

Annex I –
Minutes and Group Reports of
Collaborators' Meeting (14.10.2006)

Harbour-front Enhancement Review –
Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Areas (HER)
Realization Stage

Notes of Collaborators' Working Group Meeting

Date: 14 October 2006

Time: 2:00pm – 5:00pm

Venue: North Point Government Office, 3/F, Rm 330, 333 Java Road, North Point

Introduction

1. Ms. Betty Ho (何小芳女士), MC of the Collaborators' Working Group Meeting, briefed the meeting agenda
 - Welcoming remarks by Mr. K Y Leung (梁剛銳先生), Chairman of Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC) sub-committee on Wan Chai Development Phase II Review (WDII)
 - Presentation on the Proposed Concept Plan by Mr. Eric Ma (馬紹祥先生), Maunsell
 - Floor discussion about the Proposed Concept Plan
 - Presentation on the Sustainable Development (“SD”) assessment framework by Dr. Winnie Law (羅惠儀博士), Centre of Urban Planning and Environmental Management (CUPEM)
 - Break-out session by Dr. Winnie Law (羅惠儀博士) and Mr. Eric Ma (馬紹祥先生), Maunsell
 - Closing remarks by Mr. K Y Leung (梁剛銳先生), HEC

2. Welcoming remarks by Mr. K Y Leung (梁剛銳先生), HEC
 - Mr. K Y Leung (梁剛銳先生) briefed the current progress of Harbour-front Enhancement Review – Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Areas (HER); and the objectives of the realization stage:
 - a) Stage I, Envisioning Stage, was completed by late 2005.
 - b) The public engagement report of the Envisioning Stage was issued in early 2006.
 - c) After the consultants analyzing the ideas or comments received from the Public Forums and Community Charrettes and reviewing the technical feasibilities of different tunnel road options, HEC endorsed the adoption of Tunnel Option Variation 1 as the basis for preparing the Concept Plan

in June 2006.

- d) 5 precincts are proposed in the Concept Plan, with an intention to enhancing the harbour-front. Details will be presented by the consultant in the next session
- e) Our collaborators are invited to evaluate the concept plan based on the agreed sustainable development principles in the public consultation report of Envisioning Stage.

Presentation and Floor Discussion of Proposed Concept Plan

- 3. Mr. Eric Ma (馬紹祥先生), Maunsell, presented the Proposed Concept Plan:
 - Further Public Engagement since briefing to Town Planning Board in April 2006
 - a) Comments from Transport Advisory Committee, District Councils, Professional Institutions and LegCo PLW Panel
 - Preparation of the Concept Plan
 - a) Tunnel Option Variation 1 adopted as the basis for preparing Concept Plan
 - b) Develop different themes of land use proposals and harbour-front enhancement ideas
 - Concept Plan land uses and character precincts
 - a) Arts & Culture Precinct
 - b) Water Park Precinct
 - c) Water Recreation Precinct
 - d) Heritage Precinct
 - e) Leisure and Recreation Precinct
 - Harbour-front access
 - Way forward
 - a) Public engagement on the draft Concept Plan in October to December 2006
 - b) Assessment to confirm technical feasibility of the ideas in draft Concept Plan
 - c) Preparation of Recommended Outline Development Plan and amendments to relevant Outline Zoning Plans
- 4. Floor discussion about the Proposed Concept Plan
 - A. Comments from Mr. LAM Kin-lai (林乾禮先生), Central and Western District Council:
 - a) Doubt on the necessity of reclamation as some of the reclaimed land

will be planned for promenade and water-activity centre

- b) Suggest to retain the waterway to the west of HKCEC
- c) Question why the existing bus terminal, Harbour Road Sports Centre and Wan Chai Training Pool have to be relocated in the Proposed Concept Plan. To place the Training Pool atop the bus terminal will save the land resources.
- d) In short, not agree with the reclamation area in Proposed Concept Plan.
- Mr. Eric Ma (馬紹祥先生), Maunsell, explained the technical concerns of the proposing reclamation to the west of HKCEC:
 - a) In any case, the CWB has to cross over the existing MTR Tsuen Wan Line to the west of the HKCEC, so part of the tunnel structure will be appeared above to the water level. The CWB will only begin to drop below the seabed at the ex-cargo handling area.
 - b) The exposure of the tunnel structure is considered not safe for navigation purpose. The resulting shallow water will not only be considered as dead water causing environmental problem, but also not be suitable for any recreational purpose.
 - c) The most proper way is to reclaim this portion of the area.
 - d) The proposed option already takes the minimum reclamation approach.
- B. Comments from Dr. Siu Che-hung (蕭志雄醫生), Wan Chai District Council:
 - a) Inquire about the possibility of retaining the waterway of HKCEC by using the floating boardwalk /docks with water flow underneath, similar to some overseas countries. The proposed reclamation may reduce the water current, resulting in accumulation of waste and degradation of water quality.
- Responses from Mr. Eric Ma (馬紹祥先生), Maunsell:
 - a) In view of the navigation purpose of the harbour, it would not be safe to simply expose the tunnel even below sea level. The construction of a new breakwater is required to protect the coastal area, but this would involve additional reclamation.
 - b) If the boardwalk is to be built over water, the water beneath may become dead water, which would be an environmental concern. The proposed minimum reclamation, which will provide not only sufficient protection to the exposed tunnel, but also land for recreational purpose is thus considered the best solution to the problem.
- C. Comments from Mr. P K Lee (李炳權先生), Association of Engineering Professionals in Society:

- a) Agree with Mr. Eric Ma and support the proposed reclamation area.
- b) Remind to retain the gathering point for marathon competition at Golden Bauhinia Square.
- Responses from Mr. Eric Ma (馬紹祥先生), Maunsell:
 - a) They would work with relevant government departments in the detailed design stage to ensure that the existing public events at Golden Bauhinia Square would not be affected.
- D. Comments from Mr. Albert Lai (黎廣德先生), Hong Kong People's Council Sustainable Development (PCSD):
 - b) Ask how the relevant government departments implement the basket of sustainable transportation management measures, apart from the CWB as suggested by the Expert Panel in their report.
 - c) Doubt the feasibility of the Proposed Concept Plan, which currently does not have working programme, management plan or implementation schedule. Although the proposed 5 precincts sound very attractive, it is only a piece of paper if the plan is not implemented.
- Responses from Mr. L T Ma (馬利德先生), Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD):
 - a) The Expert Panel has confirmed the need for the construction of the CWB.
 - b) Transport Department (TD) has been working on the further investigation into the recommended mid-term and long-term sustainable transport management measures other than the CWB.
 - c) All these measures will contribute to improving the network reliability of the east-west link.
 - d) The Proposed Concept Plan, which was prepared by the consultant, has incorporated the public wishes and proposals gathered from the Envisioning Stage, taking account of the sustainability development principles, the engineering concerns and the existing infrastructural constraints, such as the Electric Substation and Wan Chai Sewerage Plant. The Proposed Concept Plan will be further revised upon receiving further advices from the public at the present Realization Stage.
 - e) The Shatin Central Link station will be proposed underneath the existing Car Park, Harbour Road Sports Centre and Wan Chai Training Pool. With an intention of preserving the newly reclaimed land for public uses, such leisure facilities are planned to be relocated on existing land, without encroachment to the newly reclaimed land, whilst allowing for

the construction of the railway station. and

- f) The present Realization Stage focused on the planning and design of the waterfront, while the implementation of the Proposed Concept Plan, including funding and management will be discussed with relevant departments in the Detailed Planning Stage. As usual, “management and maintenance matrix” will be prepared in the detailed design stage to firm up management and maintenance arrangements.
- Responses from Mr. Lawrence Kwan (關志偉先生), TD:
 - g) The Expert Panel recognized that Electronic Road Pricing (ERP) is a complementary measure to the construction of the CWB, as the implementation of which requires the construction of the CWB to serve as an alternative route. Moreover, the ERP measure is not the task to be studied by HEC.
- E. Comments from Mr. Albert Lai (黎廣德先生), PCSD:
 - a) Opine that if ERP is also required to solve the congestion problem in 2016, it should be studied in HER and implemented together with the CWB.
 - b) Public consultation on these transport measures and implementation framework should be carried out, together with the Proposed Concept Plan. Apart from the current model showing the Proposed Concept Plan, the other two models, including one showing the ERP and other recommended transport measures and development control, and the other showing the implementation framework and management public should be presented to the public.
- Responses from Mr. L T Ma (馬利德先生), CEDD:
 - a) Such concerns will be addressed as necessary in stages during detailed design. .
- Responses from Mr. K Y Leung (梁剛銳先生), HEC:
 - b) Refer to the Expert Panel study report, even if there will be no further land development in the Central and Wan Chai area and no growth in vehicle number, there will still be congestion in 2016 without the CWB. The construction of the CWB provides an opportunity to implement the ERP.
 - c) The Panel recommends that the optimal v/c ratio of 0.9 is a signal for stemming land use development. It does not mean that congestion will be resulted if the CWB has the v/c ratio of 0.9.
 - d) The v/c ratio of CBW (between Harcourt Road and Connaught Road Central will be closed to 0.9 by 2016. It does not mean there will be

congestion of the CWB (without ERP). The v/c ratio just serves the signal to stem further land use development and/ or implement other transport measures.

- F. Comments from Mr. Vincent Luk (陸德明先生), Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects (HKILA):
- a) The relatively straight shoreline in the water park to the east of HKCEC will be quite bored. A more interesting shoreline, i.e. zig-zag shoreline is more welcome.
 - b) There are not enough greenery planting in the Proposed Concept Plan.
 - c) The existing and the proposed green space should be shown clearly in the model.
 - d) The green buffer, including sun-shading planting between the flyover and the residential buildings should be widened.
 - e) Pedestrian linkages to the landscaped area at North Point (around Oil Street) from the hinterland are not enough. Without enough accesses, the promenade will become green desert.
 - f) The proposed 4 linkages (point 6-9 on the harbour-front accesses plan, p.16) from the hinterland to the promenade between Wan Chai Sports Ground and the landscaped area at North Point are considered not sufficient. More pedestrian linkages should be provided to serve the public.
 - g) The landscaped deck over the tunnel portal in North Point cannot be accessed by the public. Suggest to increase more greenery space.
 - h) Suggest to increase tree planting on the boardwalk.
- Responses from Mr. Eric Ma (馬紹祥先生), Maunsell:
 - a) Apart from the proposed 4 linkages to the promenade, there are several existing linkages between point 6 and point 9 (shown black) on the plan.
 - b) The creation of the landscape deck at point 8 (p.16 plan of the digest) is to utilize the reclaimed land required for the CWB including slip road, rather than targeting to increase the greenery space. To increase the greening extent requiring additional reclamation is not desirable. However, to provide more greenery space on the existing minimized reclamation land will be considered in the detailed design stage.
 - c) Target to provide some climbers and planters behind the noise barrier (2m-3m depth space) to minimize the visual impacts taking account of the existing technical constraints of the flyover in the detailed design stage.
 - d) Points 8 and 9 (Watson Road and Oil Street) serve as a corridor to

access the 4.2km promenade.

- e) Will consider to increase more tree plantings and to introduce greenery measures to reduce the visual impacts of the noise barrier in the detailed design stage.

G. Comments from Mr. Kim Chan (陳劍安先生), The Conservancy Association (CA) (長春社):

- a) Should indicate accessible green space and inaccessible green space on the Proposed Concept Plan;
 - b) The landing of the floating Tin Hau Temple at point 23 (p.8 of the digest) would increase the traffic and pedestrian flow around the area during some festivals. Concern on the management of the traffic and pedestrian arrangement around the time;
 - c) Concern on the water quality around the corners at points 17, 18, 20 and 7 (p.8 of the digest) and whether there will be accumulation of rubbish around the embayment;
 - d) Would like to know the actual statistics of accidents associated with boats crashing to the coastal area;
 - e) Oppose to fencing off the landscape area or the landscaped deck, like the current practice of Leisure, Culture and Recreation Department;
 - f) Concern on the management of the promenade including the choice of plant species. Only palm trees are not preferred.
 - g) Suggest to extend the bridge of point 2 (p.8 of the digest) linking directly to HKCEC to improve accessibility
- Responses from Mr. Eric Ma (馬紹祥先生), Maunsell:
 - a) The landing of the floating temple would likely facilitate an improved access. Will take account of the traffic and pedestrian arrangement in the next stage.
 - b) Area around points 20, 17 and 18 is the existing coastal line. In fact, after the removal of cargo handling activities around 17 and 18, the water quality has been improved. Will conduct environmental impact assessment (“EIA”) and introduce mitigation measures, if required, for improving water quality, especially around the Water Recreation Precinct in the detailed design stage.
 - c) To reduce the sedimentation problem, the corner of the coastal area between the HKCEC and the promenade is not at right angle. In the next stage, an EIA assessment based on the mathematical water quality model will be conducted to ensure smooth water flow.

- Responds from Mr. L T Ma (馬利德先生), CEDD:
 - a) According to the Protection of Harbour Ordinance (PHO), the reclamation needs to be proved that there is compelling and present need with no reasonable alternative. Thus, the Consultant will have to provide justifications, if reclaiming those corners is proposed.
 - b) The relocation of the floating Tin Hau Temple on shore is to increase accessibility for the public, especially the elderly. The proposal is suggested by some of the Eastern District Council Members.
 - c) Easy accessibility to the waterfront will be taken care of in the detailed design stage, details of which will also be presented to the public.
- H. Comments from Mr. Vincent Ng (吳永順先生), Hong Kong Institute of Architects (HKIA):
 - a) Agree to the construction of the CWB, although 15 ha. of land has to be reclaimed.
 - b) Appreciate that the public engagement and planning process associated with the current project is a great improvement in Hong Kong planning;
 - c) Suggest to retain the functions of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee.
 - d) Suggest to further improve the landscape design of the promenade.
 - e) Suggest to create more activity space associated with those landscape deck.
 - f) Suggest to improve the existing pedestrian linkages between Causeway Bay and the promenade.
 - g) Concern on the implementation time frame of the facilities proposed in the Concept Plan. Hope that it will follow closely to the reclamation for the CWB. Concern that it should not be like the promenade of the Hung Hom whereby the reclamation area is still fenced off without a definite programme for the construction of the promenade.
- I. Comments from Mr. Wilfred Lau (劉偉棠先生), Hong Kong Institute of Engineers and member of the Expert Panel:
 - a) Point out that the objective of the Transport Expert Panel is to arrive a basket of transport measures to ensure sustainable development in Hong Kong. The construction of the CWB is a pre-requisite, together with other transport measures to meet the future traffic needs.
 - b) ERP is a complementary measure to the construction of the CWB.
 - c) The technology for implementation of the ERP is available but will require public acceptance.
 - d) A more detailed study on the implementation of ERP is required before

implementing the ERP.

- e) Understand that the Government is currently conducting further study on the ERP. The study of the ERP should take reference to the other successful cases of foreign countries, e.g. London, Singapore and the Switzerland, while applying the actual traffic figures of Hong Kong. As the life style and travel characteristic of Hong Kong are completely different between Hong Kong and other overseas countries, we could not fully apply the overseas cases. Consultation to the public will only be held, after the study confirms the success of the implementation of the ERP.
 - f) As the ERP will trigger some social concerns, such as privacy issue, corresponding public consultations need to be carried out before launching of ERP.
 - g) The implementation of the ERP and the construction of the CWB are not mutually-exclusive. The introduction of the ERP at the opening of the CWB will bring more significant improvements to the traffic condition.
- J. Comments from Mr. Stephen Chan (陳捷貴先生), Central and Western District Council, member of HEC sub-committee on WDII:
- a) Agree with Mr. Vincent Ng that the public engagement on the detailed design of the waterfront is necessary.
 - b) People-oriented approach, with further public engagement should be taken in the comprehensive manner. Piece-meal design is not acceptable.
 - c) Suggest to integrate the waterfront design with the urban renewal of the hinterland, e.g. Central and Western district, so as to improve the living quality.

Presentation of Sustainable Development Framework

5. Dr. Winnie Law (羅惠儀博士), CUPEM, presented the Sustainable Development (“SD”) framework
- Explain that the SD principles are important guidelines for planning the harbour-front;
 - Report the design of SD principles developed in the Engagement Stage
 - Brief on the SD framework and the methodology of assessing the Proposed Concept Plan based on the SD principles.

Break-out Session

6. The Break-out Session was led by Mr. Eric Ma (馬紹祥先生), Maunsell, and Dr. Winnie Law (羅惠儀博士), CUPEM.
7. Mr. Eric Ma (馬紹祥先生), Maunsell, presented the consultant's justifications of the Proposed Concept Plan based on the 7 SD principles and 81 SD indicators. (These justifications of the SD assessment can be viewed on the HEC website: http://www.harbourfront.org.hk/eng/content_page/doc/her/SA_Concept_Plan_eng_final.pdf)
8. Dr. Winnie Law (羅惠儀博士), CUPEM, asked the Co-ordinators to provide rating on the level of satisfaction of the Proposed Concept Plan based on the agreed SD principle and indicators. Key comments and responses on each SD principle are shown below and the rating of level of satisfaction is attached at Appendix.

SD principle (1): Create a Vibrant and Attractive Waterfront that is Continuous and Accessible for All

Social

- A. Comments from Mr. Vincent Luk (陸德明先生), HKILA:
 - a) Ask whether there are any pedestrian facilities to facilitate the access for the senior citizens and the disabled, as there are many footbridges and landscape decks.
 - b) Suggest to add more footbridges and walkways to connect to these landscaped areas, as some open space/ green area have been blocked by roads.
- Responses from Mr. Eric Ma (馬紹祥先生), Maunsell:
 - a) According to the current design of footbridges, disabled ramp and 24-hr disabled lift will be provided.
 - b) CWB is a tunnel underground, which will not block the open spaces. Only P2 road is a surface road. Various crossing facilities will be provided. Apart from grade separated pedestrian links, at-grade crossings will be provided.
- B. Comment from Mr. Patrick Lau (劉興達先生), Chairman of Concern Group on Waterfront Development under Works and Development Committee, Eastern District Council:
 - a) Suggest to delete the indicator of "Access for all at no charge", as the commercial facilities are to be provided, e.g. cafe and miracle round

- involving charges.
- Responses from Dr. Winnie Law (羅惠儀博士) and Mr. Eric Ma (馬紹祥先生):
 - a) These SD principles and indicators are designed by the public during the Envisioning Stage. They are served as the guidelines to the waterfront design.
 - b) The assessment should concern whether the whole promenade can be accessible by all, rather than piecemeal portion.
 - B. Comment from Mr. LAM Kin-lai (林乾禮先生), Central and Western District Council:
 - a) Comment that only passive uses are proposed on the Proposed Concept Plan, most of the open spaces are passive. Suggest to offer more active uses, such as water cycle, basketball field and other active recreational activities at the Pier Plaza for the youths.
 - Responses from Dr. Winnie Law (羅惠儀博士), CUPEM:
 - c) The Proposed Concept Plan presents a design concept of the promenade. The assessment should be based on whether the Concept Plan would allow flexibility to accommodate the required uses.
 - d) All detailed design elements and uses, such as playground will be subject to further study in the next stage.
 - C. Comments from Mr. Stephen Ng (吳錦津先生), Wan Chai District Council:
 - a) Mention that the Wan Chai District Council has proposed to have pet park at the ex-cargo handling area. Worry on the insufficient car parking facilities along the promenade.
 - b) Suggest to provide an underground car park.
 - Responses from Mr. Eric Ma (馬紹祥先生), Maunsell:
 - a) Target not to convert the prime and valuable waterfront into car park. Have to balance the various interests
 - b) Underground car park is not possible as there is CWB tunnel underneath.
 - c) The promenade is too narrow to provide car parking spaces. In fact, car parks are abundant in Wan Chai, e.g. HKCEC and Great Eagle Centre. Coach parking area is also provided on the Wan Chai East.
 - d) Sufficient loading and unloading spaces and drop-off places will be provided along the promenade.
 - Responses from Ms. Winnie Law (羅惠儀博士), CUPEM:
 - a) Welcome the Collaborators to provide any further comments on the SD assessment after the meeting and participate in the forthcoming

community workshops.

- E. Comment from Dr. Siu Che-hung (蕭志雄醫生), Wan Chai District Council:
- a) Agree with Mr. Stephen Ng's (吳錦津先生) comment. At least loading/unloading zone has to be provided, especially for the seniors and the disabled.

Economic

- A. Comment from (林乾禮先生), Central and Western District Council:
- a) Ask how to determine the rental of the shops of along the promenade.
 - Responses from Mr. Eric Ma (馬紹祥先生), Maunsell:
 - a) Believe that the rental will be determined by market force. Believe a reasonable rental will be resulted.
- B. Comment from Mr. Stephen Ng (吳錦津先生), Wan Chai District Council:
- a) Opine that to improve the accessibility to the promenade, i.e. provision of sufficient car parks, is vital to increase the business opportunities along the promenade

Environmental

[No comments were raised by the Collaborators.]

SD principle (2): Ensure Pedestrian Connectivity between the Hinterland and the Waterfront

Social

- A. Comment from Mr. Kim Chan (陳劍安先生), CA:
- a) Suggest the provision of travellator to and along the promenade
- B. Comment from Mr. Lam Kin-lai (林乾禮先生), Central and Western District Council:
- a) Urge the consultant to improve the pedestrian linkage between the hinterland of Causeway Bay to the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter. The existing subway between World Trade Centre and the waterfront is not enough.
 - Responses from Mr. Eric Ma (馬紹祥先生), Maunsell:
 - a) The current pedestrian flow does not justify the provision of travellator.
 - b) The existing promenade at the Causeway Typhoon Shelter is too narrow to provide landing of the additional linkage. Moreover, it is hard to take over the private land to the south of Victoria Park Road (i.e. World Trade Centre side) to form additional linkage. The columns of the two

existing bridges, i.e. Gloucester Road and the new bridge over Victoria Road are also the major engineering constraint for creating addition linkage to the waterfront around Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter. Welcome any suggestions from the public.

- Responses from Mr. L.T. Ma (馬利德先生), CEDD:
 - a) Consultant will have to explore further into that issue taking into account the existing constraints. There is also public suggestion about the widening of the existing subway across Victoria Park Road near Noon Day Gun.
- C. Comments from Mr. Vincent Luk (陸德明先生), HKILA:
 - a) Suggest to provide the underground walkways with shopping facilities, e.g. from World Trade Centre to the promenade to offer more connection points between the town centre and the promenade.

Economic

[No comments were raised by the Collaborators.]

Environmental

[No comments were raised by the Collaborators.]

SD principle (3): Improve Traffic Conditions

Social

[No comments were raised by the Collaborators.]

Economic

[No comments were raised by the Collaborators.]

Environmental

- A. Comments from Mr. Vincent Luk (陸德明先生), HKILA:
 - a) Ask whether the proposed tunnel will shallow the seabed, thus reducing the water current. The resulting static water will arouse environmental problem, such as bad smell.
 - b) Concern particularly on the water quality of the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter, where both CWB and Shatin Central Link will pass through and the existence of the breakwater will further reduce the water current.
- Responses from Mr. Eric Ma (馬紹祥先生), Maunsell:
 - a) The preliminary assessment on the Proposed Scheme confirms that there is no adverse environmental impacts due to the proposed reclamation.

- b) Mathematical water quality model will be conducted in order to ensure no adverse environmental impacts in the next stage. In addition, a more detailed environmental assessment will be carried out in the next stage.
- c) Both CWB and Shatin Central Link will be below seabed, when passing through the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter. Thus, no permanent reclamation is required in the typhoon shelter.

SD principle (4): Ensure Land and Marine Use Compatibility

Social

- A. Comment from Ms. Suki Chau (周希旋女士), St. James' Settlement Family & Community Services:
 - a) Comment that it would be hard to conduct the assessment as we do not have any clue about the entrance fee and management plan of the proposed Water Sports Centre and the activities.
 - b) Whether the Water Sports Centre and the activities are accessible is different from whether they are affordable largely to the general public.
 - c) Concern on whether the proposed activities could be affordable to the general public.
- Response from Mr. Eric Ma (馬紹祥先生), Maunsell:
 - a) Agreed that affordability is an issue to be addressed in the implementation stage. Comment that the target must be to provide facilities open to and be affordable to the general public.
 - b) Quote as an example that the golf course at Kau Sai Chau is open to the public and affordable to the general public.

Economic

[No comments were raised by the Collaborators.]

Environmental

- A. Comments from Mr. Vincent Ng (吳永順先生), HKIA: (who votes for score of 5):
 - a) The current condition of the harbour-front is very undesirable
 - b) Appreciate the current harbour-front planning, especially the provision of green space.

SD principle (5): Enhance Identity by Conserving Natural and Cultural Heritage

Social

- A. Comments from Mr. Vincent Ng (吳永順先生), HKIA:
- a) Query on why these sustainable development principles do not apply to the current redevelopment of the Star Ferry Pier in Central?
- B. Comments from Mr. Kim Chan (陳劍安先生), CA: (who votes for score of 2)
- a) Reprovisioning of Floating Tin Hau Temple onshore not essential; it will be no longer unique if relocating it onto land as another building.
- C. Comments from Mr. Patrick Lau (劉興達先生), Chairman of Concern Group on Waterfront Development under Works and Development Committee, Eastern District Council: (who votes for score of 2)
- a) The straight shoreline is quite bored in the Proposed Concept Plan. Suggest to take this opportunity to revert part of the shoreline to that in the old days if possible.

Economic

[No comments were raised by the Collaborators.]

Environmental

- A. Comments from Mr. Vincent Luk (陸德明先生), HKILA:
- a) The relatively straight shoreline in the water park to the east of HKCEC is quite bored. Suggest to create a more interesting shoreline, i.e. zig-zag form, but additional reclamation may be required.
- Response from Mr. Eric Ma (馬紹祥先生), Maunsell:
 - a) To achieve a more interesting shoreline, small-scale cantilever decks may be employed to create the zig-zag form visually. However, the PHO will only allow us to have minimum reclamation.
 - Responses from Mr. L T Ma (馬利德先生), CEDD:
 - a) According to the PHO, the reclamation needs to be proved that there is compelling, present need with no reasonable alternative and the reclamation area has to be minimized. Thus, the Consultant needs to provide sufficient justifications when proposing any reclamation. On the basis of no additional reclamation, the Consultant will work on the detailed design of the shoreline to enhance its aesthetic and visual value aspect taking account of the comments of various collaborators.

SD principle (6): Enhance Environmental Quality along the Waterfront

Social

[No comments were raised by the Collaborators.]

Economic

[No comments were raised by the Collaborators.]

Environmental

[No comments were raised by the Collaborators.]

SD principle (7): Enhance Visual Amenity, Landscape and Quality of Space

Social

- A. Comment from Ms. Suki Chau (周希旋女士), St. James' Settlement Family & Community Services: (who votes for score of 2)
- a) Comment that there should be more thoughts to address local communities' concerns or needs on top of tourists' needs and other districts.
 - b) To address the needs of the local residents, the Consultant should pay more effort in management including fixing entrance fee of the proposed activities, providing sufficient infrastructure and improving accessibility of the area. It would not be desirable for the senior citizens to spend half an hour to access the waterfront on foot.

Economic

[No comments were raised by the Collaborators.]

Environmental

- A. Comment from Mr. Patrick Lau (劉興達先生), Chairman of Concern Group on Waterfront Development under Works and Development Committee, Eastern District Council: (who votes for score of 2)
- a) Comment that there visual impacts need to be addressed..
- Response from Mr. Eric Ma (馬紹祥先生), Maunsell:
 - a) It will be addressed in the detailed design Stage.

Wrap Up Session

9. Closing Remarks by Mr. K Y Leung (梁剛銳先生), HEC
 - Thanks every participant for participating into the activity. Perhaps the participants are the pioneer group conducting the SD assessment in such a way in Hong Kong.

- All comments received are very valuable.
- Welcome all to join the upcoming Community Workshops in the following Saturdays, which will be held on 21 Oct 2006 and 28 Oct 2006 respectively; in addition, there will be a Consensus Building Town Hall Meeting held on 16 Dec 2006 to sum up all received public comments.

-- THE END --

Principle 1		Principle 2		Principle 3		Principle 4		Principle 5		Principle 6		Principle 7		Overall	
Total Votes: 15		Total Votes: 15													
<u>Social</u>		<u>Social</u>		<u>Social</u>		<u>Social</u>		<u>Social</u>		<u>Social</u>		<u>Social</u>		<u>Social</u>	
Score ⁽¹⁾	Votes	Score	Votes	Score	Votes										
5	1	5	0	5	4	5	0	5	3	5	9	5	0	5	1
4	5	4	2	4	8	4	8	4	5	4	4	4	11	4	7
3	5	3	5	3	3	3	4	3	5	3	2	3	2	3	6
2	3	2	5	2	0	2	3	2	2	2	0	2	2	2	0
1	0	1	2	1	0	1	0								
Abstain:	1	Abstain:	1	Abstain:	0	Abstain:	1								
Total:	15	Total:	15												
<u>Economic</u>		<u>Economic</u>		<u>Economic</u>		<u>Economic</u>		<u>Economic</u>		<u>Economic</u>		<u>Economic</u>			
Score	Votes														
5	0	5	0	5	4	5	1	5	0	5	4	5	0		
4	4	4	2	4	9	4	4	4	6	4	6	4	5		
3	7	3	6	3	2	3	10	3	9	3	5	3	10		
2	4	2	7	2	0										
1	0														
Abstain:	0														
Total:	15														
<u>Environmental</u>		<u>Environmental</u>		<u>Environmental</u>		<u>Environmental</u>		<u>Environmental</u>		<u>Environmental</u>		<u>Environmental</u>			
Score	Votes														
5	6	5	1	5	2	5	4	5	2	5	5	5	0		
4	6	4	11	4	4	4	9	4	6	4	7	4	5		
3	2	3	2	3	9	3	2	3	4	3	3	3	7		
2	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	3	2	0	2	2		
1	0	1	1												
Abstain:	1	Abstain:	1	Abstain:	0										
Total:	15														

Note: (1) Score indicates Level of Satisfaction