

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

**Minutes of 6th Meeting**

Date : 14 June 2005  
Time : 9:30 a.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
Dr. Ng Mee-kam	Representing Citizen Envisioning@Harbour
Mr. Joseph Wong	Representing Citizen Envisioning@Harbour
Mr. Paul Zimmerman	Representing Business Environment Council
Dr. Greg Wong	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr. Hardy Lok	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour Limited
Dr. Alvin Kwok	Representing Conservancy Association
Mr. Stephen Chan	
Miss Christine Chow	Principal Assistant Secretary (Planning and Lands)2, Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau
Mr. Simon Chung	Assistant Secretary (Transport) 5A, Environment, Transport and Works Bureau
Ms Christine Tse	District Planning Officer/Hong Kong, Planning Department
Mr. L T Ma	Project Manager/Hong Kong Island and Islands, Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr. K K Lau	Deputy Commissioner for Transport/Planning and Technical Services, Transport Department
Mr. Donald Wong	Atg District Officer (Wan Chai), Home Affairs Department
Mr. Adrian Ng	Project Manager (Major Works), Highways Department
Mr. Bosco Chan	Secretary

### **In Attendance**

Mr. Bryan Li	Senior Executive Officer (Planning)1, Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau
Mr. S K Lam	Chief Engineer/Hong Kong (2), Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr. S T Chan	Engineer/Hong Kong (HW3), Water Supplies Department
Mr. T H Chan	Senior Engineer/Hong Kong 1, Water Supplies Department
Mr. C M Choi	Senior Engineer 2 (Harbour Area Treatment Scheme), Drainage Services Department
Mr. K N Li	Senior Estate Surveyor/Hong Kong East (2), District Lands Officer, Hong Kong East, Lands Department
Ms. Iris Tam	Representing City Planning Consultants Ltd
Ms. Betty Ho	Representing City Planning Consultants Ltd
Dr. Sujata S Govada	Representing City Planning Consultants Ltd
Dr. Winnie Law	Representing City Planning Consultants Ltd
Miss Flora Lai	Representing City Planning Consultants Ltd
Mr. Eric Ma	Representing Maunsell Consultants Asia Ltd

### **Absent with Apologies**

Mr. Charles Nicholas Brooke  
Dr. Chan Wai-kwan  
Mr. Steve Chan  
Mr. Patrick Lau

### **Action**

#### **Item 1 Confirmation of minutes of 5th meeting**

- 1.1 **The Chairman** said that the draft minutes were circulated to Members on 26 May 2005 for comments and no suggested amendments were received. As there was no proposed amendment, the draft minutes were confirmed without amendment. All to note

#### **Item 2 Matters Arising**

- 2.1 Regarding paragraph 2.1, **the Chairman** said that the Main HEC Committee had appointed **Mr. Stephen Chan** as a All to note

member of the WDII Review Sub-committee.

- 2.2 Regarding item 3.1, **the Chairman** suggested and the meeting agreed that the previous suggestions from Business Environment Council dated 15 June 2004 and 5 July 2004 concerning quick enhancement projects and the Causeway Bay Flyover Reconstruction project respectively could be discussed under Agenda 5 (Quick-win projects for Wan Chai/Causeway Bay harbour-front).
- 2.3 Regarding items 3.2 to 3.4, the **Secretary** reported that he had approached Scott Wilson, with the view to finding out what additional information could be provided to the Sub-committee. Scott Wilson said that they were tasked to produce a preliminary concept only and the available information had already been included into the report that Royal Hong Kong Yacht Club (RHKYC) submitted to the Sub-committee. What could be provided was a set of drawings on the proposed alignment of the Trunk Road in larger scale and 3 drawings were sent to the Secretariat in late May 2005.
- 2.4 **The Secretary** also reported that Scott Wilson said that in working out their preliminary concept, they had not yet determined the extent of reclamation required. Indeed they said that technical feasibility of their concept, including temporary arrangements during construction, had yet to be assessed in details. However, in response to the request to elaborate on paragraph R6.1.4 of the report (which stated that '[the Trunk Road] may be constructed as an immersed tube tunnel, and then the seawall would be built in front of it, and the areas between backfilled'), Scott Wilson said that as the seaward side of the Trunk Road structure had to be protected, that was a reasonable design. Scott Wilson also said that the same reason also explained the typical section shown in paragraph R5.7.3 of the report.
- 2.5 **Dr. Greg Wong** asked for circulating the larger scale drawings from Scott Wilson to the Sub-committee members so that they could consider whether the concept would

require reclamation or not. **Dr. NG Mee-kam** also asked whether the larger scale drawings from Scott Wilson could be displayed at the charrettes.

- 2.6 **The Secretary** pointed out that while Scott Wilson and Swire Properties had consented publishing their report attached to the submission from RHKYC that was discussed in the Sub-committee meeting of 7 February 2005 as Paper No. WD 1/2005, only one set of the larger scale drawings was received from Scott Wilson without indicating whether the drawings could be distributed to the Sub-committee members or disclosed to the public. He had to confirm with Scott Wilson in this regard. **The Chairman** asked **the Secretary** to check with Scott Wilson as soon as possible. He also suggested **the Secretary** to approach Swire Properties asking them to consider making their proposal a suggestion for the Envisioning Stage of HER.

Secretary

(Post-meeting note: a request was sent to Scott Wilson by e-mail on 15 June 2005. Scott Wilson responded advising that the drawings were being revised and the revised drawings would be passed to the Sub-committee when available.)

- 2.7 **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** said that RHKYC had produced physical models to illustrate their three concepts. He suggested displaying those models at the charrettes. **The Secretary** said that he had seen one of the models when RHKYC presented their concepts for beautifying Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter to the Eastern District Council (EDC) at the meeting held at end May 2005. He pointed out that the concepts and models were not included in the RHKYC's submission to the Sub-committee in February 2005. After the meeting, he had enquired RHKYC on whether they would submit the concepts and models to the Sub-committee for consideration which RHKYC agreed to consider. He said that he would follow up with RHKYC and requested **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** to assist in contacting RHKYC in this regard.

Secretary/  
Mr. Paul  
Zimmerman

(Post-meeting note: RHKYC replied in their letter of 16 June 2005 that their models were being updated and their concepts would be presented to the Sub-committee later.)

- 2.8 **Mr. Joseph Wong** cautioned the Sub-committee that efforts devoted to consider RHKYC's proposal should be comparable to any other proposals submitted by the public. **Dr. Greg Wong** said that Scott Wilson's concept was the first complete and analyzed concept received from the public which had been considered by an engineering consultant and for that reason, the concept deserved consideration in more details.
- 2.9 **Mr. L T Ma** said that all proposals from the public would be considered by the Sub-committee with input on technical aspects by the consultants. The consultants would then develop concept plans for consideration at the next stage. **Mr. Hardy Lok** said that all comments, ideas and proposals submitted either formally or informally should also be considered.
- 2.10 In response to **Mr. Paul Zimmerman's** comments on how to work out a best solution for the review on WDII including possibly design competition arrangement, **Mr. L T Ma** said it should be noted that the Government had already engaged consultants for the review of WDII and it is the responsibility of the Government and the consultants to work out a solution which would comply with the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (PHO) and the overriding public need test. He opined that the consultants were competent in that respect.
- 2.11 In response to **the Chairman** on the number of comments/proposals received so far, **Ms. Iris Tam** reported that three written comments were received and one of them was irrelevant.
- 2.12 In response to **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** on when the information such as slip roads and new heliport would be available for discussion, **Mr. K K Lau** said that information

on the slip roads could be available for consideration at the charrettes. **Mr. L T Ma** supplemented that the proposed slip roads had already been indicated in the public engagement kit and the crude models. In the charrettes, technical experts from the government and consultants would provide assistance/information to the participants on that issue.

2.13 **The Chairman** suggested indicating the slip roads with colour in each model and request the facilitators in the charrettes to remind the participants about the need for slip roads. **Mr. Eric Ma** confirmed that the slip roads had already been highlighted with colour in the models .

City Planning  
/Maunsell

2.14 Regarding the new heliport issue, **Miss. Christine Chow** said that Economic Development and Labour Bureau (EDLB) had agreed to brief the LegCo on 25 July 2005. EDLB and other relevant bureau would brief the Sub-committee on the progress of heliport in due course.

(Post-meeting note: EDLB and Security Bureau will brief the Sub-committee on the progress at its meeting on 9 August 2005.)

2.15 **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** asked about the requirement of the service roads to be provided. He opined that the requirement should be clearly indicated in the charrettes. **Mr. K K Lau** responded that the layout of the service roads in Wan Chai area was not yet determined at that stage and would depend on the harbour-front enhancement proposal and the Trunk Road design. In response to questions, he said that there was a need to improve the east-west capacity even if there was no future commercial development at Wan Chai.

2.16 **The Chairman** said that it might be premature to request for detailed information regarding layout of the service roads at the Envisioning Stage as such information should only be available when preparing the draft OZP. He also said that beside the transport issues, HER should

All to note

concentrate on the harbour-front enhancement issues. At the Envisioning Stage, the public should be encouraged to express their comments, wishes and ideas which would be assessed by using the agreed sustainability principles. He stressed that the concept plans prepared by the consultants could still be amended if consensus could not be reached at the subsequent stages of HER.

### **Item 3 Progress report on HER (Paper No. WD 10/2005)**

- 3.1 **Ms. Iris Tam** briefed the meeting on the preliminary findings of the public forums. She said that as the last forum was just held on the day before the meeting, her report could cover the first four forums only.
- 3.2 **Ms. Iris Tam** reported that on the traffic issue, diversified views were expressed. Some were in support of the Trunk Road although they stressed on the need to minimize the extent of reclamation. They also considered that the flyover concept was not preferred. A few participants considered that electronic road pricing (“ERP”) would be sufficient to address the traffic problems without the Trunk Road, while others considered that traffic demand management measures should be adopted to tackle the problems. Government had responded pointing out that the Government was indeed using a multi-pronged approach to address the traffic problems. Various measures had been implemented, but such measures would only provide local and limited short-term relief; the Trunk Road would be required to meet the present and long-term transport need of the northern shore of Hong Kong Island. For implementing ERP, the Trunk Road would be a prerequisite to provide an alternative route that would bypass the charging zone.
- 3.3 Regarding the issue of harbour-front enhancement, **Ms. Iris Tam** reported that the public seemed to hold a more consensus view. Enhancing the existing harbour-front was the common goal and the participants generally favoured a continuous, vibrant and attractive harbour-front with

improved access and maximized opportunities for public enjoyment. Reclamation should be avoided as far as possible.

- 3.4 As for the sustainability principles and indicators for harbour-front enhancement, **Ms. Iris Tam** reported that the preliminary set was discussed and the participants had proposed revisions to them. The fundamental principles of “integrated planning”, “sustainable development” and “early and ongoing stakeholder engagement” were generally accepted.
- 3.5 As for the opinion survey, **Ms. Iris Tam** reported that a total of 161 people had been interviewed in the roadside survey and more than 300 people had been interviewed in the telephone survey in each area of Hong Kong Island, Kowloon and the New Territories. She then reported on the gist of preliminary findings of the surveys.
- 3.6 **Ms. Iris Tam** reported that on awareness of the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance, only about half of the interviewees of the roadside survey (with a lower percentage for the telephone survey) were aware of it. As for wishes on the harbour-front, besides enhancing visual amenity and landscape and resolving traffic congestion, there was also the view of maintaining the status quo. As for traffic congestion problem, about 80% of interviewees agreed that there was traffic congestion problem between Sheung Wan/Central and Causeway Bay and most of them agreed that there was a need to resolve the problem. To resolve the problem, the majority of interviewees preferred building the Trunk Road as well as adopting traffic demand management measures. On the form of Trunk Road, while the tunnel option with slip roads connection to Wan Chai and Causeway Bay was preferred in the roadside survey, more interviewees of the telephone survey preferred the flyover option. While the majority favoured a continuous harbour-front promenade, only 40% of the interviewees of the telephone survey and about half of the interviewees of the roadside survey supported forming it by reclamation.

3.7 In response to questions from **Mr. Paul Zimmerman**, **Ms. Iris Tam** said that the participants at the public forums suggested splitting the principle of “land/marine use and design compatibility between the waterfront and the adjoining areas” into two principles, namely, “ensure land and marine use compatibility to maximize public enjoyment” and “enhance visual amenity, landscape and quality of space”. Regarding the suggestion of “no high-rise buildings to protect the ridgeline”, **Ms. Iris Tam** said that most of the participants were concerned about protecting the ridgeline instead of having tall buildings along the harbour-front although some of the participants also mentioned about adopting a stepped height approach. As for commercial uses along the harbour-front, **Ms. Iris Tam** said that the participants referred to low-rise buildings for kiosks, cafes etc. On the question of resolving traffic congestion issues, whether the participants referring to the high speed travelling or less cars on the roads, **Ms. Iris Tam** said that the general views were that the roads were so congested which became unreliable to travel.

3.8 **Dr. Alvin Kwok** asked how many of the interviewees did not agree to reclamation for resolving the traffic congestion problems. **Ms. Betty Ho** responded that 9.3% of roadside interviewees did not support any reclamation for that purpose. **Ms. Iris Tam** supplemented that, unlike the roadside survey, there was no direct question addressing that point in the telephone survey. Instead a question was asked requesting the interviewee to give preference on the form of the Trunk Road if he considered it required. For that question, apart from the choices of tunnel, at-grade road and flyover, a fourth choice of “others” was provided. The interviewees who did not support any reclamation might have chosen this choice and only about 5-6% of the interviewees chose that fourth choice.

3.9 **Dr. Alvin Kwok** said that the difference in the results of the certain questions in the telephone and roadside surveys might be due to the environment of the interview. In this

City Planning

regard, he suggested considering to arrange the future forums for the subsequent stages of HER at a harbour-front environment to give the participants a more realistic impression of the context.

- 3.10 **Mr. Joseph Wong** said that there was not enough reference to the economic sustainability principles at the forum discussions. He suggested reminding the participants in this regard. In response, **Dr. Winnie Law** said that the sustainability principles were accompanied by the social, economic and environmental indicators and the economic aspect was taken into account at the indicator level.
- 3.11 In response to **the Chairman**'s question on when would the report for the Envisioning Stage be available, **Ms. Iris Tam** said that the draft report would be completed by the end of July 2005. All to note
- 3.12 In response to the suggestion of holding further forum to All to note  
The meeting had discussion on the arrangement to resolve the diversified views on the traffic issues, **Mr. K K Lau** said that the traffic issues had already been fully discussed at the public forums. However, he said that as the Government was responsible for clarifying and resolving the diversified views, if it was concluded that further discussions were needed, he would certainly take part. **The Chairman** concluded that the meeting had a consensus to consider holding a round-table meeting with the transport experts to discuss the traffic issues. This matter would be discussed further.
- (Post-meeting note: The transport expert forum/round-table meeting is tentatively scheduled for 3 September 2005)
- 3.13 **Ms. Iris Tam** briefed the meeting on the arrangement of the coming charrettes. The charrettes would start by a briefing on the study background, public forum and surveys findings, highway possibilities, land use opportunities and constraints. The participants would be divided into groups and each group would be requested to come up with an

agreed vision for Wan Chai harbour-front including land use themes and preferred form of the Trunk Road if it was supported. Swapping to another group would be allowed if a participant considered that the vision of any group suited him better. The groups would then work out a concept plan for the new harbour-front.

- 3.14 In response to **Dr. Greg Wong**, **Ms. Iris Tam** said that Maunsell would provide the necessary engineering inputs with experts to advise on the feasibility of concepts drawn up by each group in the charrettes. For the design concept of the Trunk Road, there was no restriction in selecting only from the concept included in the public engagement kit.
- 3.15 **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** asked who would provide information on a submerged tunnel option as suggested by Scott Wilson, who would not be represented at the charrettes. **The Chairman** said that the engineering experts from Maunsell should be able to assist the participants to identify the constraints in envisioning the concepts.
- 3.16 **Dr. Alvin Kwok** said that while the idea to allow swapping groups was a good one, he opined that the participants should be encouraged to come up with a consensus option by combining the ideas. City Planning
- 3.17 **Mr. K K Lau** suggested and the meeting agreed having TD's representatives at each group to assist the participants on information regarding traffic issues. All to note

**Item 4 Progress report on submission and requests received (Paper No. WD 11/2005)**

- 4.1 **The Chairman** noted that there was no submission received since the last meeting on 12 April 2005. All to note

**Item 5 Quick-win projects for Wan Chai/Causeway Bay harbour-front**

- 5.1 **The Chairman** suggested the HER Task Force to discuss further on the quick-win projects taking into account comments/ideas that might be received in the coming community charrettes.

## **Item 6 Any Other Business**

- 6.1 Regarding the progress of Central Reclamation Phase III (CRIII), **Mr. H H Yeung** from CEDD reported that the reclamation at the western part of CRIII was in progress. Refurbishment of the existing Central pier 7 was completed and internal renovation and E&M works were in progress. Construction of new piers were in progress and would be completed by March 2006. After relocation of the existing Star Ferry Pier, Queen's Pier and the affected cooling water pumping stations, the remaining reclamation at the area would commence. He expected that the CRIII project would be completed by late 2008.
- 6.2 **Ms Christine Tse** said that 3 rezoning requests were received from the Society of Protection for the Harbour Limited (SPH), Save Our Shorelines and Clear the Air respectively. While the first two rezoning requests were made to the Central District (Extension) OZP, the last one from Clear the Air was made to both the Central District (Extension) OZP and the Wan Chai North OZP. Town Planning Board had originally scheduled to consider those submissions at the meeting of 20 May 2005, but had decided to defer the consideration due to the need to seek legal advice on the issue of conflict of interests of PSPL as the Chairperson of the meeting raised by SPH.
- 6.3 **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** asked about plans on temporary use of the reclaimed land formed under the Central Reclamation Phase III (CRIII) project. **Mr. L T Ma** responded that it was hoped that authorization and funding approval for Central Wan Chai Bypass (CWB) would be in place timely so that there was no need for a temporary situation. The target is to start construction work in 2006/07.

- 6.4 In response to question from **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** regarding design of the new water edge, **the Chairman** asked CEDD to provide details of the new water edge to Members for information. **Mr. L T Ma** advised that even if the construction of CWB was substantially delayed, arrangements could be made for a part of the water-front, the outermost part, to be opened to public first while the CWB was still under construction so that people could walk from Star Ferry to at least the eastern limit of CRIII before the final promenade was in place. . CEDD
- 6.5 **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** suggested and the meeting agreed for **the Secretary** to remind the relevant parties and participants for coming to the charrettes. Secretary
- (Post-meeting note: the HEC members, DC members, collaborators and those who had attended the public forums were reminded either by e-mail or by phone to attend the charrettes.)
- 6.6 The next meeting was scheduled for 9 August 2005. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:45pm. All to note

Secretariat, HEC Sub-committee on  
Wan Chai Development Phase II Review  
August 2005