

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)1952/07-08
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/PL/DEV/1

Panel on Development

Minutes of meeting
held on Tuesday, 22 April 2008, at 2:00 pm
in Conference Room A 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
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP
Hon Miriam LAU Kin-ye, GBS, JP
Hon CHOY So-yuk, JP
Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, GBS, JP
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
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, SBS, JP
Hon WONG Kwok-hing, MH

Members absent : Hon Mrs Sophie LEUNG LAU Yau-fun, GBS, JP
Dr Hon Philip WONG Yu-hong, GBS
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, SBS, JP

**Public officers
attending**

: Agenda item IV

Mrs Carrie LAM
Secretary for Development

Mrs Susan MAK
Deputy Secretary for Development
(Planning & Lands)1

Miss Annie TAM
Director of Lands

Mr CHEUNG Hau-wai
Director of Buildings

Agenda item V

Mrs Carrie LAM
Secretary for Development

Mrs Susan MAK
Deputy Secretary for Development
(Planning & Lands) 1

Mrs Ava NG
Director of Planning

Miss Ophelia WONG
Deputy Director of Planning/District

Agenda item VI

Mrs Carrie LAM
Secretary for Development

Mrs Susan MAK
Deputy Secretary for Development
(Planning & Lands)1

Mr K K LING
Principal Assistant Secretary (Planning & Lands) 5

Mrs Ava NG
Director of Planning

Mr YIP Sai-chor

Head of Civil Engineering Office

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

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1276/07-08 -- Minutes of meeting on
26 February 2008)

The minutes of the meeting held on 26 February 2008 were confirmed.

II Information papers issued since last meeting

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1153/07-08(01) -- Submission dated 27 March
2008 from World City
Committee in relation to the Peel
Street/Graham Street
redevelopment project

LC Paper No. CB(1)1258/07-08(01) -- Information paper on "118CD --
Drainage improvement in
Northern New Territories --
package B" provided by the
Administration

LC Paper No. CB(1)1281/07-08(01) -- Information paper on "139CD --
Decking of Staunton Creek
nullah in Wong Chuk Hang and
Fuk Man Road nullah in Sai
Kung" provided by the
Administration

LC Paper No. CB(1)1297/07-08(01) -- Information paper on "PWP Item
No. 717CL -- Tseung Kwan O
further development -- site
formation and infrastructure
works at Pak Shing Kok"
provided by the Administration)

2. Members noted that the above information papers were issued since the last meeting.

III Items for discussion at the next meeting

- (LC Paper No. CB(1)1273/07-08(01) -- List of outstanding items for discussion
LC Paper No. CB(1)1273/07-08(02) -- List of follow-up actions
LC Paper No. CB(1)1273/07-08(03) -- Letter dated 14 April 2008 from Hon LEE Wing-tat on "Review on the measures to promote green features in building developments")

3. Members agreed that the following items would be discussed at the next regular meeting scheduled for 27 May 2008 --

- (a) Study on Land Use Planning for the Closed Area - Draft Concept Plan;
- (b) Replacement and rehabilitation of water mains;
- (c) Mandatory building inspection scheme and mandatory window inspection scheme;
- (d) Cycle track network in the New Territories; and
- (e) Review on the measures to promote green features in building developments.

IV Provision of public facilities in private developments

- (LC Paper Nos. CB(1)1007/07-08(01), (02) and (03) -- Letters from Hon LEE Wing-tat, Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki and Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit on "Compliance by real estate developers with land lease conditions or conditions imposed by the Town Planning Board on the provision of open space and facilities for use by the public"
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1134/07-08(01) -- Submission dated 18 March 2008 from Designing Hong Kong Ltd.
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1273/07-08(04) -- Information paper provided by the Administration)

4. The Secretary for Development (SDEV) highlighted the salient points of the Administration's paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)1273/07-08(04)), including the existing policy, arrangements and measures to enhance public use of public facilities in private developments and the general situation of compliance with the requirements on the provision of such facilities. She elaborated the objectives of the policy, namely integrated planning, timely provision of public facilities and optimization of land use. She acknowledged that there was room for improvement in the management, accessibility and quality of those public facilities, particularly the open spaces. She stressed that the policy was underpinned by a strong rationale and should not be easily renounced. However, the Administration would review the policy taking into account the concerns expressed by the public and Members.

Admin 5. Mr LEE Wing-tat considered that for the Times Square incident, the developer concerned should not use that space for commercial activities to gain profit, which was tantamount to "unjust enrichment". The Administration should serve as the gatekeeper but it had failed to properly enforce the conditions in the deed of dedication. He considered that the Administration should take decisive action. He asked whether the developer concerned had submitted the necessary financial information to the Administration. He further asked whether the Administration would consult the Department of Justice and whether prosecution would be initiated. In order to see whether small property owners had been properly informed of their responsibilities in respect of the public facilities provided in their developments, he requested the Administration to provide the sales brochures of residential properties of private developments containing public facilities for the past two years.

6. In response, SDEV said that the Administration would take necessary actions in a reasonable and legal manner. The crux was whether the required facilities had been provided in accordance with the deed of dedication. For this suspected case of non-compliance with the deed of dedication, the Department of Justice had already replied to the enquiries of several Members. The developer concerned had provided preliminary information already and the Administration had taken appropriate actions. She could not disclose the details at this stage.

7. Mr CHAN Kam-lam said that the provision of public facilities in private developments was a good policy because it would facilitate management of those facilities. Nevertheless, the public might be misled into believing that the space concerned was privately owned if no notices had been posted to inform the public. The Administration had made the correct move to promulgate the two lists of private developments containing public facilities to enhance transparency. Although the presence of such facilities might have been disclosed in the deeds of mutual covenant and the plans, property owners seldom read those documents. Some property owners wanted to relinquish those public facilities in their private developments to the Government because they did not want to bear the maintenance and management costs. He enquired about the number of non-compliance cases detected by the Buildings Department (BD).

8. In response, SDEV said that property owners should have knowledge of those facilities because the sales brochures would contain such information. The Director of Buildings (DB) said that BD would carry out inspections once every three months. In the past two years, five cases of non-compliance had been detected, mainly involving minor deviations such as the presence of canopies and obstructions. Public facilities subject to deeds of dedication were mostly pedestrian passages. The non-compliance case at Times Square was discovered by BD during its inspection and remedial action had been taken. The Director of Lands (D of L) said that the Lands Department (LandsD) had in 2006 and 2007 carried out about 180 inspections to follow up suspected breaches and breaches were detected in 16 of such inspections. Seven cases on four developments were related to public open space. Developers concerned had responded positively to the Administration's request for rectification of the breaches.

9. Miss CHOY So-yuk considered that there should be sufficient notices on site to inform the public of such public facilities. Security personnel should not keep a close watch on users using those public facilities. It was also undesirable to put public space on podiums or at locations surrounded by private space of developers. The Administration was slack in its monitoring work. She queried whether inspections carried out by BD were effective because security personnel patrolling those facilities would be aware of inspectors entering the premises. She pointed out that a site near Carson Mansion and Yuet Ming Building was originally reserved for constructing an exit for the Mass Transit Railway Fortress Station. The developer concerned had already been compensated but the site, which should be public space, was used as a commercial carpark at present, blocking public access through the site. She asked whether the Administration would handle the case and rectify the situation.

10. In response, SDEV said that relevant departments would conduct inspections. As there were numerous public facilities provided in private developments, the public could also assist in playing a monitoring role. In this regard, the Administration had written to District Councils to solicit their support to report non-compliance of use of public open space. Maps and notices in relation to public open space in private developments were available in the departments' websites. As regards the location of public open space, if all such space was to be provided at ground level, flexibility in planning would be restricted. Depending on the actual geographical setting, in some circumstances, public open space above ground level could be more convenient to the users. In relation to the site mentioned by Miss CHOY, D of L recalled that the then Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau had given a reply on the subject. She would check the records and provide members with the information.

Admin

11. Mr James TO asked whether the Administration would demand a performance bond from developers and issue the certificate of compliance only after the necessary public facilities had been completed satisfactorily. He sought clarification on whether space occupied by a light well could be considered as

public open space. There was a difference between open space for owners/tenants and the general public. He considered that the problem should be tackled on multiple fronts. The Administration should require developers to include a fact sheet on the public facilities concerned in the sales brochures. It could also consider making an announcement of public interest in this regard at the same time when a developer sold its flats. The Estate Agents Authority should request estates agents to disclose information on such public facilities to prospective property purchasers. There should be guidelines for solicitors to inform property purchasers of their responsibilities. Legislative measures should also be considered.

Admin 12. In response, SDEV said that under the existing practice, the certificate of compliance would only be issued after the satisfactory completion of the required public facilities, unless delayed completion of the required public facilities was exceptionally allowed. The Administration would demand performance bonds from developers if appropriate. The interest of prospective property purchasers was protected through regulation of the sale of flats, which was a matter under the purview of the Transport and Housing Bureau. Developers were required to disclose information on maintenance and management responsibilities of those public facilities in private developments in property sales brochures, and the Administration would consider stepping up measures in this regard. As regards the light well in a shopping arcade near the Mass Transit Railway Kowloon Station mentioned by Mr TO, the Administration would investigate the case and provide a written response.

13. Mr Alan LEONG said that developers could delay the completion of those public facilities forever if no time limit was specified in the lease conditions. The negotiation of lease conditions between the Administration and the developers lacked transparency. He requested the Administration to provide information on whether the rights and responsibilities in relation to those public facilities had been transferred to small property owners upon the development falling into multiple ownership, and whether the same arrangement was applicable to all private developments concerned. He asked when the Administration would promulgate guidelines on using public space. As the standard provision of open space specified in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) also included public open space in private developments, it would be unfair if the public could not use that space with ease. He enquired about the timetable of the review on the policy and asked whether the Administration had any specific plans on how to engage the public in the review. He suggested that the Panel should hold a meeting to receive public views on the subject.

14. In response, SDEV said that many members of the public would benefit from facilities such as pedestrian footbridges and networks provided under the policy. Therefore, the policy should be retained. On the issue of whether the maintenance and management responsibilities of those public facilities had been transferred from developers to small property owners upon the development falling into multiple ownership, she responded that this would normally be the

case unless otherwise stated in the land lease and hence developers were required also to draw such liabilities to the attention of prospective buyers. As regards the suggestion for the Administration to promulgate guidelines on the use of public space in private developments, the Administration had to consider the issue with care taking into account legal implications and the views of the developers and owners concerned. HKPSG did not include specific guidelines on the design and use of open space. The Administration would conduct the review on the policy in the best possible way and the exact timetable would be decided after completing some preliminary groundwork.

15. Prof Patrick LAU said that HKPSG should set design guidelines on open space rather than merely stating the amount of open space per person. He sought clarification on open space provision as defined in HKPSG. Although some public open space was of good quality, the space might not be easily accessible by the public. On the other hand, although some open space might not be actually usable by the public, the space was a merit from the architectural design perspective. Whether public open space should be located on podiums or at ground level was an important issue for consideration.

16. In response, SDEV said that HKPSG had no distinction between private or public open space, and open space could be classified as active or passive. Some open space might only have trees and flowers planted and this was acceptable. The Administration would give due consideration to the design and locations of public open space.

17. Ir Dr Raymond HO considered that developers should not have any dissatisfaction over the policy because they could benefit from bonus gross floor area (GFA) and higher profits. Small property owners had to shoulder the maintenance and management costs of the public facilities concerned. He considered that compilation of the two lists of private developments containing public facilities was a merit and should be commended. He also asked the Administration to regulate the presentation format, such as font size, of important conditions in property sales brochures. For those outstanding public facilities such as footbridges that were not yet provided by the developers concerned, he asked whether the Administration would impose a completion date or carry out the works by itself and recoup the costs from the developers. He queried why no penalties were imposed under such circumstances.

18. In response, SDEV said that except in cases of dedication subject to the Buildings Regulations, the provision of public facilities was often a planning requirement and no bonus GFA had been granted for such provision. The requirement was specified in the planning conditions or land leases. As for the inclusion of relevant information in sales brochures of residential properties to protect the rights of prospective property purchasers, the Transport and Housing Bureau's reply to a Legislative Council question for the Council meeting scheduled for 23 April 2008 would provide the details. The Administration had reviewed all relevant cases included in the published lists and did not find any case

with public facilities which should have been there but were not yet provided in private developments. For some developments, the requirement was related to the provision of a footbridge connection point only. If the neighbouring site remained unsold or undeveloped, the footbridge could only be built according to a later timetable. .

19. Mr Albert CHAN said that while the provision of public facilities in private developments was beneficial to the public in some cases, the Administration and Town Planning Board (TPB) should be condemned for some other cases. The most obvious one was related to the required provision of public open space at Cheung Kong Center where only a pedestrian walkway and certain unusable space were provided instead. If no penalty could be imposed, the Administration was powerless in this regard. The Administration should consider introducing legislative measures which could override land lease and planning conditions, like the Building Management Ordinance's overriding status over deeds of mutual covenant. There were many different types of public space. Some space was designed for actual use and some for visual purposes. The Administration's review on the policy should include this aspect. He considered that the policy direction of providing public facilities in private developments was correct and the Administration should not terminate the policy lightly just because there were criticisms.

20. In response, SDEV said that although the review on the policy would be a difficult task, the Administration would not preclude introducing legislative measures to tackle the issue if these were necessary to achieve the desired objective. In conducting the review, the Administration would solicit the views of the public and developers in order to strike the right balance. The Administration would not terminate the policy lightly.

21. Ms Miriam LAU said that the issue of whether solicitors should have a duty to inform property purchasers of their legal responsibilities in maintaining and managing public facilities in their private developments should also be included in the review.

22. Mr James TIEN declared interest as a real estate developer and said that the most appropriate design for public open space should be left to the hands of architects and TPB. He considered it desirable to distinguish between open space above shopping arcades with residential developments, which was not easily accessible to the public and had specific opening hours, from open space easily accessible for use by the public. For the former, whether small property owners or the major owners of the arcades should be responsible for the maintenance and management costs would need further consideration. Developers would be inclined to adopt more stringent measures in managing the public open space in their private developments. For the Times Squares incident, it would be problematic if the conditions in the deed of dedication had not clearly specified the types and amounts of fees that developers could collect for letting the public space. Citing the roads between Bank of China Tower and Citibank Tower, he sought

clarification on whether those roads were public or private roads and whether the public's right in using those roads had been deprived of if they were public roads.

Admin

23. In response, SDEV said that it would be reasonable to impose opening hours for public open space in private developments for security purposes. For future private developments, the Administration would reconsider whether space not easily accessible to the public should be designated as public space. The Times Square incident was the only case where the developer had been compensated for the public usage with additional GFA and at the same time was allowed to collect fees for letting out the space concerned for specific purpose. The developer concerned had not yet provided all the necessary financial information and the Administration was following up the matter. As regards the roads mentioned by Mr TIEN, she undertook to check the records and provide information on whether they were public or private roads.

24. Dr KWOK Ka-ki was dissatisfied that the Administration had passed its responsibility in monitoring onto the public. He said that the provision of such public facilities would be beneficial to developers because when they submitted their development plans to TPB for consideration, TPB might give favourable consideration to such plans. Developers would also be granted additional GFA for providing such public facilities. As some public open space at International Finance Centre II and Grand Millennium Plaza was used for commercial purposes, he asked whether the Administration would impose penalties for non-compliance; recoup the profits gained by the developers, or resume the public open space concerned. Noting that some public open space did not even provide any seats, he urged the Administration to require the developers concerned to provide amenities to make them more suitable for public use. The attitudes of security personnel patrolling some of the public open space were also far from satisfactory. The policy would create a win-win situation if implemented in a fair manner. However, someone had acted not in the public interest and failed to play the role of gatekeeper. He considered that the Administration should deploy sufficient staff to carry out inspections more frequently. The Administration should actively post notices at appropriate places to inform the public of those public facilities in private developments. He supported the suggestion of holding of a special meeting to further discuss the subject.

25. In response, SDEV said that Dr KWOK's accusation was serious and unfounded. She had never said that the Administration had no monitoring responsibility. What she had mentioned was that the public could assist in the monitoring work by reporting cases of non-compliance. In fact, the Administration would carry out inspection before issuance of the certificate of compliance and regular inspections would also be carried out thereafter. She disagreed to Dr KWOK's statement that someone had acted not in the public interest and failed to play the role of gatekeeper, and queried if he had evidence to support his claim. In the public interest, provision of public facilities was often specified in the planning briefs, especially for projects in Comprehensive Development Area zones. No additional GFA would be granted for the provision

Admin of such facilities. Bonus GFA could be granted in accordance with provisions of the Buildings Ordinance for the provision of public facilities subject to deeds of dedication and those facilities were mostly pedestrian passages. Where the public space/facilities were located on land owned by the developers, the Administration could not resume the space/facilities because the Basic Law protected private property rights. Suggestions for purchasing back the space/facilities were impractical because a substantial amount of public funds would be required. For the cases mentioned by Dr KWOK, she said that the required public facilities had been provided and there was no non-compliance with the deeds of dedication. She undertook to provide further information on those cases relating to International Finance Centre II and Grand Millennium Plaza. Whether the public facilities provided were sufficient and whether the attitudes of security personnel could be improved would be separate issues which could be further considered. She had reservation on the suggestion that the Administration should, on behalf of the developers, post notices in private developments about the public facilities provided therein because the Director of Audit would not agree to the idea of using public funds for such purposes.

26. Members agreed that a meeting would be arranged to receive public views on the subject.

V Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront Stage 2 Public Engagement

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1273/07-08(05) -- Information paper provided by the Administration)

27. Members noted the submission dated 22 April 2008 from Designing Hong Kong Limited which was tabled at the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: The submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1350/07-08(01)) was subsequently issued to members on 23 April 2008.)

28. With the aid of a short video, SDEV briefed members on the Administration's design proposals for the new Central harbourfront which aimed at creating a vibrant, green and accessible harbourfront in Central.

29. Dr KWOK Ka-ki expressed reservation on the Administration's plan to include an 18-storey hotel on Site 1. He was worried that, like the International Finance Centre II, the hotel would eventually become an eyesore at the harbourfront and block the sea view. Besides, to make the harbourfront lively and vibrant, he believed that Hong Kong should follow Boston and Sydney in forming a harbour authority with representation from members of the public. Otherwise, the new harbourfront might end up one day as a place of expensive shopping

arcades and restaurants serving only affluent people. He also considered that there should be plenty of green areas in the harbourfront.

30. In response, SDEV pointed out that there would be a 2-kilometre continuous waterfront promenade for people to walk on and enjoy the harbour view. Further to that, there would also be vantage points at different locations of the harbourfront for visitors to enjoy the harbour view. As for the proposed formation of a harbour authority, she said that there were no plans for an all-embracing harbour authority but a subcommittee under the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee was studying the best model to manage the harbourfront.

31. Mr WONG Kwok-hing commended the Administration for agreeing to add an additional floor to the Central Piers 4 to 6 as a means to subsidize outlying islands ferry services. Such a move represented a major breakthrough in the Administration's response to the problem. However, in his opinions, the addition of a single floor for retail and dining facilities above the piers would not be adequate to generate sufficient income to cross-subsidize the ferry services. In this regard, the Administration might consider adding more floors above the piers for commercial activities. As a supplementary measure, he suggested that the Administration set aside a portion of the revenue from land sales of the harbourfront sites to support the ferry services.

32. In response, SDEV thanked Mr WONG for his views and commented that it would not be feasible for the Administration to appropriate part of the revenue from land sales to support a particular cause. On other suggestions to help improve the viability of outlying ferry services which was basically a transport policy matter, she undertook to relay them to the Secretary for Transport and Housing for consideration.

33. Miss CHOY So-yuk recalled that a major reason given by the Administration for the reclamation of the harbour in Central was the urgency to construct the Central-Wan Chai Bypass (CWB) to relieve traffic congestion in Central. Now that the construction of CWB remained yet to be decided, she asked whether Road P2 alone was adequate to ease traffic congestion in the area. On the proposed re-assembly of Queen's Pier in-situ, she suggested that a canal, like those in Netherlands, should be built to connect the pier to the harbour so that the pier could resume its original function. Further, she also pointed out that apart from green areas, facilities such as open areas that could cater for art performances and restaurants would be necessary to attract people flow.

34. In response, SDEV explained that works on Road P2 had started and in future the road would relieve part of the traffic congestion in Central. As for the proposal to construct a canal linking the re-assembled Queen's Pier to the harbour, she pointed out that technically it would be very difficult, given the presence of Road P2 and other facilities between the original site of Queen's Pier and the harbour. She agreed with Miss CHOY that facilities that could attract people flow

should be provided at different locations along the harbourfront to enhance vibrancy of the harbourfront.

35. Mr CHAN Kam-lam supported the Administration's proposals and commented that they had taken care of the needs and interests of all social sectors. Nevertheless, he pointed out that the Administration's decision to reduce development intensities was contrary to the demand of the commercial sector for Grade A offices and would lead to a substantial loss in public revenue. Meanwhile, he did not wish to see any further delay of the project since this might imply further loss in terms of public revenue. Besides, to address the aggravating traffic condition in Central, construction of CWB should proceed as soon as possible. Concerning re-assembly of the Queen's Pier, he did not think that it should be turned into a sitting-out area resembling a pavilion on land. Instead, it should be placed at the waterfront to resume its pier function.

36. In response, SDEV said she agreed entirely with Mr CHAN that CWB deserved a higher priority than other development components in the area. Nevertheless, since the Administration had lost in a recent judicial review regarding the temporary reclamation for the Wan Chai section of CWB, progress of CWB might be held up. As regard Mr CHAN's view on Queen's Pier, she said discussion on the re-assembly location was open and she welcomed different views.

37. Mr LEE Wing-tat commended that the Administration had indeed incorporated a lot of public views into the present proposals. As for surface traffic, he was concerned with the unusual width of Road P2 which appeared to exceed the normal configurations of a dual-two road. He wondered whether it was possible for the Administration to revise the design of the road so that more space could be released for leisure purposes in the harbourfront. He was also concerned with the accessibility of the harbourfront and enquired what had been planned for in this regard. As a related issue, he noticed that due to the presence of Government facilities at the Central Government Pier, a section of the pedestrian link connecting Central to Shun Tak Centre was diverted away from the waterfront, thereby depriving pedestrians of a good view of the harbour. He hoped that the Administration could bear this in mind when enhancing this part of the harbourfront.

38. In response, SDEV welcomed the views of Mr LEE and said that the width of Road P2 was based on genuine needs. Since construction of the road had already been gazetted and started, it would not be easy to bring about major changes to its design. As for arrangements to enhance public access to the harbourfront, the Deputy Director of Planning/District responded that the new Central harbourfront would be served by a multi-modal transport system and a multi-level (underground, at-grade and elevated) pedestrian network. On Mr LEE's suggestion about the pedestrian link, SDEV said the Administration would consider relocating facilities/premises by the waterfront that would block public

accessibility. She would bear Mr LEE's suggestion in mind when improvement works were extended to that portion of the harbourfront.

39. Prof Patrick LAU noticed that of all the sites in the study area, Site 6 was the site with the most reduction in GFA. He questioned the reasons behind and wondered whether it was possible for the Administration to even out the GFA reductions among the sites, in particular Sites 1 and 2. Besides, with the lowering of the development intensities of the harbourfront, he enquired whether it was still necessary to maintain the existing width of Road P2.

40. In response, SDEV thanked Prof LAU for his views and said that the reduction in GFA was decided in response to public aspirations to reduce development intensities of the new harbourfront. The reduction was done in a cautious manner with due consideration given to different factors and hence further reduction or adjustments would be extremely difficult. On Road P2, she reiterated that there was already a pressing need for the road at present and hence, the 25% reduction in GFA of the future developments would not affect the road's design.

41. Miss CHAN Yuen-han was concerned about whether Queen's Pier would be re-assembled in-situ and queried whether adequate consultation had been made with professional bodies on the design proposals. She requested the Administration to draw reference from the design of the Chicago river banks. She also expressed concern on the likelihood of obstruction that the high-rise buildings on Sites 1 and 2 might pose to passers-by traveling to and from the waterfront promenade. Further, knowing that the Administration was considering the relocation of the Hong Kong Maritime Museum from Stanley to Central Pier No. 8, she urged the Administration to exercise extra care in this matter concerning private museums in Hong Kong as the arrangement might invite lots of queries and challenges from non-government organizations.

42. Responding to Miss CHAN, SDEV said the design proposals for re-assembling Queen's Pier were prepared by professionals of the Planning Department based on views received and further views from members and the public were welcome. On public access to the harbourfront, she reassured members that adequate provisions for easy access had been made. Insofar as the Hong Kong Maritime Museum was concerned, she would relay Miss CHAN's views to the Home Affairs Bureau for consideration.

VI The Work of Hong Kong-Shenzhen Joint Task Force on Boundary District Development

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1273/07-08(06) -- Information paper provided by the Administration)

43. Due to insufficient time, members agreed that discussion of the item would be deferred to another meeting.

VII Any other business

44. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 4:30 pm.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
19 June 2008