

立法會 *Legislative Council*

LC Paper No. CB(1)232/08-09(07)

Ref: CB1/PL/DEV

Panel on Development

Meeting on 25 November 2008

Background brief on Central-Wan Chai Bypass and Wan Chai Development Phase II

Introduction

This paper provides background information on the Central-Wan Chai Bypass (CWB) and Wan Chai Development Phase II (WDII)¹ as well as a summary of the recent deliberations of the Panel on Development (the Panel) on the relevant issues.

Background

2. In 1989, the Central and Wan Chai Reclamation Feasibility Study recommended reclaiming 48 hectares of land in WDII for residential and hotel development, as well as development of a cruise centre and a public park. Having regard to the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (Cap. 531) (PHO) and the strong public sentiments against reclamation, the Administration subsequently reduced the extent of reclamation to 28.5 hectares to provide land just enough to accommodate the necessary transport infrastructure as well as to permit the design and development of a waterfront promenade.

3. In the light of the Court of Final Appeal (CFA)'s judgment handed down on 9 January 2004 in respect of the judicial review on the Draft Wan Chai North Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) (S/H25/1), the Government undertook to conduct a comprehensive planning and engineering review of WDII to ensure full compliance with the requirements of the PHO and the CFA judgment. In May 2004, the Administration established the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC) to provide advice to the Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (now the Secretary for Development) on the planning, land uses and

¹ For more background information on the respective scopes and purposes of the reclamation projects in Central and Wan Chai and the litigation relating to WDII and Central Reclamation Phase III, please refer to the Background Brief on Central and Wan Chai Reclamation (LC Paper No. CB(1)921/04-05(02) at the website of <http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0222cb1-921-2e.pdf>).

developments along the existing and new harbourfront of the Victoria Harbour. The HEC had set up the Sub-committee on WDII Review to advise on the WDII Review.

Central-Wan Chai Bypass

4. According to the Administration, there is a compelling and present need to alleviate the traffic congestion problem along the northern shore of the Hong Kong Island. The Government has examined various traffic management measures and concluded that, even with all those measures in place to relieve traffic congestion and maximize the capacity of existing roads and junctions along the Connaught Road Central/Harcourt Road/Gloucester Road Corridor, it is necessary to provide a strategic road link along the north shore of Hong Kong Island, i.e. Central-Wan Chai Bypass (CWB), connecting Rumsey Street Flyover in Central and the Island Eastern Corridor. A fact sheet prepared by the Administration in March 2008 setting out why CWB is needed and the alternatives considered is at **Appendix I**. The Administration has indicated that the extent of reclamation would depend on the alignment, design and location of CWB. In any event, any reclamation must fully comply with the PHO and the "overriding public need test" stipulated by CFA. The Administration has also stressed that any reclaimed land for WDII would be put to public use only and no land would be reclaimed for the purpose of land sale.

Harbour-front Enhancement Review -- Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Areas

5. In mid-January 2005, the Government announced its acceptance of the recommendation of the Sub-committee on WDII Review that an enhanced public participation should be adopted in the course of the review. To achieve this, a public engagement exercise, namely the "Harbour-front Enhancement Review -- Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Areas" (HER) had been carried out from May 2005 to June 2007 under the steer of the Sub-committee on WDII Review. The HER comprised three stages, namely the Envisaging Stage, the Realization Stage and the Detailed Planning Stage. Detailed information, including the public engagement reports, on the HER is available on the website of http://www.harbourfront.org.hk/eng/content_page/her.html?s=2.

6. In August 2005, the Sub-committee on WDII Review decided to convene an "Expert Panel Forum on Sustainable Transport Planning and Central-Wan Chai Bypass". An Expert Panel consisting of local and overseas experts was constituted on 18 August 2005. In its report published in October 2005, the Expert Panel recommended a package of short-term, medium-term and long-term measures to achieve a sustainable transport strategy. It supported the construction of CWB as a medium-term solution to tackle the problem of deteriorating traffic congestion in the Central and Wan Chai areas, and considered that CWB was essential for improving the network reliability of

the east-west link. The report of the Expert Panel [Annex A to LC Paper No. CB(1)1519/05-06(03)] was endorsed by the Subcommittee on WDII Review on 12 December 2005.

7. At its meeting on 20 April 2006, the Sub-committee on WDII Review considered the findings of the Consultants engaged by the Government for the WDII Review on possible trunk road alignments and harbour-front enhancement. The findings were presented in a report prepared by the Consultants [Annex C (CD-ROM) and Annex D (summary of the report) to LC Paper No. CB(1)1519/05-06(03)]. At its meeting on 13 June 2006, the Sub-committee on WDII Review supported the adoption of Tunnel Variation 1 as a basis for the Consultants to prepare the Concept Plan for WDII.

8. The Consultants subsequently prepared a Concept Plan in which five "character precincts" were proposed to enhance the waterfront areas. In early October 2006, the Sub-committee on WDII Review launched a series of public engagement activities of the Realisation Stage of HER with a roving exhibition to display details of the concept plan, community workshops and a public meeting was held on 16 December 2006 with an aim of reaching a consensus on the Concept plan revised according to the outcome of the community workshops and other feedback. Following that, the Administration had prepared a Recommended Outline Development Plan for WDII and proposed amendments to the Draft Wan Chai North OZP and the Draft North Point OZP. The Administration briefed the Panel on the details of these plans on 29 May 2007.

9. On 23 June 2007, the HEC held a public briefing to provide opportunity for the public to provide views on the Recommended Outline Development Plan and the proposed amendments to the relevant OZPs, making sure that these plans would reflect the majority public views expressed at the Realization Stage. It was concluded in the report on the public briefing that there was a general consensus that the Recommended Outline Development Plan and the proposed amendments to the relevant OZPs had reflected most of the views and directions on the Concept Plan expressed at the Realization Stage. Key issues, including creation of vibrant and continuous waterfront, further improvement of existing traffic conditions and pedestrian connection to the waterfront area, and environmental impacts associated with the exhaust vent and tunnel portal were the major concerns of the participants. Further public participation in the subsequent planning and development stages in various forms was generally supported.

Reclamation for construction of the proposed trunk road and judicial review on temporary reclamation

10. According to the Administration's paper provided to the Panel in May 2007, under the Tunnel Option Variation 1 adopted for the construction of the Trunk Road, the minimum extent of reclamation required is 12.7 hectares with an additional water area of 0.4 hectare that will be affected by new flyover

structures at the eastern end where the CWB joins the existing Island Eastern Corridor. Temporary reclamation would be required at the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter and the ex-public cargo working area. The temporary reclamation materials would be removed and the seabed would be re-instated upon completion of works.

11. The proposed road scheme of the CWB and Island Eastern Corridor Link (together known as "the Trunk Road") was gazetted under the Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance (Cap. 370) on 27 July 2007. The proposed works include, inter alia, temporary breakwater, temporary piled wave walls, and phased temporary reclamation works. The Administration has stated in the gazette notice that, after construction of the Trunk Road tunnel, the temporary reclamation works and the temporary breakwater will be removed and the existing sea-bed will be re-instated. The WDII reclamation and at-grade roadwork scheme as well as the proposed amendments to the two relevant OZPs were also gazetted on the same date.

12. On 3 October 2007, the Society for Protection of the Harbour (SPH) lodged an application for a judicial review against the Administration in respect of the proposed temporary reclamation. SPH sought a declaration that the PHO and the presumption against reclamation contained therein does apply to the proposed temporary reclamation works. On 8 October 2007, the High Court granted leave to the application. The Court of First Instance of the High Court delivered its judgment on 20 March 2008 ruling that the PHO does apply to the proposed temporary reclamation referred to in the road scheme.

Deliberations of the Panel

13. The Panel discussed the progress of the WDII Review at a series of meetings from February 2005 to May 2007. The major concerns/views of members are summarized below.

Necessity for the Trunk Road

14. Members expressed diverse views on the necessity for constructing the Trunk Road. Some members considered that the Trunk Road would solve the traffic congestion along the northern shore of the Hong Kong Island, and urged the Administration to implement the project as soon as possible and it was long overdue. Some other members expressed the view that the Administration had yet to convince the public that it had thoroughly explored alternatives other than reclaiming land and spending some \$20 billion to construct the Trunk Road to address the traffic congestion problem. They considered that the Administration should reduce planned commercial developments in the Central reclamation area and adopt a basket of traffic management measures to address the traffic congestion problem, such as restricting private vehicles from entering the Central

Business District (CBD), rationalizing the usage of the cross-harbour tunnels and implementing electronic road pricing.

15. According to the Administration, the Trunk Road 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 the Trunk Road in place, the ratio would only be 0.7 by 2016. The Administration had conducted quantitative traffic modelling to test various scenarios and the results indicated that the Trunk Road 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. 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. However, such measures alone could not solve traffic congestion in the long run and the Trunk Road, together with other traffic management measures, would offer a long-term solution.

Harbourfront enhancement

16. Land formed consequential to the construction of the Trunk Road would provide opportunities for providing waterfront open space in Wan Chai and in North Point. Members noted that under the Concept Plan prepared for the Realization Stage of the HER, five "character precincts" namely, Arts and Culture, Water Park, Water Recreation, Heritage and Leisure and Recreation Precincts were proposed to enhance the waterfront areas in Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and North Point. Members in general supported the proposal of creating a vibrant and attractive waterfront that was continuous and easily accessible for all, and called for early implementation of the enhancement measures. Members also provided specific views on certain design aspects, such as placing emphasis on the provision of a natural and open environment at the waterfront and the need to ensure that the greening and supporting facilities provided at the waterfront would not block the sea view. Members also urged the Administration to address the odour problem at the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter.

Extent of reclamation

17. There was a general consensus among members that the extent of reclamation should be as small as possible and the Administration should ensure that the proposed reclamation could meet the overriding public need test. Members however raised queries on whether reclamation was necessary at certain locations, and whether any reclamation was aimed at creating land for sale for commercial use.

18. The Administration explained that the Trunk Road 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. The extent of reclamation was entirely based on a technical analysis with reference to the depth of the tunnel at various locations. If the tunnel was under the seabed, no reclamation would be required. However, where this was infeasible due to constraints such as the presence of the tunnel of the Mass Transit Railway Tsuen Wan Line and the need for constructing slip roads and seawalls for protecting the CWB tunnel, reclamation would be required. The strategy was to keep the tunnel under the seabed as far as possible. A minimum of 12.7 hectares of reclamation would be required for constructing the tunnel, seawalls and connection points with the Island Eastern Corridor, and there would be an additional 0.4 hectare of affected water area due to the construction of new flyover structures for connection to the Island Eastern Corridor. Locating the tunnel portal at North Point would provide good connectivity to the existing road networks with the least extent of reclamation.

19. The Administration affirmed that no reclamation would be carried out for the purpose of providing land for waterfront enhancement whilst the land formed incidental to the construction of the Trunk Road would be used for harbourfront enhancement for public enjoyment. The provision of facilities for harbourfront enhancement in itself would not meet the overriding public need test but the construction of the Trunk Road would. A very small portion (about 0.34 ha) of the reclaimed land would be designated for "Other Specified Uses (Waterfront Related Commercial and Leisure Uses)" to create a vibrant waterfront for the public. The developments would be low-rise and low-density.

20. As regards the proposed temporary reclamation works, when it came to the notice of the Panel that SPH on 3 October 2007 had lodged an application for judicial review against the Administration in respect of the proposed temporary works, the Panel had sought relevant information from the Administration and the Administration replied on 6 December 2007 (LC Paper No. CB(1)411/07-08(01)).

21. A list of the relevant papers with their hyperlinks is in **Appendix II**.

Facts on Central – Wan Chai Bypass

What is the Central – Wan Chai Bypass (CWB)?

- CWB is the last, yet to be built section of a strategic highway running along the northern part of the Hong Kong Island. It is planned to be 4.5 km long dual three-lane trunk road with a 3.5 km long tunnel. It will link up the Rumsey Street Flyover at Central with the Island Eastern Corridor (IEC) at North Point near City Garden.
- When CWB is completed, vehicles from Chai Wan can use the strategic highway to go all the way to Tuen Mun or the Hong Kong International Airport without having to pass through the busy districts of Causeway Bay, Wan Chai and Central unnecessarily.
- The CWB tunnel will lie within the Central and Wan Chai reclamation areas and underneath the seabed of the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter. The CWB will mainly be built in the form of tunnel so that as much as possible valuable land along the harbour-front could be available for the enjoyment of the public. There is broad support from the public for a tunnel option, especially where this can incorporate the suggested harbour-front enhancement ideas while at the same time providing the functional requirements of the road.

Why is CWB required?

- Traffic congestion along the Connaught Road Central/Harcourt Road/Gloucester Road Corridor (the Corridor) at present is not limited to just the few rush hours experienced by other busy roads in Hong Kong. Gridlocks are not uncommon at most times of the day, especially when there is a traffic accident along the Corridor.
- Vehicles commuting between the western part and the eastern part of the Hong Kong Island along its northern shore have to make use of the Corridor. CWB will divert such through traffic away from the Central Business District (CBD), cater for the anticipated traffic growth and alleviate congestion on the Corridor and the existing local road networks in the area.

When is CWB required?

- There is a compelling and present need for CWB.

- At present, travelling by car from Rumsey Street to Causeway Bay during the rush hours takes about 15 minutes. If CWB were not ready by 2016, the Corridor would be running at 30% above capacity, the travelling time would worsen to 45 minutes and the average vehicle speed would deteriorate to 5 km/h.

On what basis is the need for CWB established?

- Government's traffic infrastructure planning models since the late 1980s have confirmed the need for CWB. The Comprehensive Transport Study (CTS) model is a planning model that helps formulate solutions to cope with anticipated traffic demand. CTS-2, completed in 1989, confirmed the need for CWB by mid to late 1990s. CTS-3, completed in 1999, reconfirmed the need for the CWB. A recent re-run of CTS-3 using the latest land use planning assumptions and population projections has also reaffirmed the compelling need for CWB.

What economic benefits will CWB bring about?

- Using the Internal Rate of Return assessment, the investment on CWB will generate an Economic Internal Rate of Return of about 17% over its estimated project life of 40 years.

Why can't traffic management measures replace CWB?

- Traffic management measures will only provide local, limited short-term relief. They can complement but cannot replace CWB.
- Indeed, we have been pursuing various traffic management measures to reduce congestion along the Corridor --
 - *Restricting loading and unloading times in Central*
We are imposing strict restrictions on loading/unloading along the Corridor. At present, only franchised buses can stop on the Corridor when they call on the bus stops along it. No other vehicles are allowed to carry out loading/unloading on the Corridor.
 - *Reducing buses on the Corridor*
We have reduced the number of bus trips going through Central by 18% since 1999. Our plan to further rationalize bus services will continue.

➤ *Improving traffic movements through traffic management measures and associated works*

We have revised routings, changed lane demarcations and widened road sections in the area where technically feasible to improve traffic movements to reduce congestion.

● We have also considered the following options --

➤ *Rationalizing tolling regimes of cross harbour tunnels*

We are exploring options to rationalize tolling regimes of cross harbour tunnels, in order to achieve a better distribution of cross-harbour traffic among the three tunnels. Nevertheless, tunnel toll rationalization may only complement but cannot replace CWB in terms of bringing about significant improvement in the traffic flow between the western part and the eastern part of the Hong Kong Island.

➤ *Electronic Road Pricing (ERP) and Fiscal Measures*

ERP is one possible form of traffic management provided that: (a) there is an alternative route bypassing the charging zone for those cars not destined for Central (otherwise it would be unfair to charge through traffic); and (b) there is community support for its implementation. We are now conducting a feasibility study on the congestion charging transport model.

ERP can complement CWB in relieving traffic congestion but cannot replace it.

➤ *West Island Line*

The forecast deterioration in traffic condition mentioned above has assumed the presence of the West Island Line which will be an extension of the MTR line from Sheung Wan to Kennedy Town. Moreover, we should note that most bus routes run along "inner" roads, including Des Voeux Road and Queen's Road, and not the Corridor. Therefore, even if train service is available in the western district, any reduction in bus services as a result of passenger diversion to the MTR will be limited and at most provide slight relief to the already congested inner roads. It will not help relieve congestion on the Corridor to any significant extent.

➤ *New hillside escalators from Central to Mid-levels*

Additional escalator links might help relieve the traffic burden along roads in the Mid-levels to a small extent, but will not help relieve congestion in the Central and Wan Chai areas.

More pedestrian escalators linking Mid-levels to the harbour front will not help reduce traffic running between the eastern and western parts of the northern shore of the Hong Kong Island.

What if CWB is delayed?

- Protracted delay of CWB will lead to the following problems --
 - worsening traffic congestion
 - increased risk of gridlock;
 - worsening air quality, noise and physical environment;
 - deteriorating operating conditions for public transport; and
 - deteriorating environment for pedestrians.
- The Corridor has been used heavily for many years. Major repair and reconstruction works would be required in the next decade. If the CWB were not completed in time for such works, east-west traffic could be paralyzed when parts of the Corridor have to be closed for repair and/or reconstruction works.

Why are the planned slip roads of CWB important?

- The planned slip roads near the Convention and Exhibition Centre and Victoria Park Road would help optimise the use of CWB and enhance the accessibility of the whole Wan Chai North area.
- At present, there are often tailbacks on Fenwick Street, Fleming Road, Harbour Road, Victoria Park Road, Hing Fat Street and Causeway Road as traffic queues to get into the Corridor. The slip roads would facilitate dispersing traffic from Wan Chai North and Causeway Bay areas to CWB directly and would thus relieve the traffic congestion.
- Our assessment shows that without the slip roads, a significant portion of CWB traffic would revert back to the Corridor. The critical sections of the Corridor would be overloaded by up to 20% by 2016. With the slip roads, the Corridor would work within capacity by 2016.
- Just imagine what King's Road would be like if the slip roads of the Island Eastern Corridor near Tai Koo Shing were not built. All vehicles commuting from the area would be using King's Road.

Transport Expert Forum on Sustainable Transport Planning and CWB

- A panel made up of leading local and overseas transport planning experts has completed its deliberation on the need for CWB.
- The panel supports the construction of CWB to improve the reliability of the road network and to enhance multi-modal public transportation in the

Corridor. The panel agrees that the inability of the present infrastructure capacity to cope with present and future travel demand would persist even if development in Central reclamation area were stopped and territory-wide car ownership held unchanged from now until 2016. It further supports the provision of the planned slip roads at the Convention and Exhibition Centre area and Victoria Park Road/Gloucester Road/Hing Fat Street passageway to magnify the benefits of CWB.

- The panel has also recommended a number of short to long term measures for achieving sustainable transport. The full report of the panel can be viewed at http://www.harbourfront.org.hk/eng/content_page/doc/report_of_the_expert_panel.pdf.

Latest Development and Way Forward

- The proposed road schemes of the CWB and Wan Chai Development Phase II were gazetted under the Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance on 27 July 2007. The amendments to the relevant Outline Zoning Plans (Wan Chai North and North Point) and the reclamation scheme were also gazetted under the Town Planning Ordinance and Foreshore and Sea-bed (Reclamations) Ordinance respectively on the same date.
- In October 2007, Society for Protection of the Harbour applied for a judicial review against the Administration in respect of the proposed temporary reclamation for the construction of the CWB. The judicial review was heard by the High Court on 4 and 5 February 2008. The judgment has yet been handed down.
- The project costs are estimated to be about \$20.5 billion (Sept 2007 prices).

Transport and Housing Bureau
March 2008

Central-Wan Chai Bypass and Wan Chai Development Phase II

List of relevant papers

Council/Committee	Date of meeting	Paper
Panel on Planning, Lands and Works (PLW Panel)	22 February 2005	<p>Administration's paper on "Comprehensive Planning and Engineering Review of Wan Chai Development Phase II" (LC Paper No. CB(1)763/04-05(01)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/english/panels/plw/papers/plwcb1-763-1e.pdf</p> <p>Administration's paper on "Progress of the Review of Wan Chai Development Phase II and Kai Tak" (LC Paper No. CB(1)921/04-05(01)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0222cb1-921-1e.pdf</p> <p>Background brief on "Central and Wan Chai reclamation" (LC Paper No. CB(1)921/04-05(02)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0222cb1-921-2e.pdf</p> <p>Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)1117/04-05) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/english/panels/plw/minutes/pl050222.pdf</p>
PLW Panel	26 April 2005	<p>Administration's paper on "Wan Chai Development Phase II Review -- Harbour-front Enhancement Review -- Wan Chai and Adjoining Areas : A Public Engagement Exercise" (LC Paper No. CB(1)1319/04-05(05)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0426cb1-1319-5e.pdf</p>

Council/Committee	Date of meeting	Paper
		<p>Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)1567/04-05) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/english/panels/plw/minutes/pl050426.pdf</p>
PLW Panel	28 June 2005	<p>Administration's paper on "Wan Chai Development Phase II Review -- Harbour-front Enhancement Review -- Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Areas : A Public Engagement Exercise" (LC Paper No. CB(1)1875/04-05(03)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0628cb1-1875-3e.pdf</p> <p>Updated background brief on "Wan Chai reclamation" (LC Paper No. CB(1)1875/04-05(04)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0628cb1-1875-4e.pdf</p> <p>Administration's response dated 3 November 2005 providing information on the sample sizes of the kerb side and telephone opinion surveys conducted on the future harbourfront in Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and the adjoining areas (LC Paper No. CB(1)225/05-06(01)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0628cb1-225-1e.pdf</p> <p>Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)2291/04-05) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/english/panels/plw/minutes/pl050628.pdf</p>
PLW Panel	23 May 2006	<p>Administration's paper on "Wan Chai Development Phase II Review -- Harbour-front Enhancement Review -- Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Areas: Outcome of Public Engagement at the Envisioning Stage" (LC Paper No. CB(1)1519/05-06(03)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr05-06/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0523cb1-1519-3e.pdf</p> <p>Background brief on "Wan Chai Development Phase II Review" (LC Paper No. CB(1)1519/05-06(04))</p>

Council/Committee	Date of meeting	Paper
		<p>(http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr05-06/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0523cb1-1519-4e.pdf)</p> <p>Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)2024/05-06) (http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr05-06/english/panels/plw/minutes/pl060523.pdf)</p> <p>Follow-up paper – written reply by the Administration to issues raised at the meeting on 23 May 2006 (http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr05-06/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0609cb1-1706-1e.pdf)</p>
PLW Panel	9 June 2006 26 June 2006	<p>Administration's paper on "Wan Chai Development Phase II Review -- Follow-up to the discussion on 23 May 2006" (LC Paper No. CB(1)1706/05-06(01)) (http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr05-06/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0609cb1-1706-1e.pdf)</p> <p>Administration's paper on "Wan Chai Development Phase II Review -- Harbour-front Enhancement Review -- Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Areas: Outcome of Public Engagement at the Envisioning Stage" (LC Paper No. CB(1)1519/05-06(03)) (http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr05-06/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0523cb1-1519-3e.pdf)</p> <p>Background brief on "Wan Chai Development Phase II Review" (LC Paper No. CB(1)1519/05-06(04)) (http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr05-06/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0523cb1-1519-4e.pdf)</p> <p>Submissions (http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr05-06/english/panels/plw/agenda/plag0626.htm)</p> <p>Minutes of meeting on 9 June 2006 (LC Paper No. CB(1)2232/05-06) (http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr05-06/english/panels/plw/minutes/pl060609.pdf)</p>

Council/Committee	Date of meeting	Paper
		<p>Minutes of meeting on 26 June 2006 (LC Paper No. CB(1)60/06-07) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr05-06/english/panels/plw/minutes/pl060626.pdf</p> <p>Follow-up paper - Written reply by the Administration to issues raised at the meeting on 9 June 2006 http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr05-06/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0609cb1-701-1-e.pdf</p>
PLW Panel	28 November 2006	<p>Administration's paper on "Wan Chai Development Phase II Review -- Harbour-front Enhancement Review -- Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Areas: Concept Plan" (LC Paper No. CB(1)360/06-07(03)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr06-07/english/panels/plw/papers/plw1128cb1-360-3-e.pdf</p> <p>Background brief on "Wan Chai Development Phase II Review" (LC Paper No. CB(1)360/06-07(04)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr06-07/english/panels/plw/papers/plw1128cb1-360-4-e.pdf</p> <p>Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)943/06-07) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr06-07/english/panels/plw/minutes/pl061128.pdf</p>
PLW Panel	29 May 2007	<p>Administration's paper on "Wan Chai Development Phase II Review" (LC Paper No. CB(1)1723/06-07(01)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr06-07/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0529cb1-1723-1-e.pdf</p> <p>Background brief on "Wan Chai Development Phase II Review" (LC Paper No. CB(1)1723/06-07(02)) http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr06-07/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0529cb1-1723-2-e.pdf</p>

Council/Committee	Date of meeting	Paper
		Minutes of meeting (LC Paper No. CB(1)2149/06-07) (http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr06-07/english/panels/plw/minutes/pl070529.pdf)
Development Panel	--	Administration's response dated 6 December 2007 providing information on the temporary reclamation for the construction of the Central-Wan Chai Bypass and Island Eastern Corridor Link (LC Paper No. CB(1)411/07-08(01)) (http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr07-08/english/panels/plw/papers/devcb1-411-1-e.pdf)
--	March 2008 (Version date as shown on the website)	Facts on Central-Wan Chai Bypass prepared by the Transport and Housing Bureau (http://www.thb.gov.hk/eng/policy/transport/issues/cwcb/20080304.doc)
--	20 March 2008 (Date of delivery of judgment)	Judgment of the judicial review lodged by the Society for Protection of the Harbour against the Administration in respect of the proposed temporary reclamation (English version only) (http://legalref.judiciary.gov.hk/doc/judg/word/vetted/other/en/2007/HCAL000116_2007.doc)