

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

Minutes of Special Meeting

Date : 21 July 2005
Time : 4:00 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
Dr. Ng Mee-kam	Representing Citizen Envisioning@Harbour
Dr. Andrew Thomson	Representing Business Environment Council
Dr. Greg Wong	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr. Hardy Lok	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour Limited
Mr. Charles Nicholas Brooke	
Dr. Chan Wai-kwan	
Mr. Steve Chan	
Mrs. Ava Ng	Deputy Secretary (P&L)1, Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau
Ms Sharon Ho	Principle Assistant Secretary (Transport) 5, Environment, Transport and Works Bureau
Mr. Michael Ma	Atg Assistant Director (Metro & Urban Renewal), 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
Miss Pauline Wong	District Officer (Wan Chai), Home Affairs Department
Mr. Adrian Ng	Project Manager (Major Works), Highways Department
Mr. Bosco Chan	Secretary

In Attendance

Mr. Roger Nissim	HEC Member, representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Ms Y Y Pong	HEC Member, representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Miss Christine Chow	Principal Assistant Secretary (Planning and Lands)2, Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau
Ms Lydia Lam	Assistant Secretary (P)3, Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau
Miss Clara Tang	Principle Assistant Secretary (C&I)1 Commerce, Industry and Technology Bureau
Mr. Bryan Li	Senior Executive Officer (Planning) 1, Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau
Ms Iris Tam	Representing City Planning Consultants Ltd
Miss Flora Lai	Representing City Planning Consultants Ltd
Mr. Eric Ma	Representing Maunsell Consultants Asia Ltd
Mr. Fred Lam	Executive Director of Hong Kong Trade Development Council
Mr. Alan Wong	Deputy Executive Director of Hong Kong Trade Development Council
Mr. K F Chan	Head, HKCEC Extension Project
Mr. W H Lam	Director of Wong & Ouyang (HK) Ltd.
Mr. Ha Si Hung	Associate Director of Wong & Ouyang (HK) Ltd.
Mr. Chapman Lam	Associate of MVA Ltd.

Absent with Apologies

Dr. Alvin Kwok	Representing Conservancy Association
Mr. Patrick Lau	
Mr. Stephen Chan	

Action

Agenda and Declaration of Interest

The Chairman said that although two discussion items were included in the agenda, they were both on same topic of the proposal from Trade Development Council (TDC). He suggested discussing both items together. **The meeting** agreed.

The Chairman said that **Dr. Greg Wong** has submitted a written declaration of interest which stated that while he had no

business dealing with TDC, he was a member of a committee of TDC to provide advice to TDC on how to market HKSAR's professional services and he received no remuneration for the post. **Mr. Charles Nicholas Brooke** said that he was also a member of the same committee.

The Chairman also declared that he had no business dealing with TDC but represented the Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong (CILTHK) at an advisory committee of TDC on logistics services. In addition, he said that both CILTHK and TDC were one of the organizers of Logistics Award Hong Kong 2005.

Ms Iris Tam said that City Planning would act as facilitator at the public consultation forum to be organized by TDC on 23 July 2005. She said that the matter had been reported to and discussed at a HER Task Force meeting.

(Post-meeting note: **Dr. Chan Wai-kwan** declared that he had no business dealing with TDC but was a member of TDC's professional services advisory committee.)

Item 1 Proposed extension of the Atrium Link at Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre (HKCEC)

- 1.1 With the aid of powerpoint, **Mr. Fred Lam** of TDC explained that the proposed extension of the Atrium Link between the two phases of HKCEC consisted of rebuilding the Atrium Link wider to enlarge the exhibition halls. He pointed out that even if the new exhibition centre at the Hong Kong International Airport to be opened by end 2005 was taken into account, the proposed extension was still urgently needed in order to maintain Hong Kong's superior position in the world's exhibition business against keen competitions from the nearby areas. He also said that the project would benefit the overall economy of Hong Kong.
- 1.2 **Mr. Fred Lam** said that in planning the extension, their key considerations were: no reclamation, no significant

visual impact, no additional roads or trade fair jams and no burden on taxpayers. TDC would adopt best environmental practices for construction. He was confident that the project aligned with harbour planning principles for sustainable development while also bringing additional economic benefit to Hong Kong and enhancing its competitiveness.

- 1.3 **Mr. Fred Lam** said that TDC had consulted the public extensively since September 2004 and had briefed the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC) on the proposal on 5 January 2005. In general, the public were supportive of the project. Their major concerns were visual impact, connectivity and traffic impact. He said that those key concerns had been addressed in the current proposal.
- 1.4 Regarding visual impact, **Mr. Fred Lam** explained that plan area of the extension had been reduced in the current proposal in order to enhance visual appearance. It would only require an additional 12% increase in plan area to create a 42% increase in exhibition space. For connectivity, he said that the extension project would provide an opportunity to improve connectivity and TDC had made recommendations to Government to construct additional footbridge links along Fleming Road and Fenwick Street. As for traffic impact, Mr. Lam said that an independent traffic impact assessment (TIA) had demonstrated that the project had no adverse impact. He added that the “central forwarding system” that proved to be useful would become mandatory for all mega fairs, a truck marshalling area at Tseung Kwan O would be arranged and shuttle ferry services between Wan Chai and Tsim Sha Tsui East would be provided.
- 1.5 **Mr. Fred Lam** concluded his presentation by saying that TDC would still welcome suggestions for further improving their proposal. In that respect, a community consultation forum organized by TDC and supported by the Wan Chai District Council would be held on 23 July

2005. He invited the Members to participate.

- 1.6 **Mr. Nicholas Brooke** said that the Sub-committee should consider TDC's proposal from the perspective of harbour-front enhancement. He opined that the proposal had little input on enhancing the harbour-front. He also said that with a 42% increase in exhibition space, there were bound to be some impacts on traffic. He asked TDC to elaborate on that aspect.
- 1.7 **Mr. Fred Lam** responded that most of the area around HKCEC was government land and they were prepared to discuss and co-operate with government on any greening and enhancement proposals. He said that the Atrium Link Extension would provide an opportunity for improving pedestrian access and to open areas. He believed that the package of traffic management measures would be sufficient to resolve any traffic impact in that area. (TDC then presented a short video to explain the central forwarding system.)
- 1.8 In response to the question from **Mr. Nicholas Brooke** on the TDC's TIA report, **Mr. K K Lau** said that the report was acceptable in principle to Transport Department (TD) although some details and recommendations made still had to be elaborated and clarified. He said that the critical traffic impact around HKCEC would be at the closing down of mega fairs as a large number of trucks and vans might gather around the area. Having discussed with TDC, TD commissioned a trial in 2003 on operating an off-site marshalling area at Lei King Wan. That trial was successful. That arrangement and the central forwarding system already implemented by TDC had proved to be effective in mitigating traffic impact in the critical closing-down scenario. He said that TDC would also be requested to consider further improvements, such as better utilizing the space at HKCEC Phase II for passenger drop-off, instead of concentrating at Phase I and also pedestrian connections. The proposed shuttle ferry services to

Tsim Sha Tsui East should be useful.

- 1.9 **Dr. Andrew Thomson** said that as enhancement of the harbour-front needed to be considered holistically and including the HKCEC area, he questioned on the urgency in implementing the project before the overall plan for enhancing the harbour-front was available. He said that the conclusion that the proposed extension would not have any impact in those areas mentioned might not be the real situation and suggested a more transparent presentation of the impacts by TDC. For visual impact, he remarked that it should be viewed from the perspective of the beholder. As for the traffic management measures, he pointed out that air pollution would be greater from heavy goods vehicles compared with a medium or light goods vehicle and a full presentation of such impacts would be useful. He also questioned the conclusion that no reclamation under the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance was involved as the proposal involved decking over the harbour.
- 1.10 **Mr. Roger Nissim** pointed out that he had doubt regarding the continuous implementation of the off-site marshalling area arrangement. He said that if the site at Tseung Kwan O was not owned by TDC, TDC might have difficulties in identifying a suitable replacement site later.
- 1.11 **Dr. Ng Mee-kam** asked if ground level perspectives of the proposed extension were available so that the tunnel effect created, if any, could be visualized. Besides traffic impact, she asked if a sustainable development assessment had been conducted, as the project would also have social, economic and environmental impacts. For example, the proposal might have impact on Tseung Kwan O due to the off-site marshalling area proposed there. She opined that TDC should take a more active role in enhancing the Wan Chai waterfront area. Lastly, she asked for clarification on whether TDC had considered the relationship between the extension project

and the possible alignments for the future Central-Wan Chai Bypass (CWB).

- 1.12 **Dr. Chan Wai-kwan** pointed out that an area for exhibition purpose was allowed in the draft Wan Chai North Outline Zoning Plan (OZP), although it would require reclamation. As the extent of the current proposed extension was smaller, he asked TDC to clarify on their further expansion plan beyond the current proposal.
- 1.13 For the above comments, **Mr. Fred Lam** responded that TDC had confidence on the effectiveness of the traffic management measures proposed to alleviate traffic impact. He said that although the central forwarding system would increase the number of large trucks traveling to HKCEC, the number of small vans to the same destination would be substantially reduced. Thus, there should not be any adverse air pollution impact. The system was also a proven one in many foreign countries. He clarified that the site to be used for off-site marshalling was located within the Tseung Kwan O Industrial Estate. Long-term use of the site had been secured. Even if the site was not available in future, he said that there was no reason why a suitable replacement site could not be identified. With HKCEC being a landmark of Hong Kong, he said that efforts would be devoted to eliminate or minimize any adverse visual impact. The reduction in the plan area in the current proposal as compared with the original one was a good example of TDC's effort in that respect. Views at ground level would be provided later.
- 1.14 On the issue of reclamation, **Mr. Fred Lam** advised that their legal adviser has advised that no reclamation in the context of the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance was involved. As for enhancing the surrounding area, he said that they would co-operate with the parties concerned once a concrete enhancement plan was formulated. Regarding CWB, as the alignment was still not yet fixed,

TDC

he said that TDC would continue to discuss with government on the interface issues.

- 1.15 **Mr. Fred Lam** also confirmed that the current proposed extension was smaller in scale when compared with that allowed at the area reserved for exhibition purpose in the draft Wan Chai North OZP. He said that the proposed extension could only satisfy the minimum of the predicted demand and was therefore very important. Further expansion of HKCEC was uncertain for the time being.
- 1.16 As for implementation programme, **Mr. Fred Lam** reiterated that there was a real urgency for the project in order to safeguard Hong Kong's position against competitions from nearby cities as those cities were developing large exhibition centers. He also remarked that business opportunities once missed would never return.
- 1.17 On sustainable development assessment, **Mr. W H Lam** said that environmental impact assessment (EIA) and TIA had been conducted in accordance with the requirements of Town Planning Board (TPB) and the adverse impacts were low.
- 1.18 **Mr. Charles Nicholas Brooke** asked whether it was possible for TDC to withhold their project until the draft concept plan to be prepared at the Realization Stage of Harbour-front Enhancement Review – Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Areas (HER) project was available by about end 2005. In response, **Mr. Fred Lam** reiterated that they could not afford missing any business opportunity. He opined that TDC had already spent much effort in gauging public views on their extension proposal and they would continue to consult the public and work with HEC and the Sub-committee.
- 1.19 In response to **Dr. Chan Wai-kwan**, **Mr. L T Ma** said that judging from the current progress, the new draft Wan

Chai North OZP could only be available by mid 2006.

- 1.20 In response to the question of **Mr. Roger Nissim** on the validity of the current draft Wan Chai North OZP, **Mr. Michael Ma** said that the current OZP was in force. The area where TDC proposed to extend was designated as “road” in that draft OZP. According to notes of the draft OZP, TDC’s proposal required permission of the TPB.
- 1.21 **Dr. Ng Mee-kam** suggested that TDC should consider more about its corporate social and environmental responsibilities. For instance, the HKCEC itself could embrace greener design and play a more proactive role in serving the Wan Chai community. In response, **Mr. Fred Lam** said that the suggestion was in line with their current work of promoting that HKCEC was a venue of Hong Kong and Wan Chai. He said that TDC was discussing with the management company of HKCEC on allowing non-profit making organizations to hire their facilities at a cheaper rate at off-peak hours. TDC was also allowing such organizations to set up promotion booth at exhibitions, especially when overseas exhibitors were involved.
- 1.22 **Mr. Steve Chan** highlighted the uncertainties on whether the extension would be challenged as reclamation over the harbour and the legal validity of the TPB’s decision on the extension as the area was currently over the harbour the OZP of which was under review. He also suggested TDC to pay special attention on enhancing the use of natural light to minimize the tunnel effect under the extension and within the public areas of the extension.
- 1.23 As there were no further comments on TDC’s proposal, the meeting then discussed the format of submitting views to TPB. **The Chairman** reminded that views should be submitted before 26 July 2005.
- 1.24 **Mr. Charles Nicholas Brooke** suggested submitting all

views expressed by the members at the meeting to TPB. **Mr. Fred Lam** asked for including TDC's response in the submission. **Dr. Ng Mee-kam** questioned on the need to include TDC's response as the submission was one from the Sub-committee. **Mr. Charles Nicholas Brooke** said that members' views should be submitted to TPB and it would be up to TDC to consider how to respond to such views and they might also wish to improve their response when submitting formally to TPB.

- 1.25 **Mr. L T Ma** then suggested submitting the draft meeting minutes to TPB instead. **Mr. Hardy Lok** supported the suggestion and said that views expressed by the Society for Protection of the Harbour (SPH) on the TDC's proposal in their letter of 15 July 2005, that was circulated to all HEC members, should also be included in the submission to TPB. **Mr. Charles Nicholas Brooke** pointed out that there was a difference in weight between members' views and meeting minutes. **Miss Christine Chow** advised for reference that for previous briefings to HEC, the relevant extracts of the draft briefing minutes were provided to the respective proponents as a record of the views of members.
- 1.26 **Dr. Chan Wai-kwan** pointed out that there was a difference between submitting views and submitting information to TPB. Views were more important. As meeting minutes were information only, he suggested submitting both the meeting minutes and members' views, extracted from the minutes, to TPB. **The meeting** agreed. Secretary
- 1.27 **Mr. K K Lau** suggested that his comments on the traffic impact should be included in the submission in both the capacity of a Sub-committee member and a government official. **The meeting** agreed. Secretary
- 1.28 **The meeting** agreed that the letter of SPH dated 15 July 2005 to HEC should be attached to the views to be submitted to TPB. Secretary

- 1.29 **Mr. L T Ma** suggested discussing at the next Task Force meeting on means to enhance liaison on other projects that would have interface with HER. **The Chairman** agreed.
- 1.30 **Ms. Iris Tam** asked whether the Sub-committee had any objections for her to utilize the sustainability principles and indicators developed under HER at TDC's forum to be held on 23 July 2005. As there were no objections, **the Chairman** remarked that it should be emphasized that the principles and indicators had yet to be endorsed.
- 1.31 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:50pm.

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