that some drawings and layout plans for the Tamar development project on the Internet were illegible. He said that he had personally requested for factual information about the project from the Administration, but his request was turned down. He suggested that the Chairman should write to the Administration to confirm what type of information about the Tamar development project could be provided to Members and what mode of discussion could be arranged

Action

for the purpose.

8. Dr KWOK Ka-ki suggested that the Chairman should write to The Legislative Council Commission as soon as possible requesting for a meeting to discuss the design of the future Legislative Council Complex on the Tamar site. A date should also be fixed for a meeting of the Subcommittee when representatives of the Administration should attend and explain the detailed arrangements for the Tamar development project and the new Central waterfront.

Motion moved by Dr KWOK Ka-ki

9. Dr KWOK Ka-ki moved the following motion:

"對政府不尊重本小組委員會，不派出代表參與討論與添馬艦發展工程有關的規劃事宜，本小組委員會表示遺憾；並促請政府於本小組委員會另訂時間討論是項議題時，派出代表參與討論。政府應盡早安排公聽會，令公眾、立法會議員及投標人士能有更深入的了解及討論。"

(Translation)

"That this Subcommittee regrets that the Government does not respect the Subcommittee and refuses to send representatives to participate in the discussion on the planning issues relating to the Tamar development project; this Subcommittee also urges the Government to send representatives to participate in the discussion on the subject at a meeting to be scheduled by the Subcommittee. The Government should expeditiously arrange a public hearing to enable members of the public, Legislative Council Members and tenderers to understand and discuss the development project more thoroughly."

10. Mr CHAN Kam-lam opined that it was not necessary to move the motion although he would not object to any members moving a motion. He pointed out that the Administration had advised that an independent Special Selection Board had been set up to examine the four tender proposals for the Tamar development project. Any response to members' questions from the Administration and subsequent discussion might prejudice the fairness and integrity of the tender process. Members' concerns and views, and requests for further information, could be conveyed by writing to the Administration. Mr CHAN said that if members insisted on proceeding with the motion, he would abstain from voting.

11. Dr KWOK Ka-ki reiterated that members had made clear that there was no intention to influence the assessment of the tenders for the Tamar development project. He said that apart from the models and plans being displayed in the public exhibition, Members and the public did not have further information on the proposals, and hence members requested representatives of the Administration to attend the meeting to provide more information about the proposals. He opined that there was no conflict of views among members regarding the need for more information for discussion of

Action

the Tamar development project.

12. Mr CHAN Kam-lam said that it was a matter of enhancing communication between the Subcommittee and the Administration, and the Subcommittee did not need to express regret about the absence of representatives from the Administration at the meeting.

13. The Chairman considered that the proposed motion was directly related to the agenda item under discussion and that it was appropriate for the Subcommittee to deal with it. Three members voted for the motion, and no member voted against the motion. The Chairman declared the motion passed.

III Design and alignment of Road P2

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1498/06-07(05) -- Submission dated April 2007 from
The Hong Kong Institute of
Planners

LC Paper No. CB(1)1366/06-07(02) -- Letter dated 4 April 2007 from Dr
Hon KWOK Ka-ki

LC Paper No. CB(1)1498/06-07(06) -- Information paper provided by the
Administration)

Briefing by the Administration

14. The Deputy Commissioner for Transport/Planning & Technical Services (DC for T) briefed members on the details of the Administration's paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)1498/06-07(06)), including the alignment, functions and layout of Road P2.

Presentation by deputations

Designing Hong Kong Harbour District (DHKHD)

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1563/06-07(01), Powerpoint presentation materials issued to members on 8 May 2007)

15. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN, Convenor of DHKHD, delivered his presentation, the details of which were given in the relevant presentation materials. He considered that there was no dispute that Road P2 was needed, but the crux of the issue was how much land should be allocated for it. The planned capacity of Road P2 was over-provided. A width of 20 metres should be sufficient for Road P2 but 40 metres had been reserved under the current design. The extra reserve of 20 metres, if removed, would allow preservation of the Queen's Pier in-situ. Road P2 would be a massive road with more than four lanes at some places and it would disturb the waterfront. Although the extent of reclamation and the number of planned developments in the area had been reduced during the planning process for Central Reclamation Phase III (CRIII), the planned width of Road P2 had remained unchanged. He pointed out that that the Central Reclamation Urban Design Study (the Study) would not include any review of the planned transport infrastructure in the area.

Action

Mrs Margaret BROOKE
(LC Paper No. CB(1)1498/06-07(03))

16. Mrs Margaret BROOKE delivered her presentation, the details of which were given in the relevant submission. She said that while Road P2 was required to service the new waterfront areas, its proposed width was too wide and its alignment was gazetted without due consideration for the heritage aspects of the area comprising the Star Ferry Pier, the Queen's Pier and the City Hall. Its width suggested that its purpose was to alleviate traffic congestion in Central, but that should be the function of the Central-Wan Chai Bypass (CWB). Road P2 could be much narrower even when a portion of its width was dedicated to greening. If it was wide and the alignment was too direct, it would become a "rat run", where at-grade crossing would be dangerous and pedestrians seeking access to the waterfront would feel intimidated and uncomfortable. It should be as narrow as was compatible with its use as a local distributor road and its alignment should not encourage high levels of through traffic. Such traffic should be directed to CWB which should be implemented as soon as possible.

Save Our Shorelines (SOS)

17. Ms Annelise CONNELL, Spokesperson of SOS, played a sound recording to demonstrate the noise level at the new waterfront promenade and the open space near the Tamar site if Road P2 was constructed according to the planned scale. She opined that the people using the waterfront promenade and the open space should be considered when designing Road P2. The present design of Road P2 had not given regard to the need to reduce noise and pollution. There was no need for Road P2 to be a high speed road and its present scale was more than necessary.

Society for Protection of The Harbour Limited (SPHL)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)1554/06-07(01), tabled and issued to members on 8 May 2007)

18. Mr Winston K S CHU, Adviser of SHPL, said that Friends of The Harbour would give its presentation time to SPHL. He delivered his presentation, the details of which were given in the relevant submission. He said that the width of Road P2 would be able to accommodate eight lanes. The planned developments in the Central reclamation area would create a total Gross Floor Area (GFA) of some 9.8 million square feet and attract 50 000 people to the area. According to the estimates of the Transport Department, the developments, excluding the hotel developments adjoining Central Piers No. 4 to No. 6, would generate an additional 7 623 passenger car units per hour. Without all those developments, the width of Road P2 could be reduced. The Administration had misled the court. Although the Administration claimed that the purpose of CR III was to provide land for the construction of essential transport infrastructure and a waterfront promenade and the reprovisioning of existing waterfront facilities, there was no mention of selling six large pieces of land for 10 million square feet of development. He sought an explanation on why the Administration had not told the court that there were 10 large planned developments in

Action

Central. He suggested that this was because sale of land could not be considered as an overriding public need to justify reclamation. The Administration used the excuse that it wanted to solve traffic congestion but in fact it was creating land for sale for property development. The Administration had failed to conduct any timely review on the planning for Central as requested by the Town Planning Board (TPB) and on the relevant Outline Zoning Plan. There had been no public consultation on the design of Road P2. As TPB had requested that there should be a review on Road P2, it would be illogical to commence construction works before conducting the review. He considered that in the light of the above and in fairness to the people of Hong Kong, the Government should be publicly censured.

Friends of The Harbour (FTH)

19. The presentation time for FTH had been given to SPHL.

The Conservancy Association (CA)

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1563/06-07(02), Powerpoint presentation materials issued to members on 8 May 2007)

20. Mr LI Siu-man, Peter, Campaign Manager of CA, delivered his presentation, the details of which were given in the relevant presentation materials. He pointed out that the projected traffic demand could easily be met by having one lane west bound and two lanes east bound for Road P2. Therefore, the dual two-lane design of Road P2 was more than adequate. Furthermore, as Road P2 was designed to be a local distributor road, the traffic speed should be no more than 50 kilometres per hour and a wide dual two-lane carriageway was not required. A narrow central divider would suffice for safety purposes. There was no need to set up a lay-by at the existing location of the Queen's Pier and a slight adjustment of the alignment of Road P2 to the north could avoid the Queen's Pier.

Action Group on Protection of the Harbour (AGPTH)

21. Mr Winfield CHONG Wing-fai, Member of AGPTH, said that measures were required for alleviating traffic congestion in Central and Wan Chai. However, AGPTH was dissatisfied that the Administration tried to solve traffic problems by constructing roads through reclamation because this would lead to a vicious cycle. The crux of the issue was that there would be massive new developments in the Central reclamation area, and as such traffic in Central and Wan Chai would again be nearly saturated by 2016 even with Road P2. The Administration should rationalize the fares of the three cross-harbour tunnels, expedite railway development, and remove unnecessary developments in the area. Together with these measures, the Administration should amend the design and alignment of Road P2 so as to allow the public to access the waterfront easily and respond to the community's call for in-situ preservation of the Queen's Pier. If the Administration continued with its current planning, the public could only initiate litigation to avoid further destruction of the harbour.

Action

Dr Bill BARRON
(LC Paper No. CB(1)1498/06-07(04))

22. Dr Bill BARRON delivered his presentation, the details of which were given in the relevant submission. He considered that the scale of Road P2 indicated that the Administration was uncertain whether CWB could completely alleviate traffic congestion in the area. If Road P2 was constructed according to its current design, the quality of the waterfront promenade would be greatly diminished because most parts of it would be bordered by a busy high speed road at a short distance apart. The noise and pollution generated would make the waterfront promenade far less appealing than the people of Hong Kong should deserve. Road P2 had been planned as a major roadway and the new office developments in the area would generate a lot of vehicle traffic. The Legislative Council should challenge the Administration on this issue and should not let it take forward the matter lightly.

Central & Western District Council (C&WDC)

23. Mr YUEN Bun-keung, Central & Western District Councillor, said that C&WDC passed a motion at its meeting on 23 March 2006, which strongly requested the Administration to substantially reduce commercial developments in CRIII, disallow the construction of commercial buildings such as offices and hotels, and convert the reclaimed land into open space for use by the public. C&WDC passed another motion at its meeting on 25 May 2006, which demanded a review of the planning for Central and Wan Chai and a reduction in the scale of commercial developments in CRIII and that of the Tamar development so as to reduce traffic demand.

24. Mr LAM Kin-lai, Central & Western District Councillor, said that the design and implementation date of Road P2 should be reconsidered because the extent of reclamation under Wan Chai Development Phase II had yet to be decided. The Administration had no strategies to restrict vehicle access to Central Business District and constructing roads to solve traffic problems was not a long-term solution. He had reservation on the planned commercial developments in the area and queried whether Road P2 had to be constructed according to its current design if those developments were not implemented.

The Hong Kong Institute of Architects (HKIA)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)1554/06-07(02), received subsequent to the meeting and issued to members on 8 May 2007)

25. Mr Ivan HO, Member, Planning & Lands Committee of HKIA, delivered his presentation, the details of which were given in the relevant submission. He pointed out that the primary objective of urban planning and design should be to serve the people, and roads and infrastructure should not become an overriding element. HKIA strongly urged the Government to immediately redesign Road P2 because its current design had a lot of deficiencies. Its current alignment would diminish the urban quality of Edinburgh Place and there were no user-friendly pedestrian linkages

Action

connecting Central to the future waterfront. Road P2 would eventually create a new bottleneck at Fenwick Pier Street. The new design should be integrated with a graceful urban setting for the future Central Business District and allow for various possible options for in-situ preservation of the Queen's Pier. Re-alignment of Road P2 involved no technical difficulties and only needed to go through statutory planning procedures.

26. Mr Freddie HAI, Member, Planning & Lands Committee of HKIA, said that instead of designing Road P2 as a 40-metre wide road with trees planted in the middle of the road, it should be made narrower with trees planted on the two sides. As providing at-grade pedestrian crossings would affect traffic flow along Road P2, the Administration should identify creative methods to facilitate the public's direct access to the waterfront.

Discussion

27. Dr KWOK Ka-ki considered that the construction of Road P2 and CWB was just the Administration's excuse for carrying out reclamation. Representatives from the Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau (HPLB) should have attended the meeting because planning matters were involved. He commented that the plans and figures used by deputations were more comprehensive than those provided by the Administration. He criticized that under the current design, Road P2 would be a very wide road preventing the public from accessing the new waterfront. The design and scale of Road P2 should be reviewed and construction works should not commence before completion of the review. He queried why there were no details on pedestrian crossings and why a dual two-lane Road P2 was required if its traffic flow was expected to be low. What the public wanted was a leisure-style road rather than a highway. He asked whether the findings of the Study would affect the design of Road P2, and opined that the Transport Department should put forward a new design for Road P2 with sufficient details taking into consideration the views of deputations expressed at this meeting. He suggested that another meeting be held to further discuss the subject.

28. In response, DC for T clarified that many of the plans and figures used by the deputations were in fact based on information provided by the Administration in the public domain. He further explained that the parameters for a primary distributor road cited by some deputations were not applicable to Road P2, which would be a distributor road with features such as junctions, pedestrian crossings, drop-off areas, and ingress and egress points. He emphasized that at-grade pedestrian crossings and lower traffic speed were characteristics of a leisure-style road like Road P2. The Administration had already provided a lot of information relating to Road P2 and the Expert Panel on Sustainable Transport Planning and Central-Wan Chai Bypass had confirmed the need for its construction. The planning for Road P2 had undergone the necessary statutory procedures and funding approval had been obtained. Depending on how the Queen's Pier would be preserved, the alignment of Road P2 might have to be amended.

Action

29. Miss CHOY So-yuk considered that there should be opportunities for direct dialogue between the Administration and deputations on the subject. She suggested that the Administration should provide a written response to the views of the deputations and the subject should be further discussed with the relevant Government bureaux and departments and deputations. She had previous experience where the Administration had provided statistical figures, such as traffic flow and population projection, which were to its advantage in order to provide supporting arguments for its projects. The Administration was providing misleading information under such circumstances and it should review such a practice. She sought further clarification on the planned developments on CRIII.

30. In response, DC for T said that the Administration had no intention to provide misleading information and clarified that in presenting the GFA for the planned developments in the Central reclamation area, the Administration had already allowed for the GFA for the proposed hotel developments, which SPHL claimed to have been omitted from the calculation. The information provided by SPHL was not entirely accurate.

31. Mr LEE Wing-tat considered that the Administration should provide a written response to the views of each deputation. He queried about the width and necessity of Road P2 and was worried that the construction of more roads would induce more traffic. He asked whether the Administration would introduce traffic management measures to reduce traffic flow in the area and suggested that restrictions on vehicle use should be included in the land leases for developments in the Central reclamation area. As regards the traffic flow projections for the CGC and Legislative Council Complex, he considered that Government officials and Legislative Council Members should strive to reduce the traffic flow by adopting measures such as using car pools, implementing alternate-day driving or using the Mass Transit Railway. If traffic flow was lowered, the width of Road P2 could be reduced and more space could be reserved for pedestrians. He considered that planning issues were also involved in discussing transport infrastructure and responsible Government officials should have been present at the meeting.

32. In response, DC for T pointed out that the criticism that Road P2 was too wide arose from inappropriate comparisons between Connaught Road and Road P2. The design standards of Connaught Road and Road P2 were different because the former was built a long time ago. More importantly the operation of the two roads would be entirely different. As the mainline Connaught Road was designed with no junctions, signal lights and at-grade pedestrian crossings, the free flow of traffic allowed it to attain a high capacity at its present width. On the other hand, Road P2 was designed with junctions, signal lights, at-grade pedestrian crossings and lay-bys. As such, traffic flow would be slower, resulting in a lower capacity and the need for a dual two-lane design. Therefore, it was not appropriate to compare the width of the two roads. Furthermore, additional space would be needed for turning pockets, drop-off areas, pavements and greening areas along Road P2. Drivers would more likely use CWB instead of Road P2 because the former would allow higher traffic speed. As Road P2 would serve as a distributor road for distributing traffic between

Action

CWB and the neighbouring area covering Central, Wanchai and Midlevels, a reduction in the GFA of the proposed developments in the Central reclamation area would not reduce the traffic from this source and change the role of Road P2.

33. In response to the comments from Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN, Convenor of DHKHD, DC for T clarified that the figure of 2 600 to 2 800 vehicles per hour for a primary distributor road would not be applicable to Road P2 because of the presence of signal-controlled junctions, pedestrian crossings, and kerb-side activities. A distributor road with these features like Road P2 was a lower class of distributors with much lower capacity.

34. Mr Abraham SHEK supported the construction of Road P2 but considered that the Administration had not clearly explained to the public in layman terms why Road P2 was needed. Instead of adopting a professional perspective, the Administration should provide an easily comprehensible explanation so that the public would feel that the construction of Road P2 was needed and should be supported. As the subject was not entirely a transport issue, he considered that HPLB was disrespectful to the Subcommittee in not sending representatives to attend the meeting.

35. In response, DC for T clarified that there had been many opportunities for the public to comment on the design of Road P2. The Administration had collected their views and assimilated their ideas into the design of Road P2. For instance, the provision of more at-grade pedestrian crossings was a response by the Administration to public views. Priority would be given to pedestrians crossing Road P2 through assigning appropriate timing for pedestrian green signals.

36. Mr Alan LEONG considered that if the Administration recognized public wisdom, it should prepare a model of the planning for the Central, Admiralty and Wan Chai districts for public viewing and plan the developments according to public views. He pointed out that there should not be unlimited quest for land in Central for hotel and commercial uses. The design of the waterfront was an issue for all and Road P2 should be designed to facilitate access to the waterfront. He shared the view that the Administration should respond to the views of each deputation.

37. In response, DC for T reiterated that as Road P2 would serve as a distributor road for distributing traffic between CWB and the neighbouring area covering Central, Wanchai and Midlevels, a reduction in the proposed developments in the Central reclamation area would not reduce the traffic from this source. Both elevated and at-grade pedestrian crossings along Road P2 would be provided to facilitate access to the waterfront.

Motion moved by Dr KWOK Ka-ki

38. Dr KWOK Ka-ki moved the following motion:

"由於中環及灣仔規劃重新檢討及諮詢尚未完成，該區的交通流量仍未確定，政府應停止現時P2路建設，重新檢討P2路的設計

Action

及其規模，並應以保育海港、減少中環新填海區之發展密度及活化海濱之原則下，另行設計P2路。"

(Translation)

"That, with the Central and Wan Chai planning reviews and consultation exercise still underway and the traffic flow of the district has yet to be ascertained, the Government should halt the construction of the present Road P2 to review afresh the design and scale of Road P2; the Government should also re-design Road P2 in keeping with the principles of preserving the harbour, reducing the development intensity of the new Central reclamation area and regenerating the harbourfront."

39. The Chairman considered that the proposed motion was directly related to the agenda item under discussion and that it was appropriate for the Subcommittee to deal with it. Four members voted for the motion, and no member voted against the motion. The Chairman declared the motion passed.

IV Any other business

40. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 10:55 am.

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, 7 May 2007, at 8:30 am
in the Chamber of the Legislative Council Building**

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
000000 - 000020	Chairman	Confirmation of minutes of the meeting held on 8 March 2007 (LC Paper No. CB(1)1401/06-07)	
000021 - 000700	Chairman	Opening remarks	
000701 - 001340	Mr LEE Wing-tat	Expression of views	
001341 - 001540	Dr KWOK Ka-ki	Expression of views	
001541 - 002010	Mr Alan LEONG	Expression of views	
002011 - 002444	Mr LEE Wing-tat	Expression of views	
002445 - 003330	Dr KWOK Ka-Ki Clerk Mr CHAN Kam-lam Chairman	Processing of motion Motion passed	
003331 - 004330	Break		
004331 - 005148	Chairman Administration	Briefing by the Administration on the design and alignment of Road P2	
005149 - 005242	Chairman	Invitation for deputations to present views	
005243 - 005700	Designing Hong Kong Harbour District (DHKHD)	Presentation of views	
005701 - 005942	Mrs Margaret BROOKE	Presentation of views (LC Paper No. CB(1)1498/06-07(03))	
005943 - 010203	Save Our Shorelines (SOS)	Presentation of views	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
010204 - 010959	Society for Protection of The Harbour Limited (SPHL) Friends of The Harbour (FTH)	Presentation of views	
011000 - 011128	The Conservancy Association (CA)	Presentation of views	
011129 - 011527	Action Group on Protection of The Harbour (AGPTH)	Presentation of views	
011528 - 011833	Dr Bill BARRON	Presentation of views (LC Paper No. CB(1)1498/06-07(04))	
011834 - 012143	Central & Western District Council (C&WDC)	Presentation of views	
012144 - 012608	The Hong Kong Institute of Architects (HKIA)	Presentation of views	
012609 - 013449	Dr KWOK Ka-ki Administration	Expression of views and the Administration's response	
013450 - 014258	Ms CHOY So-yuk Administration Chairman SPHL	Expression of views and the Administration's response	
014259 - 015522	Mr LEE Wing-tat Administration DHKHD	Expression of views and the Administration's response	
015523 - 020035	Mr Abraham SHEK Administration	Expression of views and the Administration's response	
020036 - 020714	Mr Alan LEONG	Expression of views	
020715 - 020902	HKIA	Expression of views	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
020903 - 021824	Dr KWOK Ka-ki DHKHD Ms CHOY So-yuk Mr LEE Wing-tat Administration SPHL	Expression of views and the Administration's response	
021825 - 022219	Chairman Ms CHOY So-yuk Clerk Dr KWOK Ka-ki	Processing of motion Motion passed	
022220 - 022248	Chairman	Any other business	

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
27 June 2007