

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)91/99-00

(These minutes have been
seen by the Administration)

Ref: CB1/PL/PLW/1

LegCo Panel on Planning, Lands and Works

**Minutes of meeting
held on Thursday, 10 June 1999, at 10:45 am
in the Chamber of the Legislative Council Building**

Members present : Hon Edward HO Sing-tin, JP (Chairman)
Dr Hon TANG Siu-tong, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai, JP
Hon LEE Wing-tat
Hon WONG Yung-kan
Hon LAU Kong-wah
Hon TAM Yiu-chung, JP

Non-Panel member attending : Hon Ambrose CHEUNG Wing-sum, JP

Members absent : Hon HO Sai-chu, JP
Hon Ronald ARCULLI, JP
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBS, JP
Hon Andrew CHENG Kar-foo

Public officers attending : For items IV and V

Mr Gordon SIU
Secretary for Planning, Environment and Lands

Mr Patrick LAU
Secretary for Planning, Environment and Lands
(Planning and Lands)

Action

Mr Wilson FUNG
Principal Assistant Secretary for Planning,
Environment and Lands (Planning)

For item IV

Mr Bosco FUNG
Director of Planning

Mr K K LING
District Planning Officer (Hong Kong)
Planning Department

Miss H Y CHU
Chief Town Planner (Metro Group)
Planning Department

Mr LO Shit-cham
Acting Project Manager
Hong Kong Island and Islands Development Office
Territory Development Department

Mr TANG Kam-fai
Senior Engineer (2)
Hong Kong Island & Islands Development Office
Territory Development Department

For item V

Mr David O Y WONG
District Planning Officer (Tsuen Wan, Kwai Tsing &
Sham Shui Po)
Planning Department

Mr C J CHIVERS
Chief Engineer (Tsuen Wan)
New Territories West Development Office
Territory Development Department

Mr K M LAU
Senior Engineer (Major Works)
New Territories West Development Office
Territory Development Department

Mr LIU Hon-por, Francis
General Manager/Planning & Development

Action

Marine Department

Mr CHAN Ming-kwong
Senior Marine Officer (Planning & Development)
Marine Department

Mr Terence S W TSANG
Acting Principal Environmental Protection Officer
Assessment and Audit Group
Environmental Protection Department

Dr WONG Pat-shun, Patsy
Senior Aquaculture Fisheries Officer
Environmental Protection Department

For item VI

Mr Howard CHAN
Principal Assistant Secretary for Planning,
Environment and Lands (Environment)

Mr Elvis AU
Assistant Director
(Environmental Assessment & Noise)
Environmental Protection Department

Mr CHAN Kam-sun
Principal Environmental Protection Officer
Environmental Protection Department

For item VII

Mr R K S CHAN
Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office
Civil Engineering Department

Mr M C TANG
Assistant Director
(Geotechnical/Landslip Preventive Measures)
Civil Engineering Department

Mr K W MAK
Assistant Secretary for Works (Works Policy)

Action

Attendance by invitation : For item IV

Professor Anthony WALKER
Member of Town Planning Board

Mr Daniel HEUNG Cheuk-kei
Member of Town Planning Board

Mr Charles Nicholas BROOKE
Member of Town Planning Board

Clerk in attendance : Miss Odelia LEUNG, Chief Assistant Secretary (1)1

Staff in attendance : Mrs Mary TANG, Senior Assistant Secretary (1)2

I Confirmation of minutes of meeting and endorsement of Panel report

(LC Paper Nos. CB(1)1266, 1364, 1445 and 1448/98-99)

The minutes of joint meeting with Financial Affairs Panel on 7 January 1999 and the minutes of meetings on 9 March and 29 April 1999 were confirmed. Members endorsed the Panel report and authorised the Chairman to revise it in the light of discussion at this and further Panel meetings before presentation to the Council on 7 July 1999.

II Date of next meeting and items for discussion

2. Members agreed to discuss the Administration's revised proposal on South East Kowloon Development at the next Panel meeting scheduled for 9 July 1999. Members also agreed to invite professional institutes from the building and planning sectors to attend the meeting.

(*Post meeting note: The meeting on 9 July 1999 was postponed to 20 July 1999.*)

III Information papers issued since last meeting

3. Members noted the following information paper which was issued since last meeting -

Action

LC Paper No. CB(1)1308/98-99 - submission from the Urban Watch on the Town Planning Bill.

Members noted the respective lists of outstanding items for discussion and of follow-up actions arising from discussion which were tabled at the meeting.

IV Draft Vision Statement for the Victoria Harbour and Central Reclamation Phase III (CR III)

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1443/98-99)

Draft Vision Statement for the Victoria Harbour

4. The Secretary for Planning, Environment and Lands (SPEL) thanked members for giving the Administration and representatives of the Town Planning Board a chance to share their views on the Vision Statement for the Victoria Harbour. With the aid of a computer, the Chief Town Planner (Metro Group), Planning Department (CTP) gave a presentation on the vision and goals for the Victoria Harbour which were set out in Annex A to the Administration's paper.

(Post-meeting note: A set of colour prints setting out the vision and goals for the Victoria Harbour was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1497/98-99)

5. Mr Charles Nicholas BROOKE, member of the Town Planning Board (TPB), pointed out that the Vision Statement for the Victoria Harbour was a milestone in the planning process of Hong Kong. The Vision Statement was the result of team efforts involving all sectors of the community. There had been good progress in balancing the competing needs for space. Infrastructure development was needed as part of the ongoing development of the harbour front. The Vision Statement was subject to further refinement and public views were welcome.

6. The Chairman thanked members of the TPB for attending the meeting and sharing their views with the Panel. He expressed appreciation for the efforts made in the formulation of the Vision Statement for the Victoria Harbour and the revised plan for CR III which took into account public views. He hoped that the Administration and the TPB would take a similar approach in future to consult as early as possible the public and professionals on town planning matters, not just reclamation.

7. Mr LEE Wing-tat also expressed appreciation for the joint efforts of the Administration and the TPB in accommodating the views put forth by the public. In order to achieve the goals and visions for the Victoria Harbour, Mr

Action

LEE opined that new guidelines should apply on the use of the waterfront, including the South East Kowloon Development. He enquired if the Administration would consider setting up a new committee responsible for the planning and co-ordination of culture, sports and other activities along the waterfront.

8. SPEL said that the Central - Wanchai development provided an useful opportunity for the development of a 40-to-60-metre wide waterfront promenade. The promenade would bring the people to the harbour and would be an attractive and unbroken waterfront walkway for the enjoyment of the public. As the said development was only at the conceptual stage, its design and use as well as the maintenance responsibility would be decided at a later stage when the plans were finalized. The Administration might consider organizing a design competition for the development of the waterfront promenade.

9. The Chairman supported the goal of creating a quality harbour front through innovative building designs. He said that for such goals to be realized, the Administration would have to consider how best development should proceed.

10. Mr Daniel HEUNG of TPB said that in designing waterfront development, TPB would take into account public aspirations for the harbour. The waterfront promenade would provide a variety of uses for the enjoyment of the public.

11. Professor WALKER of TPB said that reclamation had to be infrastructure driven. The most important goal of the Vision Statement was to bring the people to the harbour and the harbour to the people. In order to achieve this goal, the harbour front had to be made more attractive and accessible to the public.

12. Mr Charles Nicholas BROOKE of TPB said that the next challenge would be implementing the vision, followed by the management of the vision when it was translated into reality. The waterfront promenade would be one of the first special design areas for Hong Kong and its design would form part of the approval process.

13. Mr LEE Wing-tat said that since the latest approach of formulating the Vision Statement and conducting consultation on development proposals was widely accepted by the public, he enquired whether the Administration would use the same approach when dealing with other new developments like North Lantau.

14. SPEL said that the latest approach was the first of its kind which had integrated the ideas put forward by the public. Since this had gained public

Action

acceptance, the Administration would continue to adopt similar approach in future projects such as the forthcoming Metroplan and the North Lantau Development.

CR III

15. At the invitation of the Chairman, the District Planning Officer (Hong Kong), Planning Department (DPO) gave a presentation on the revised plan for CR III, highlighting the four different zones in terms of urban design features and town planning concepts.

16. Notwithstanding the proposed reduced scale of reclamation from 38 ha to 22 ha, Mr LAU Kong-wah was of the view that it should be further reduced. In this connection, he queried the rationale for the increase in area for specified uses (from 4 ha to 7 ha) and Comprehensive Development Area (from 1.2 ha to 5.2 ha) as set out in Annex C to the paper.

17. In response, the Director of Planning (D of P) said that the increase in area for specified uses was to cater for tourism related uses at the waterfront including piers, shops and leisure facilities. These facilities would be low-rise developments. Meanwhile, the commercial sites on the reclaimed land would be combined to form one large Comprehensive Development Area (CDA). The increase in the size of CDA was set off by a corresponding decrease in commercial areas.

18. On Mr LAU Kong-wah's enquiry about the provision or otherwise of a cruise terminal at CR III, SPEL said that at present there were no such plans. The Administration was contemplating the provision of a pier to replace the Queen's Pier for the berthing of yachts and sailing boats. There were a few sites along the waterfront which could be developed as cruise terminals, for example North Point and Kai Tak Point at the South East Kowloon Development. The Administration had yet to decide whether a second cruise terminal should be built and if so, where it should be.

19. Ir Dr Raymond HO said that there were significant improvements in the revised plan for CR III, in particular the provision of a submerged Central - Wanchai Bypass which would ease the traffic flow between Central and Wanchai. Since a lot of traffic would be generated by the proposed Central Government Complex (CGC), he enquired about the possibility of relocating it away from Central.

20. D of P said that it was a policy decision to build a CGC in CR III development. From the planning point of view, it was workable whether or not the CGC was located in Central. However, a centrally located Government complex would provide convenience and accessibility to the public. The traffic generated by the proposed CGC would be addressed. In

Action

response to Dr HO's concern about the lack of parking facilities in Central, D of P assured that the provision of parking facilities would be considered at the detailed design stage.

21. Mr TAM Yiu-chung concurred that traffic was a major problem which need to be addressed in proceeding with CR III. He said that while the aesthetics of the waterfront development was important, it was equally important that the waterfront area would actually be used by the public. To maximise the use of the waterfront promenade, more facilities should be provided for the enjoyment of the public.

22. Mr LEE Wing-tat expressed concern about the extensive road network along the waterfront. He opined that the number of road links should be minimised and situated away from the waterfront. In his view, the military site and the CGC were concrete barriers and were not compatible with the waterfront promenade where tourist related facilities would be located.

23. DPO said that the traffic arrangement at CR III had been carefully examined by the Administration. Presently Gloucester Road/Harcourt Road Corridor provided through traffic between Central and Wanchai. In future, the traffic between Central and Wanchai would be eased by the Central-Wanchai Bypass. Owing to the anticipated heavy vehicular traffic around the Airport Railway Hong Kong Station and its associated development, there would still be a need to provide sufficient road links to facilitate traffic. On the suggestion of maximising the provision of submerged roads to facilitate traffic, DPO said that a detailed transport study had been conducted in the area and the number of road links had already been minimised. He pointed out that the distribution of underground utilities and sewerages had constrained the further depressing of the road network.

24. As for the design of the waterfront promenade, DPO advised that there would be low rise developments along the promenade such as open cafes and retail pavilions, so that the area could be made better use of for public enjoyment. In designing the promenade, flexibility would be allowed for the provision of arts and cultural facilities to complement the Arts Centre and the Academy for Performing Arts located nearby.

25. Mr Ambrose CHEUNG sought information on the concept of view corridor and the height restrictions in CR III developments. He suggested that height restrictions should be imposed on new developments at the waterfront to avoid obstruction of harbour views. DPO explained that there would be three main view corridors in CR III, namely the north-south view corridor from the existing LegCo Building to the new waterfront, the Civic Corridor at the Tamar site, and the Arts and Entertainment Corridor to the east of CR III. With the exception of the CGC which would have a height of 180 metres, all other new developments along the waterfront would be low-rise.

Action

26. Mr LAU Kong-wah sought clarification on the width of the waterfront promenade. DPO advised that a minimum width of 36.5 metre was required to accommodate the seawall and the pumping stations. In addition a buffer area of 20 metres was required to alienate the promenade from the main road. Therefore, the promenade would need to have a width of at least 60 metres in order to accommodate recreation and cultural facilities.

27. Dr TANG Siu-tong pointed out that the waterfront promenade would provide a convenient venue for staging protests and demonstrations in front of the CGC. He enquired whether this factor had been taken into account in planning for the promenade. D of P said that the Police had been consulted on crowd control since the promenade was expected to be frequented by swarms of people. SPEL said that based on overseas experience, there should not be problems of crowd management in open areas.

V Tang Lung Chau Dangerous Goods Anchorage
(LC Paper No. CB(1)1443/98-99(02))

28. The Principal Assistant Secretary for Planning, Environment and Lands (Planning) (PAS/PEL(P)) said that the Administration originally planned to submit a funding request for the relocation of the Dangerous Goods Anchorage (DGA) from Tsuen Wan to Tang Lung Chau (TLC) to the Public Works Subcommittee for consideration on 28 April 1999 but subsequently withdrew the submission in order to address more fully two particular concerns of members, namely the choice of the TLC site and ex gratia allowances payable to the fishing and mariculture community that might be affected.

29. On the choice of location of the DGA, PAS/PEL(P) advised that eight possible sites had been identified in a comprehensive territorial site search and a summary comparison of these sites was set out at Annex C to the information paper. Of these sites, south of TLC was found to be the most suitable one for reprovisioning the DGA. Subsequent to the Panel meeting on 23 March 1999 when the reprovisioning of the DGA to the TLC site was discussed, some members had suggested an alternative site to the south of Sunshine Island. The Administration considered the proposed site not suitable as it was flanked by two busy channels.

30. As regards ex gratia allowances and compensation, PAS/PEL(P) said that the Administration was aware of the difficulties faced by mariculturists affected by public works in seeking indemnity from contractors and had decided to launch a pilot scheme to facilitate claims from mariculturists for damages caused by the DGA project. Under the scheme, the Government would be responsible for establishing whether such damages were caused by the DGA project and if so, deciding on the level of compensation. The

Action

Government would also ensure that contractors would settle the claim without delay. If settlement was delayed, the Government would make direct payment to the claimant and recover it from the contractors concerned.

31. Mr WONG Yung-kan said that the proposed reprovisioning of the DGA to TLC was met with strong opposition from fishermen in Tsuen Wan and Ma Wan area who were concerned that the fishing grounds at TLC would be lost if the DGA was located there. The fishermen were more concerned about the choice of site for the DGA than the ex gratia allowance. The recent oil spillage at Sha Chau had led to serious contamination and the fishermen worried that the DGA would expose TLC to a higher level of marine risks. He therefore suggested that the Administration should give further thought to the Siu Lam site which was one of the eight possible sites originally identified. Referring to page 3 of Annex C to the information paper, Mr WONG queried the need for the provision of a typhoon shelter at the Siu Lam site. He said that the DGA could be located at the site reserved for the typhoon shelter.

32. PAS/PEL(P) said that the Siu Lam site was one of the three sites which had been shortlisted for further assessment. The site was considered not suitable because it was too close to densely populated areas. Furthermore, the location of the DGA at the site would intrude into the Ma Wan fairways. As Siu Lam was facing the Ma Wan fish culture zone, any oil spillage would rapidly be diffused to the sensitive receivers. In this context, the TLC site was considered more suitable than the Siu Lam site.

33. Following up on some members' proposed location of the DGA at the south of Sunshine Island, Mr TAM Yiu-chung enquired whether it would be possible to align the DGA in such a way that it would not intrude into the nearby channels. PAS/PEL(P) said in response that the reprovisioning of the DGA required 70 hectares of space. The initial assessment was that for the DGA to be located at the south of Sunshine Island, it would most probably intrude into the fairways because of its size. While the alignment of the DGA at the proposed site could be further assessed through a detailed engineering feasibility study, it might not be worthwhile to spend extra time and resources to study a site which was considered not entirely feasible. In response to Mr TAM Yiu-chung, PAS/PEL(P) said that the Administration would be prepared to explain to the fishermen the pros and cons of the eight possible sites and its choice of the TLC site to the affected fishermen.

34. Mr LAU Kong-wah enquired whether assessment had been made on a possible site in the north of Sunshine Island or Hei Ling Chau as the area was much further away from mariculture zones. PAS/PEL(P) said the north of Hei Ling Chau was one of the eight possible sites which had been considered. One of the reasons for rejecting the site was that the water was too shallow and extensive dredging of marine sediments was required. The site was also too close to the fish culture zone at Chi Ma Wan.

VI Policy on mitigation of traffic noise from roads
(LC Paper No. CB(1)1443/98-99(03))

35. The Chairman said that the subject of mitigation of traffic noise had been discussed at the Public Works Subcommittee meeting on 28 April and 12 May 1999 in the context of the West Rail project. Members then considered that the problem of traffic noise should be abated at source. Traffic noise impacts, if not properly dealt with, would give rise to serious constraints in land planning as well as housing designs. The Chairman pointed out that proponents of new roads might not be aware of the planned sensitive uses nearby since the relevant outline zoning plan might not be available at the time when a new road was being planned. In some cases, although the outline zoning plans were available, land uses were subject to change. As such, the Chairman enquired whether it was feasible to require the proponents of new roads to make allowance for future installation of noise mitigation measures irrespective of whether planned sensitive uses in the vicinity had been confirmed.

36. The Principal Assistant Secretary for Planning, Environment and Lands (Environment) (PAS/PEL(E)) said that it was quite unlikely that a proponent of a new road was unaware of the neighbouring developments since planning was undertaken on an area wide basis. However, he acknowledged that there could be changes to land uses shown in the outline zoning plans and these might include the addition of sensitive uses which could be affected by noise impacts from road developments. The Administration was reviewing the findings of a territory-wide study commissioned by the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) on the technical feasibility of retrofitting noise barriers and enclosures on existing roads. It aimed to formulate a programme on retrofitting traffic noise mitigation measures to suitable existing roads within this year and to consult the public on the proposed programme by early next year.

37. The Assistant Director of Environmental Protection (Environmental Assessment and Noise) (ADEP) added that land uses and roads were jointly considered in the land planning process to ensure compatibility. Noise mitigation measures were applied to new roads to mitigate the problem of traffic noise. The consultancy study on the technical feasibility of retrofitting noise mitigation measures on existing roads had just been completed and the Administration was working out a prioritised programme for the retrofitting of noise mitigation measures to existing roads.

38. The Chairman enquired if it was technically feasible to make allowance for loading in the design of new roads and flyovers to accommodate future installation of noise barriers, if necessary. ADEP said that allowance

Action

had to be made for loading if noise barriers were to be installed on a road. There would be cost implications if allowance for loading had to be provided for in each and every new road project.

Admin.

39. On the Chairman's enquiry on whether extra reinforcement was needed if noise barriers were retrofitted on existing flyovers, PAS/PEL(E) said that the consultancy study commissioned by EPD had looked into the technical feasibility of retrofitting noise barriers on existing flyovers. The Administration would examine the noise mitigation requirements for both new and existing roads. At the request of the Chairman, the Administration agreed to review the feasibility to make allowance for loading in the design of new roads and flyovers to accommodate additional noise barriers, if necessary.

40. Ir Dr Raymond HO said that different types of materials could be used for building noise barriers and a lighter kind of building materials would reduce the loading requirements. Dr HO further pointed out that the provision of trees as noise barriers was preferable from an aesthetic point of view.

41. ADEP agreed that the planting of trees along roads would help to make the roads more aesthetically pleasing and EPD always supported the planting of trees for that reason. However, trees were not effective noise barriers. PAS/PEL(E) added that apart from the provision of noise barriers, the Administration was studying other noise mitigation measures such as low noise surfacing and traffic management. With these in mind, the Administration would work out a programme on the mitigation of traffic noise from existing roads.

42. Ir Dr Raymond HO opined that the use of asphalt for road surfacing would have a better effect than concrete in reducing noise. The Principal Environmental Protection Officer affirmed that low noise material had been used wherever applicable for road surfacing as it could absorb noise better and was highly permeable to water.

VII Slope safety

(LC Paper Nos. CB(1)1076/98-99 and 1443/98-99(04))

43. Ir Dr Raymond HO suggested that instead of spraying concrete to stabilise slopes, the Administration should consider greening slopes which would have better aesthetic as well as stabilising effects. He also called on the Administration to step up public education on owners' responsibility for slope maintenance.

44. The Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering Department (H/GEO) said that the greening of slopes had been an ongoing project. In fact, the Administration had just engaged the services of experts in

Action

this area as part of the Landslip Preventive Measures Programme.

45. The Assistant Secretary for Works (AS/W) said that there were technical guidelines on the application of concrete sprays to slopes. Spraying concrete would only be applied where there were no available alternatives. As regards public education, H/GEO said that the Administration had been taking a proactive approach to assist private owners in discharging their slope maintenance responsibility and taking measures to protect themselves against landslide hazard during heavy rainstorms. He noted Ir Dr Raymond HO's view that in designing the public education programmes, three-dimensional models and videos should be made use of as these aids were more appealing to the general public.

46. On Dr TANG Siu-tong's enquiry about the state of maintenance of private slopes, H/GEO informed that the annual survey on the state of maintenance of selected private slopes indicated that only 41% of the 300 private slopes inspected were in a satisfactory state of maintenance. The Administration acknowledged that there was a need to enhance public education on slope maintenance and safety with respect to the standards to be achieved. AS/W added that a Community Advisory Unit was set up in April 1999 to assist owners in discharging their slope maintenance responsibility.

(The Chairman left at this juncture and Dr TANG Siu-tong took the chair.)

47. Dr TANG Siu-tong sought information on the existing legislation governing owners' responsibility for maintenance of slopes. H/GEO advised that under the Buildings Ordinance, Cap. 123, the Building Authority would issue Dangerous Hillside Orders requiring owners to repair their slopes if these were found to be dangerous. In case of emergencies, the Building Authority would take action to rectify the dangerous slopes and recover the costs of works from the owners. There were no provisions under the Buildings Ordinance requiring regular maintenance of slopes. However, under the Building Management Ordinance, Cap. 344, owners corporations were required to regularly maintain their slopes and retaining walls.

48. Regarding the recent funding proposal to convert three supernumerary directorate posts to permanent posts in the Geotechnical Engineering Office of the Civil Engineering Department, H/GEO said that this was necessary to oversee the ten-year expanded Landslip Prevention Programme.

VII Any other business

49. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 12:45 pm.

Action

Legislative Council Secretariat
11 October 1999