

**HEC Sub-committee on  
Wan Chai Development Phase II Review**

**Outcome of Further Engagement and  
Concept Plan Preparation Work**

**Introduction**

1. At its meeting on 9 March 2006, the Sub-committee on Wan Chai Development Phase II Review (Sub-committee) endorsed the approach for proceeding with the Realization Stage of Harbour-front Enhancement Review – Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Areas (HER).
2. According to the endorsed approach, the Town Planning Board (TPB), relevant District Councils (DCs), Legislative Council (LegCo), HER collaborators, professional institutions and other stakeholders would be further engaged on the outcome of the Envisioning Stage of HER; the Consultants' findings regarding alignments and construction forms of the Trunk Road, harbour-front enhancement; and the Sub-committee's views in those aspects.
3. The Sub-committee's views on the Consultants' findings are as follows:
  - There is a need to build the Trunk Road.
  - The practical alignment option for the Trunk Road is to have it built along the foreshore.
  - The At-grade Road Option should not be pursued.
  - In general, the Flyover Option is not preferred.
  - If the Trunk Road is to be built in the form of a tunnel, there are five areas along the harbour-front that can be enhanced, namely areas to the west and to the east of the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre, ex-Wan Chai Public Cargo Working Area, Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter (CBTS) and the shoreline to the east of CBTS where the Trunk Road connects to the Island eastern Corridor.
  - The Tunnel Option has a number of variations with different traffic and other impacts during construction stage and extent of

harbour-front enhancement at the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter area.

- For selection among variations of the Tunnel Option with comparable traffic performance, there should be full regard to the PHO implications and the Court of Final Appeal judgment.
- The Deep Tunnel Option, which would require more reclamation and would not be able to provide connecting slip road at Causeway Bay, should not be pursued.
- In view of the PHO implications and environmental considerations, the “shallow water idea” should not be pursued.

4. Details of the further engagement conducted are as follows:

- (i) 21 April 2006 – TPB
- (ii) 11 May 2006 – Works and Development Committee of Eastern DC
- (iii) 15 May 2006 – Traffic and Transport Committee of Southern DC
- (iv) 16 May 2006 – Wan Chai DC
- (v) 20 May 2006 – Hong Kong Institute of Architects, Hong Kong Institute of Engineers, Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects, Hong Kong Institute of Planners and Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors (through a Joint Institute Seminar on Progressing to Realization Stage of Wan Chai Development Phase II Review & Harbour-front Enhancement review – Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Areas)
- (vi) 23 May 2006 – LegCo Panel on Planning, Lands and Works (PLW)
- (vii) 25 May 2006 – Central and Western DC
- (viii) 9 June 2006 – LegCo PLW Panel special meeting

5. The Government has also consulted the Transport Advisory Committee (TAC) on the possible alignments and construction forms of the Trunk Road on 17 May 2006.

### **Outcome of further engagement**

#### *TPB*

6. The “shallow water” idea attracted much discussion and members expressed concerns from the perspectives of PHO, water quality, navigation safety and other environmental concerns. There was the view that the idea was not preferred due to the limited useful usage of

the shallow depth of water.

7. Members also paid particular attention to potential impacts on traffic arising from temporary traffic diversions associated with the various Trunk Road ideas, potential impacts to Victoria Park and whether any of the Trunk Road ideas would jeopardize the railway projects being planned.
8. There was view that the Flyover Option is unlikely to be acceptable to the general public and Variation 1 of the Tunnel Option was the most viable option. On these premises, it was advisable for the Government and the consultants to clearly explain the merits of this option to the public with a view to soliciting the widest possible community support. The Board also saw the need to focus on the practicality and details of the feasible options in the next stage of public consultation in HER.

#### *TAC*

9. The TAC maintained their full support for the construction of the Trunk Road with its two sets of planned slip roads in Wan Chai and Causeway Bay. It also looked forward to the early completion of this last piece of infrastructure of the strategic road link along the northern shore of the Hong Kong Island.
10. It was stressed that due regard should be paid to the need to minimize traffic disruption and nuisance caused to the public during the construction stage.
11. The TAC also noted that considerable attention had been given to limit the reclamation required in examining how to build the Trunk Road and to maximize the opportunities the reclamation may provide for enhancing the harbour-front.

#### *DCs*

12. There was a general support for the construction of the Trunk Road and quite a number of members urged for early completion of the Trunk Road.
13. As for the construction forms of the Trunk Road, there was a majority support for Variation 1 of the Tunnel Option in the Southern DC and there were also views expressed in the other three DCs in support of it. On the other hand, the flyover option had little support.

14. Another main concern of the members was on traffic impacts during construction stage and stressed that such impacts must be minimized.
15. Members requested for maximizing harbour-front enhancement opportunities, but there were views expressed that it should not be a reason for reclaiming the Harbour.
16. Members of the DCs pointed out that there was a need to ensure that all ideas have already been exhausted in arriving at the conclusion that there is no possible “no-reclamation” alignment for constructing the Trunk Road. The Central & Western DC passed a motion objecting to the conclusion of no possible “no reclamation” alignment and requesting the Administration to review the planning for Central and Wan Chai and to reduce the commercial development in Central Reclamation Phase III and Tamar Development so as to minimize the transport need.
17. The need to engage the public further in the planning process was reaffirmed by the DC members.
18. The importance of ensuring that the public can understand the relevant information was stressed and the use of physical models, photomontages and computer animations to assist the public in visualizing the concepts was suggested.

*Professional institutions*

19. The need of the Trunk Road with its planned slip roads at Wan Chai and Causeway Bay was supported by many participants and reaffirmed by the representatives from those institutions organizing the Joint Institute Seminar.
20. Regarding the various options and ideas for the Trunk Road, Variation 1 of the Tunnel Option was considered to be the most feasible solution.
21. The participants also requested an integrated planning of the Trunk Road and harbour-front enhancement.
22. Taking into account the views regarding the “shallow water” idea of the public, there was suggestion of achieving similar effect through suitable landscape features, such as a large fountain.

### *LegCo PLW Panel*

23. In view of insufficient time, there was no discussion at the meeting on 23 May 2006 after the Consultants' powerpoint presentation. A special meeting was held on 9 June 2006 on this topic. Outcome of the discussion will be reported at the Sub-committee meeting. A second special meeting will be held on 26 June 2006 to receive deputations' views.

### **Way Forward**

24. In view of the least area of the Harbour affected under Variation 1 of the Tunnel Option amongst other variations/option with comparable traffic performance and there is obvious preference for Variation 1 of the Tunnel Option, it should be adopted as the basis for the Concept Plan preparation work. It is suggested that the Consultants should be asked to develop a Concept Plan with different themes of land use proposals and harbour-front enhancement ideas.
25. Preparation of the Concept Plan shall be accompanied by an assessment on its environmental implications in accordance with the requirements of the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (EIAO).
26. Information of all other ideas/proposals that have been considered, including their pros and cons, technical feasibility, PHO implications and especially reasons for not further pursuing them, shall be summarized and presented to the public in an easily understood manner during the public engagement activities of the Realization Stage.
27. Presentation of the Concept Plan and other information to the public should, as far as possible, be enhanced by physical models, photomontages and computer animations.

### **Programme**

28. Preparation of the Concept Plan will start immediately after the endorsement of the way forward as described above with a view to having it ready in July 2006.
29. The environmental impact assessment work will also start immediately.
30. Public engagement activities for the Realization Stage will be arranged

in around July/August 2006.

31. It is targeted to submit the draft Recommended Outline Development Plan (RODP) and relevant Outline Zoning Plan(s) (OZP(s)) to the TPB in late 2006 for its consideration.

### **Advice Sought**

32. Members are requested to consider and endorse the recommended way forward and the programme mentioned above.

Secretariat,  
HEC Sub-committee on WDII Review  
June 2006