

**Harbour-front Enhancement Committee
Sub-committee on Wan Chai Development Phase II Review**

Minutes of Tenth Meeting

Date : 9 March 2006
Time : 2:30 p.m.
Venue : Conference Room at 15/F,
North Point Government Offices,
333 Java Road, North Point, Hong Kong

Present

Mr. Leung Kong-yui	Chairman Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Mr. Paul Zimmerman	Representing Business Environment Council
Dr. Ng Mee-kam	Representing Citizen Envisioning@Harbour
Dr. Greg Wong	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr. Hardy Lok	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour Limited
Dr. Alvin Kwok	Representing The Conservancy Association
Dr. Chan Wai-kwan	
Mr. Stephen Chan	
Mr. Steve Chan	
Mr. Charles Brooke	
Mr. Robin Ip	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands) 1, Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau
Ms. Sharon Ho	Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport) 5, Environment, Transport and Works Bureau
Mr. L T Ma	Project Manager/Hong Kong Island and Islands, Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr. Raymond Chiu	Assistant Director/Special Duties, Planning Department
Mr. Wan Man-leung	Deputy Project Manager (Major Works), Highways Department
Mr. Kwan Chi-wai	Chief Engineer/Traffic Engineering (Hong Kong), Transport Department
Mr. William Yuen	District Officer (Wan Chai), Home Affairs Department
Mr. Bosco Chan	Secretary

In Attendance

Ms. Lydia Lam	Assistant Secretary (Planning) 3, Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau
Ms. Phyllis Li	Chief Town Planner/Special Duties (1), Planning Department
Mr. S K Lam	Chief Engineer/Hong Kong (2), Civil Engineering and Development Department
Ms. Iris Tam	Representing City Planning Consultants Ltd
Dr. Sujata S Govada	Representing City Planning Consultants Ltd
Miss Flora Lai	Representing City Planning Consultants Ltd
Dr. Winnie Law	Representing City Planning Consultants Ltd
Ms. Betty Ho	Representing City Planning Consultants Ltd
Mr. Peter Cheek	Representing Maunsell Consultants Asia Ltd

Absent with Apologies

Mr. Patrick Lau

Action

Welcome message and agenda

1. **The Chairman** welcomed **Mr. Raymond Chiu** and **Ms Phyllis Li** who replaced Mr. Anthony Kwan and Ms. Christine Tse respectively as the representatives of Planning Department (PlanD) at the Sub-committee. **The Chairman** also welcomed **Mr. William Yuen** of Home Affairs Department who attended the meeting the first time.
2. **Mr. Alvin Kwok** suggested bringing forward the discussion of Paper No. WD6/2006 on ‘No-Reclamation’ Alignments for the Trunk Road (agenda item 8) before agenda items 5, 6 and 7. **The meeting** agreed.
3. **The Chairman** said that Planning Department (PlanD) would give a brief report on the possible “Central HER” under AOB.

4. **Mr. Charles Brooke** said that for a large group, there would likely be different views. He suggested that, say for agenda items 3 and 4, the majority views should be adopted with the minority views recognized and recorded. **Mr. Steve Chan** supported and **the Chairman** said that the same approach should also apply to agenda item 2.
5. **The Chairman** pointed out that when discussing the technical papers submitted by Maunsell at the last Extended HER Task Force, members were of the view that those matters should be discussed at the Sub-committee meeting. He reminded that for smooth running of Sub-committee meetings, discussions should be confined to matters of principles rather than details, such as checking the detailed wordings of a report.
6. **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** said that a major stakeholder in the entire process for the development and design of the harbour-front was Government, he suggested that the identity of the party making views at the meeting should be recorded. He also re-iterated his previous suggestion of having an independent secretariat and independent agents for necessary work of HEC. **The Chairman** said that while the former suggestion should be agreeable to the meeting, the latter one was beyond the terms of reference of the Sub-committee.

Item 1 Confirmation of minutes of last meeting

- 1.1 The draft minutes of the 9th meeting circulated on 28 February 2006 were confirmed with no amendments.

Item 2 Matters arising

- 2.1 **The Chairman** said that the only matter to be addressed was the endorsement of the draft report of the Envisioning Stage of HER. He reported that in accordance with the conclusion of the last meeting, the third draft of the report was discussed at the HER Task Force meeting held on 20 December 2005. The fourth draft of the report with all agreed changes

incorporated was circulated on 4 February 2006 to all Sub-committee members for endorsement on or before 13 February 2006. No comments were received by the due date. The Extended Task Force meeting on 14 February 2006 agreed to add to the report a ‘Foreword’ and an ‘Appendix’ to identify issues which were beyond the ambit of the WDII Review Sub-committee but should be followed up at other forums. **The Secretariat and Dr. Ng Mee-kam** had subsequently proposed drafts for the Foreword and Appendix respectively. In addition, **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** had proposed amendments to chapter 9 of the draft report (Conclusions and Recommendations), which were supported by **Mr. Hardy Lok**, and amendments to the draft Foreword and Appendix. **The Chairman** asked whether the proposed amendments to chapter 9 of the draft report made by Mr. Zimmerman should be considered.

- 2.2 **Mr. L T Ma** requested members to note there were overlaps between Mr. Zimmerman’s proposed amendments to chapter 9 of the draft report and his proposed amendments to the draft Foreword and Appendix.
- 2.3 As there were no objections, **the Chariman** concluded that the meeting agreed to consider Mr. Zimmerman’s proposed amendments to chapter 9 of the draft report.
- 2.4 In response to the request from **Dr. Chan Wai-kwan** to comment, from the view-point of the author of the report, on the acceptability of Mr. Zimmerman’s proposed amendments, **Ms. Iris Tam** said that, a distinction was made in the report between matters within the ambit of the WDII Review Sub-committee and those that were outside. For those points on actions required along the Connaught Road/Gloucester Road Corridor, she was of the view that they should be included in the ‘Appendix’ of the report as they were outside the scope of the WDII Review Sub-committee.
- 2.5 **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** suggested either deleting the words ‘in the Corridor’ from the relevant paragraphs of the report, namely, 9.1.4(b), 9.1.4(c), 9.2.1(a) and 9.2.1(c), or making it

clear in the Appendix that not only issues outside the scope of the WDII Review but also those extended beyond the WDII area were included in it.

- 2.6 **Dr. Greg Wong** said that he noted that paragraphs 9.2.1(a), 9.2.1(b) and 9.2.1(c) were abstracted directly from paragraphs 3.3.3, 3.3.11 and 3.3.15 of the Expert Panel report. He considered it inappropriate to extract paragraphs from the Expert Panel report but with some words deleted.
- 2.7 **Mr. Charles Brooke** pointed out that independence of the consultants should be respected. For those amendments that the consultants had difficulties to accept, they could at most be included as an Appendix.
- 2.8 As there were no other comments, **the Chairman** concluded that Mr. Zimmerman's suggested paragraphs 9.1.4(b), 9.1.4(c), 9.2.1(a) and 9.2.1(c) would be deleted from chapter 9 and be included in the Appendix of the report. On the above basis, the Chairman confirmed that the fourth draft of the report with amendments proposed by Mr. Zimmerman but excluding paragraphs 9.1.4(b), 9.1.4(c), 9.2.1(a) and 9.2.1(c) was endorsed by the Sub-committee.
- 2.9 For the draft Foreword as amended by Mr. Paul Zimmerman, **Dr. Chan Wai-kwan** suggested requesting the author to comment on whether the suggested amendments were acceptable or not.
- 2.10 **Mr. L T Ma** asked whether the phrase 'surface transport infrastructure' in the last sentence of page one of the draft Foreword referred to the slip roads and Road P2 only. **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** confirmed that was the case. **Mr. Ma** then said that the phrase could be accepted with that meaning.
- 2.11 **Ms. Sharon Ho** questioned on the need for a further study on Road P2 and the slip roads given that the Sub-committee had already endorsed the recommendations of the Expert Panel which supported Road P2 and the slip roads. **The Chairman** pointed out that although the Expert Panel had established the

need for the Central-Wan Chai Bypass (CWB) and the associated slip roads, detailed design had yet to be carried out. **Ms. Sharon Ho** said that on the basis of the Chairman's understanding, she could accept in principle the sentence proposed after adding the phrase "detailed design" to clarify the intention and the sentence would then become "However, the detailed design of surface transport infrastructure is subject to further study," **The meeting** agreed.

- 2.12 **Mr. L T Ma** proposed replacing "started to develop" in the fifth line of paragraph 2 on page 2 to "have developed" as it was mentioned in the report on the Envisioning Stage of HER that a set of sustainability principles and indicators had been developed. **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** said that development of the principles and indicators was an on-going process and would need to be updated from time to time. **Ms. Iris Tam** said that the set of sustainability principles and indicators developed in the Envisioning Stage would be used in the next stage. **The meeting** agreed "have developed" fully reflected the state of play of the concerned issue.
- 2.13 **Mr. L T Ma** suggested deleting the phrase "Unless agreed otherwise" in the seventh and eighth lines of paragraph 2 on page 2 as it had already been agreed by the Sub-committee that the Realization Stage would be confined to the ambit of the WDII Review Sub-committee and those matter outside its ambit would be included in the Appendix to be addressed at other forums. **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** said that the purpose of the phrase was to allow for potential expansion of the ambit of the WDII Review in the future if agreed. In response to the invitation of **Dr. Ng Mee-kam** to decide on the matter, **the Chairman** confirmed deleting the phrase.
- 2.14 **Mr. L T Ma** pointed out that "Connaught Road" that appeared on the tenth line of paragraph 2 on page 2 fell outside the WDII area and should be deleted. **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** agreed.
- 2.15 As there were no other comments, **the Chairman** asked the Secretary to circulate the final version of the Foreword to the Secretary

members.

(Post-meeting note: The final version of the Foreword was circulated by e-mail on 13 March 2006.)

- 2.16 In response to **the Chairman, Dr. Ng Mee-kam** said that she had no comment on the amendments to the draft Appendix proposed by Mr. Paul Zimmerman.
- 2.17 **Mr. Robin Ip** suggested deleting the first bullet point under the heading of ‘land use development’ as the proposal of HEC collaborating with Town Planning Board (TPB) and relevant Government departments to develop a mechanism to monitor the development density on Hong Kong Island north, would be beyond the terms of reference of HEC and its Sub-committee.
- 2.18 **Dr. Ng Mee-kam** proposed amending the bullet point to read: “HEC should exchange views with TPB and relevant government departments, and advise on possible mechanisms to monitor the development density...”. In response, **Mr. Robin Ip** suggested amending it to read : “HEC should advise Government on possible mechanisms” so as to make it consistent with the terms of reference of HEC. **Mr. Raymond Chiu** also pointed out that as TPB was an independent statutory body on plan making, it was not appropriate to include wording about advising TPB; it would be more appropriate to confine the suggestion to matters within the terms of reference of HEC. **Dr. Chan Wai-kwan** opined that it should be acceptable for HEC to exchange views with TPB.
- 2.19 **Mr. Robin Ip** suggested amending that bullet point to read : “HEC should advise Government on monitoring development on Hong Kong Island north shore so that protection of the harbour, harbour-front enhancement, and the prospect of sustainable transport solutions will not be jeopardised”.
- 2.20 **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** considered it appropriate for HEC to exchange views with TPB and he also objected to deleting the

word ‘density’ after ‘development’. **Mr. Hardy Lok** and **Dr. Ng Mee-kam** supported.

- 2.21 **Dr. Ng Mee-kam** suggested amending the wording to read : “HEC should exchange views with Town Planning Board and advise relevant Government departments, on possible mechanisms to monitor the development density on Hong Kong Island north shore so that protection of the harbour, harbour-front enhancement, and the prospect of sustainable transport solutions will not be jeopardised”.
- 2.22 In response to **Ms. Phyllis Li**’s question on whether there could be a practical mechanism to monitor the development density, **Dr. Ng Mee-kam** said that it would be a matter of development control. **The Chairman** pointed out that that bullet point on land use development was actually abstracted from the recommendations in the Expert Panel report as the experts would like to highlight the relation between development control and transport planning. In view of such background, **Ms. Phyllis Li** suggested deleting the word ‘density’ after ‘development’. **The meeting** had no objection.
- 2.23 **Mr. L T Ma** suggested using the word ‘seize’ instead of ‘optimise’, as proposed by Mr. Paul Zimmerman, in the second bullet point under the heading ‘A Sustainable Transportation System’ as that word was used by the Expert Panel in their report. **The meeting** agreed.
- 2.24 **The Chairman** suggested the Secretary to circulate the final version of the Appendix to members. **Secretary**

(Post-meeting note: The final version of the Appendix was circulated by e-mail on 13 March 2006.)

- 2.25 **The Chairman** said that as members had no further comment on the draft report, Foreword and Appendix, he concluded that the draft report with the amendments agreed at the meeting was endorsed. **All to note**

- 2.26 **The Chairman** added that as the report would be published under the name of the Sub-committee, HKSAR and the consultancy agreement no. on cover page and the subsequent pages of the report should be deleted, the logo of the Sub-committee should be added and the date should be March 2006. **The meeting** agreed and suggested stating that the report was prepared by City Planning Consultants Ltd to recognise their efforts in that respect.

(Post-meeting note: The finalized version of the report was circulated to members by e-mail on 17 March 2006.)

2.27 **Mr. Steve Chan** requested Government to work out a timetable for implementing the recommendations in the report in the right order. relevant Government departments

2.28 In relation to a new billboard erected near the Cross Harbour Tunnel approach, **Dr. Chan Wai-kwan** suggested that more information such as land status, tenancy term etc should be provided at the next meeting. HPLB

2.29 **The Chairman** reported that the Society for Protection of the Harbour Ltd had sent a letter to HEC on the day before the meeting regarding the report for the Envisioning Stage and the letter had been circulated to members. He would like to know whether members had any comments on the letter.

2.30 **Mr. L T Ma** pointed out that the Expert Panel had fully completed their work in accordance with the terms of reference specified to them by the Sub-committee. Matters relating to design of the CWB, Road P2 and slip roads were beyond their terms of reference and had to be addressed by the Sub-committee instead. Such an arrangement should not be regarded as an inadequacy of the work of the Expert Panel. **The Chairman** added that the report of the Envisioning Stage was to summarize public's views, ideas and proposals on harbour-front enhancement as well as on sustainable development principles and indicators, and their input would be the basis for developing the concept plans in the next stage, the Realization Stage. Thus the

report should not be regarded as a report on detailed proposals for enhancing the harbour-front and for building the CWB.

Item 3 Progress report on HER (Paper No. WD 1/2006)

3.1 **The meeting** noted the progress report.

Item 4 Progressing from Envisioning Stage to Realization Stage (Paper No. WD 2/2006)

- 4.1 **The Chairman** said that with the completion of the Envisioning Stage, the HER project would progress to the Realization Stage. He said that a request was received from TPB to brief them on the progress and he understood that the Legislative Council (LegCo) and at least one District Council (DC) had formally or verbally made similar request. Besides summarizing work in the Envisioning stage, the purpose of the paper was to suggest an approach for briefing those parties at the Realization Stage. **The Secretary** supplemented that a time frame of four months for the Realization Stage and three months for the Detailed Planning Stage, as pledged in the public engagement kit for the Envisioning Stage, was suggested in the paper.
- 4.2 **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** commented that HPPs, in addition to the agreed sustainability principles and indicators, should also be evaluation tools for the concept plans to be developed. He added that in consulting the TPB, DCs and LegCo, specific points should be made by reference to the report for the Envisioning Stage noting that the Expert Panel report covered a broader context.
- 4.3 **Mr. Steve Chan** informed the meeting that there would be a Wan Chai DC meeting on 21 March 2006 and that meeting might be a suitable forum for briefing Wan Chai DC.
- 4.4 **Mr. Stephen Chan** said the Central and Western DC was

very concerned about the progress of the HER project and would also like to be briefed on the outcome of the Expert Panel Forum. He informed the meeting the coming DC meeting would be held on 23 March 2006.

- 4.5 **Ms. Iris Tam** said that two months would probably be required for the workshops and town hall meeting for the Realization Stage. **The Chairman** suggested considering that point further when more information was available.
- 4.6 **Mr. Robin Ip** reiterated that the programme pledged in the public engagement kit for the Envisioning Stage, i.e. to complete the Realization Stage in four months (June 2006) and the Detailed Planning Stage in three months (September 2006), should be adhered to. He requested **City Planning** to reconsider the period required for the workshops and town hall meeting. City
Planning
- 4.7 **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** supported Ms. Iris Tam's suggestion of allowing more time for the workshops and townhall meeting but to shorten the time for preparation work.
- 4.8 As there were no further comments, **the Chairman** concluded that the paper was endorsed but the time schedule for the Realization Stage had to be reviewed. He asked the Secretary to work on that respect. Secretary
- 4.9 **Mr. Steve Chan** reminded that the paper for DC should be submitted earlier, say few days before the meeting.
- 4.10 **Mr. L T Ma** said that the timing for briefing TPB had yet to be fixed. **The Chairman** asked the Secretary to liaise with TPB on that matter. Secretary
- 4.11 **Mr. Stephen Chan** also requested for early supply of information by Government departments, especially those related to reclamation.

- Item 5** **Discussion paper on deep tunnel option (Paper No. WD 3/2006)**
- Item 6** **Discussion paper on inland alignment (Paper No. WD 4/2006)**
- Item 7** **Discussion papers on slip roads (Paper No. WD 6/2006)**

In view of the time, discussion on these three items was deferred.

Item 8 **Discussion paper on “no-reclamation” alignments for the Trunk Road (Paper No. WD 6/2006)**

- 8.1 **Mr. Peter Cheek** presented, with the aid of a power point, the paper and highlighted the following conclusions:
- reclamation would be required at area west of the HKCEC for all Trunk Road schemes;
 - reclamation would also be required for connecting the Trunk Road, if constructing in the form of tunnel, to the existing Island Eastern Corridor (IEC); and
 - there was no possible ‘no-reclamation’ alignment option.
- 8.2 **Dr. Greg Wong** said that he appreciated reclamation would be required at the western end as the Trunk Road had to pass above the existing MTR Tsuen Wan Line tunnel. For the eastern end, he said that reclamation might also be required for connecting the tunnel with IEC, however, he asked whether the existing strip of land at North Point, currently being used as car park, would be sufficient for that purpose such that reclamation could be avoided.
- 8.3 **Dr. Chan Wai-kwan** said that he accepted the conclusion that there was no possible ‘no-reclamation’ alignment for the Trunk Road and the importance of the paper was to demonstrate to the public that the possibility of having no reclamation had been considered. He suggested beefing up the paper by including the consultants’ assessment on two further matters, namely, those ideas raised by the public

which allegedly did not required reclamation and those which might not be perceived as reclamation in layman term, such as the ‘flyover’ option.

- 8.4 **Mr. Hardy Lok** said that he needed more time to consider the paper. He said that the consultants should provide information on vertical and horizontal alignments and method of construction for the whole CWB for further consideration. He added that he had been requesting for such information for some time.
- 8.5 **Mr. Steve Chan** suggested including information such as the “zero-reclamation” proposal submitted by Swire. He also suggested developing some more creative proposals for enhancing the harbour-front such as reclaiming the area underneath IEC area for open space or cycle track use. He also asked whether reducing the number of slip roads could reduce the extent of reclamation.
- 8.6 **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** pointed that enjoyment of the harbour-front and minimizing land use for transport infrastructure was not mentioned in the paper. **The Chairman** said that to facilitate better and more focused discussion, the papers were arranged to address issues one by one. Matters related to the slip roads were covered under separate papers.
- 8.7 Regarding the proposal submitted by Swire, **the Secretary** said that it was discussed in the Sub-committee meetings last year and the secretariat was asked to approach the consultant of Swire for more details. That consultant pointed out that Swire’s proposal was not one that could avoid reclamation completely and the main emphasis of the proposal was on harbour-front enhancement, especially the idea of providing an urban beach at Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter. At the western end, that consultant agreed to Maunsell’s assessment that reclamation would be required at the connection at the CRIII construction limit. The above had been reported to the Sub-committee already.

- 8.8 **Mr. Peter Cheek** responded that the existing strip of land at North Point was inadequate in terms of both width and length for providing the tunnel portal and therefore additional reclamation was required. Extent of reclamation would increase if the tunnel portal were shifted eastward. He said that for connection to the CWB tunnel to be constructed under CRIII, at a road level of -10mPD, some reclamation would be required, even if the Trunk Road was to be built in the form of flyover. He also pointed out the above assessments would not depend on the vertical and horizontal alignments to be adopted for the Trunk Road in between nor whether slip roads would be provided or not though the extent of reclamation required might be different.
- 8.9 **Mr. Hardy Lok** said that he was not yet able to accept the consultants' conclusion without information on vertical alignment and method of construction. He also asked whether reclamation could be avoided completely if the number of lanes for the Trunk Road was reduced.
- 8.10 **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** asked whether reclamation could be avoided completely at the eastern end if the number of lanes for the Trunk Road was reduced and at the western end if the height of the tunnel could be reduced.
- 8.11 **Mr. L T Ma** said that questions raised by members demonstrated the complexity of the issue. For the time being, the papers were arranged to address issues one by one and it seemed that the important conclusion of no possible 'no-reclamation' option could only be accepted after further issues had been considered. He said that there might be a need to combine the papers to give a more comprehensive view of the topic. For presentation to the public, he agreed to the point raised by Dr. Chan Wai-kwan to include assessments on allegedly "no-reclamation" ideas from the public and the flyover option. Discussion on slip roads might also be included. He said that the consultant should expand the papers to address members' concerns. **Dr. Alvin Kwok** agreed and stressed on the importance of providing sufficient information to the public for enabling an informed

choice. To address the sentiment against reclamation, he suggested that any “no-reclamation” proposal that might be raised by the public in the future should still be considered.

- 8.12 **The Chairman** agreed that any future “no-reclamation” proposal from the public should still be considered. He also requested Maunsell to provide information on vertical alignment of the CWB for further consideration by the Sub-committee. Maunsell
- 8.13 In response to the Chairman’s request to elaborate on justifications for reclamation at the western end, **Mr. Peter Cheek** said that the Trunk Road had to pass either above or below the MTR Tsuen Wan Line. The possibility of tunneling underneath it had been considered but found not feasible. He said that sufficient clearance must be maintained between the two tunnels to avoid inducing any movement of the MTR tunnel or causing disturbance to the existing ground and due to gradient limitation on the Trunk Road, connecting back to the Rumsey Street Flyover and the adjoining road network would not be feasible if the Trunk Road passed underneath the MTR tunnel. Passing above the MTR tunnel could be achieved by a piled deck structure spanning across the MTR tunnel, but because the Trunk Road tunnel levels become high, some reclamation would be required.
- 8.14 **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** asked about the off-setting of the high point of the CWB tunnel from the MTR tunnel as shown on Maunsell’s presentation. **Mr. Peter Cheek** responded that the tentative alignment shown had taken into account other constraints such as box culverts. He said that the conclusion would remain the same even if the high point could be shifted to match with the MTR tunnel.
- 8.15 **Mr. Steve Chan** further asked whether the extent of reclamation could not be reduced by not providing the slip roads or reducing the number of lanes of the Trunk Road. He then expressed concern on environmental impacts arising from the Trunk Road as the road might attract more vehicles

to the area.

- 8.16 **Mr. Hardy Lok** asked about the height of the tunnel, which appeared to be about 10m from the presentation powerpoint. He reiterated the need for further information. He also said that as the CWB within CRIII had yet to be constructed, it should not be treated as a constraint.
- 8.17 **Mr. Peter Cheek** responded that the purpose of the paper was to address whether reclamation was required or not at the connection with CRIII rather than the extent of reclamation required for which the issues raised by members might be relevant. The gist of the justifications was that the Trunk Road had to pass above the MTR tunnel and by doing so, it would be above sea level at the crossing point, leading to reclamation at that location. Details could be provided if needed.
- 8.18 **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** said that even if reclamation in the legal sense would be required, the harbour would be better preserved and maintained if the Trunk Road could be put below sea level. **Mr. L T Ma** agreed that the idea of having a shallow depth of water above the Trunk Road tunnel structure would have to be addressed. Maunsell
- 8.19 **Mr. Hardy Lok** requested withdrawing the paper pending for more information.
- 8.20 **Mr. Greg Wong** said that from engineering point of view, he agreed that reclamation would be required in the area west of the HKCEC if the Trunk Road was to pass over the MTR tunnel and he agreed that vertical alignment extended up to the Rumsey Street Flyover, with all the constraints shown, should be provided to demonstrate that tunneling underneath the MTR tunnel was not feasible. He suggested that the presented trunk road's vertical i.e. culverts and tunnel alignment to be extended to the Rumsey Street Flyover, with details of all the constraints presented, should be provided to members so that they can satisfy themselves whether an alternative vertical alignment underneath the MTR tunnel

(which may not need reclamation east of CRIII) is feasible or not.

8.21 **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** suggested members to consider the papers further after the meeting and raise questions for Maunsell to follow up.

8.22 **The Chairman** summarized the main points of the discussion as follows:

- The purpose of the discussion paper was to address from a conceptual perspective whether reclamation was required or not rather than the extent of reclamation required
- The Consultant had stated that the existing land at North Point was not sufficient to provide the tunnel portal and reclamation would be required at the eastern end
- The Consultant had also explained that at the western end the Trunk Road had to pass above the MTR tunnel but members asked for the vertical alignment of the CWB starting from the Rumsey Street Flyover and further information on the technical infeasibility of tunneling underneath the MTR tunnel
- There was suggestion that besides addressing the issue of reclamation from the legal perspective (that is any work above the sea-bed might be regarded as reclamation), keeping the Trunk Road below sea water level should be considered.

8.23 **The Chairman** then requested Maunsell to provide further information on the following matters: Maunsell

- details of the crossing with the MTR tunnel;
- information on the technical infeasibility of tunneling underneath the MTR tunnel; and
- details of reclamation required for providing the tunnel portal at the eastern end.

8.24 **Mr. Steve Chan** reiterated the need to address the issues in a more creative manner.

- 8.25 **Mr. L T Ma** suggested that Maunsell should expand the paper to address comments raised by members at the meeting and to include assessments of ideas raised by the public before as well as other ideas such as seaward or flyover alignments to make the paper more comprehensive. Maunsell
- 8.26 **Dr. Ng Mee-kam** suggested members sending their questions and/or comments to the Secretariat for Maunsell to prepare for responses. **The meeting** agreed and **the Chairman** requested members to provide their input within one week. All Members
- 8.27 **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** suggested that questions to be raised by Members should not be limited to those discussion papers already submitted to the Sub-committee already. **Mr. L T Ma** supported. All Members
- 8.28 **Dr. Greg Wong** said that whilst there might not be any possible ‘no-reclamation’ alignment option for the Trunk Road, the consultants should aim at minimizing reclamation at all time. **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** supported. Maunsell

Item 9 Any Other Business

- 9.1 In response to **the Chairman’s** invitation to brief members on the possible “Central HER”, **Mr. Raymond Chiu** said that at the HEC meeting on 16 February 2006 members of HEC discussed the idea of a possible HER for Central Reclamation Phase III (CRIII). He said that there was a major difference between WDII and CRIII. While the draft OZP for Wan Chai North was under review, the Central District (Extension) OZP was an approved plan. The TPB in considering a few rezoning requests recently had confirmed that there was no need to amend the land use zonings of the Central District (Extension) OZP but requested PlanD to refine the existing urban design framework and prepare planning/design briefs for the key development sites. PlanD would brief the HEC at the next meeting in April 2006 on the follow-up actions.

- 9.2 **Dr. Chan Wai-kwan** said that HEC had been discussing enhancing the Central harbour-front since 2004. With TPB having decided not to accept the rezoning requests submitted by several parties, he considered that it was an appropriate time to launch a HER for Central which was in line with TPB's decision that certain planning proposals should be refined. He remarked that for the CRIII area, discussion on the reclamation extent was over but the current public debate related was too much focused on the Tamar site only. With the completion of the Envisioning Stage of the WDII HER, he considered that it might be appropriate for the Sub-committee to discuss or even take up the Central HER. Although PlanD was working on that respect, he pointed out that following the conventional approach without enhanced public participation would not be acceptable to the public. He suggested that a harbour-front improvement study ("HIS") for enhancing the harbour-front area for the Central area be conducted with joint efforts of HEC, TPB and Government, and with emphasis on urban design rather than land use planning and adopting a holistic approach integrating with the adjoining areas.
- 9.3 **Mr. Steve Chan** agreed that it was already the appropriate time to conduct harbour-front enhancement review for the Central area. He also pointed out that an approved OZP could still be changed if needed.
- 9.4 **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** said that with the recent completion of the Envisioning Stage for WDII HER and CHARM for the Central ferry pier area, the final area to be reviewed would be the Central area. He considered that the HER for Central should start as soon as possible.
- 9.5 **Mr. Robin Ip** said that as PlanD was going to refine the existing urban design framework and prepare planning/design briefs for key sites on the Central District (Extension) OZP, that would provide a suitable platform for further public discussion. He considered that the WDII Review Sub-committee would now need to concentrate on the preparation of the Concept Plan and the associated public

engagement for the next stage of the WDII HER i.e.the Realization Stage. He added that as the Central District (Extension) OZP had gone through a due process of public consultation and consideration of public views and objections by the TPB, and had subsequently been approved by the Chief Executive in Council, any request for amendment should go through the relevant statutory planning procedures.

- 9.6 **Ms. Phyllis Li** said that the land use zonings for the reclamation area on the approved Central District (Extension) OZP had already been re-examined and re-affirmed by the TPB when considering the recent rezoning requests raised by the public. She said that PlanD would take into account the harbour visions of the TPB, the harbour planning principles of the HEC, the urban design guidelines and other relevant planning considerations when refining the existing urban design framework for the Central waterfront. She added that PlanD intended to commission expertise consultants for conducting an urban design study to undertake the task, and would consult the public, TPB, HEC, DCs etc in the process. PlanD would brief HEC on the proposed scope, approach, programme and public engagement arrangements of the urban design study in the coming HEC meeting in April 2006 .
- 9.7 **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** considered that PlanD should seek the public's views on the HER for Centralas soon as possible.
- 9.8 **Dr. Ng Mee-kam** said that the Centre of Urban Planning & Environmental Management of the University of Hong Kong had completed a report for Central & Western DC, it was observed that the public did not demand for a complete revision of the OZP, but to address the deficiency of the current planning and enhancing the urban design. Engaging the public at an early stage would be essential for better achieving community consensus.
- 9.9 **Mr. Hardy Lok** pointed out that the Society for Protection of the Harbour Limited would continue to pursue changing the approved OZP. He considered that the approach suggested

by PlanD was piece-meal and selective and he quoted the consultation concerning the Tamar site as an example. He then invited members to attend a forum on the Tamar site to be held on 18 March 2006.

- 9.10 **The Chairman** reckoned that CRIII was different from WD II as there was already an agreed land use framework provided by an approved OZP and it was recently reconfirmed by the TPB. He agreed with some members that the focus of the next stage of work for CRIII should be on the urban design and detailed planning aspects. He considered that in undertaking the proposed urban design study, a partnership with the HEC in engaging the public should be adopted. The experience of the WDII HER demonstrated the importance and benefit of enhancing public participation. **Ms. Phyllis Li** said that in the proposed urban design study, a comprehensive approach would be adopted and the urban design framework would cover the Central waterfront with due consideration to integration of the existing hinterland. She agreed with the Chairman on the partnering approach and that the experience of public engagement gained in the WDII HER was very useful. Views of the HEC would be sought on the public engagement arrangement of the proposed urban design study.
- 9.11 **The Chairman** reminded Members to also provide their questions/comments on the papers not discussed to the Secretariat within a week. All Members
- 9.12 **Mr. L T Ma** said that while the consultants would start preparing the additional information required, he expected that the additional information could be completed in about two weeks after receipt of questions/comments from Members. Maunsell
- 9.13 **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** requested recording his impression that urgency was stressed for matters related to WDII but not for other matters such as the HER for Central . **Mr. Steve Chan** shared the impression of Mr. Zimmerman.

9.14 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:25pm. The next meeting was tentatively scheduled for 11 April 2006.

Secretariat, HEC Sub-committee on
Wan Chai Development Phase II Review
April 2006