

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

Minutes of 7th Meeting

Date : 9 August 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
Miss Lister Cheung	Representing Conservancy Association
Mr. Hardy Lok	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour Limited
Dr. Ng Mee-kam	Representing Citizen Envisioning@Harbour
Mr. Joseph Wong	Representing Citizen Envisioning@Harbour
Dr. Greg Wong	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr. Charles Nicholas Brooke	
Mr. Stephen Chan	
Mrs. Ava Ng	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. K K Lau	Deputy Commissioner for Transport/Planning and Technical Services, Transport Department
Mr. Anthony Kwan	Assistant Director/Metro and Urban Renewal, Planning Department
Ms Christine Tse	District Planning Officer/Hong Kong, Planning Department
Mr. Adrian Ng	Project Manager (Major Works), Highways Department
Mr. Donald Wong	Atg District Officer (Wan Chai), Home Affairs Department
Mr. L T Ma	Project Manager/Hong Kong Island and Islands,

Mr. Bosco Chan Civil Engineering and Development Department
Secretary

In Attendance

Miss Christine Chow Principal Assistant Secretary (Planning and
Lands)2, Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau

Ms Lydia Lam Assistant Secretary (Planning)3, Housing,
Planning and Lands Bureau

Mr. S K Lam Chief Engineer/Hong Kong (2), Civil Engineering
and Development Department

Ms. Iris Tam Representing City Planning Consultants Ltd

Miss Flora Lai Representing City Planning Consultants Ltd

Mr. Peter Cheek Representing Maunsell Consultants Asia Ltd

Mr. Darryl Chan Principal Assistant Secretary (Economic
Development)A2, Economic Development and
Labour Bureau

Ms. Amy Wong Acting Principal Assistant Secretary (Security) A,
Security Bureau

Mr. Jeffrey Law Acting Chief Operations Officer (TA), Civil
Aviation Department

Mr. Franco Ngan Acting Senior Operations Officer (Statistics), Civil
Aviation Department

Captain Michael Helicopter Operations Inspector, Civil Aviation
Webber Department

Captain West Wu Senior Pilot, Government Flying Service

Mr. John Leigh Representing Hong Kong Regional Heliport
Working Group

Mrs. Sandra Mak Representing Hong Kong Regional Heliport
Working Group

Mr. Cliff Dunnaway Representing Hong Kong Regional Heliport
Working Group

Mr. Robert Hill Representing Hong Kong Regional Heliport
Working Group

Absent with Apologies

Dr. Andrew Thomson Representing Business Environment Council

Dr. Chan Wai-kwan

Mr. Steve Chan

Mr. Patrick Lau

Agenda

The Chairman suggested discussing agenda items 3 and 4 together as they were on similar topics. **The meeting** agreed.

Item 1 Confirmation of minutes of 6th meeting and special meeting

1.1 The revised draft minutes of the 6th meeting circulated on 4 August 2005 were confirmed with no amendments.

1.2 For the revised draft minutes of special meeting held on 21 July 2005 circulated on 26 July 2005, **the Secretary** proposed amending the title of Mr. Michael Ma to “Acting Assistant Director (Metro and Urban Renewal), Planning Department”. The revised draft minutes of the special meeting held on 21 July 2005 were confirmed subject to the amendment proposed by the secretary.

(Post-meeting note: **Dr. Andrew Thomson** suggested, after the meeting, revising paragraph 1.9 of the draft minutes of the special meeting by replacing "air pollution would be greater from heavy goods vehicles" in the fourth sentence by "air and noise pollution would be greater from heavy goods vehicles" and replacing the last sentence by "He also questioned whether the proposal complied with the Harbour Protection Ordinance as it effectively decked over the harbour.")

Item 2 Matters Arising

2.1 Regarding paragraph 2.6 and 2.7, **the Chairman** said that a submission from Swire and an updated submission from RHKYC were received.

All to note

2.2 **The Secretary** said that disks containing all the written comments and submissions received during the Envisioning

Stage of HER were prepared for members' information and would be distributed to the members after the meeting.

(Post-meeting notes: The disk was also sent by post to those members who were unable to attend the meeting.)

- 2.3 Regarding paragraph 3.11, **the Chairman** reported that a preliminary draft report for the Envisioning Stage of HER prepared by the Consultant was circulated to the HER Task Force members for comments on 3 August 2005 as per the decision of the HER Task Force meeting of 1 August 2005. He said that he agreed to the suggestion of **Mr. Charles Nicholas Brooke** of convening a meeting to consider the draft report in details and asked **the Secretary** to arrange.

Secretary

- 2.4 Regarding paragraphs 3.2 to 3.4 and 3.12, **the Chairman** said the topic of 'quick win' projects and the details of the transport expert forum would be discussed under agenda item 5.

Item 3 Proposed development of a Government helipad at the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre (Paper No. WD 12/2005); and

Item 4 Proposed Regional Hong Kong Heliport

- 3.1 **Ms. Amy Wong** explained that the Government helipad, originally located at Lung Wui Road, was closed in January 2004 to facilitate the Central Reclamation Phase III construction works. Emergency and other services of the Government Flying Services (GFS) were being provided at a temporary helipad at the former Wan Chai Public Cargo Working Area (PCWA). A permanent helipad was needed to provide emergency services and swift flying support to the Police. After a thorough site search and consultation with the Legislative Council (LegCo) and District Councils (DCs) concerned, a site at the north-eastern corner of the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre (HKCEC) was considered most suitable for a permanent Government

helipad due to its strategic location and proximity to the Police Headquarters.

- 3.2 **Ms. Amy Wong** said that the size of the proposed government helipad would be about 2,700m² and would comprise two landing/taking-off pads with ancillary facilities. Apart from government uses, spare capacity of the helipad would be made available for commercial uses, but the Government would have priority at all times in the use of the helipad.
- 3.3 **Mr. Darryl Chan** said that for the time being there was only one temporary domestic heliport in operation at West Kowloon. A site adjacent to the Western Park Sports Centre in Sheung Wan was identified suitable for developing a permanent domestic heliport. While consultations with LegCo, Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC) and DCs concerned revealed a general support for a domestic heliport, the proposed site at Sheung Wan was considered undesirable due to concern of potential noise impact on nearby residents and the distance from the central business district (CBD). At a joint meeting of the LegCo Panel on Economic Services and Panel on Planning, Lands and Works held on 28 February 2005, a motion was passed urging the Government to expedite the provision of a permanent commercial heliport and associated facilities in the CBD of the Hong Kong Island and, under the principle of no unlawful reclamation, allow the helipad at the HKCEC to accommodate both government and commercial uses. Therefore, a 'shared-use' arrangement was proposed for the permanent Government helipad at HKCEC.
- 3.4 In response to the HEC's concern regarding the long-term planning of heliport development, **Mr. Darryl Chan** said that the proposed helipad at the HKCEC would cater for commercial domestic services. The growth in demand for cross boundary services would be satisfied by providing an additional landing/take off pad at the existing heliport at the Macau Ferry Terminal (MFT). It was expected that the HKCEC helipad and the expanded MFT heliport would be

able to meet the demands for domestic and cross-boundary helicopter services up to 2020 and 2015 respectively.

- 3.5 With the aid of powerpoint, **Mr. John Leigh** explained the proposal of the Hong Kong Regional Heliport Working Group (RHWG) on a regional heliport which consisted of 4 pads. He said that their proposal should be able to address the sensitive issues concerning a heliport and in particular the reclamation issue. He said that there were three possible pad formation options, namely, a deck supported by four circular columns, a piled structure similar to a normal pier and a floating pontoon, all of which would not involve conventional reclamation. Besides no permanent alternation or disturbance to the shoreline, complete removal of heliport facilities at a later stage could be accomplished.
- 3.6 **Mr. John Leigh** said that their proposal would be able to preserve the harbour-front at that area and public access to it. The existing ferry pier would be converted into a helicopter terminal building with restaurants, kiosks, viewing galleries etc. which would be another attraction for residents and visitors. In addition, the terminal building would also serve as a natural noise barrier and visual separation between the helipads and public activity areas.
- 3.7 **Mr. John Leigh** pointed out that demand for cross-boundary helicopter services between Hong Kong and Pearl River Delta (PRD) would increase dramatically. There was a need for 4 pads instead of 2 in order to meet the long-term planning for sustainable growth. He explained that the heliport facilities at MFT would not be sufficient even after expansion because the helipads at MFT would only be suitable for twin-engine helicopters due to safety requirements of Civil Aviation Department, but however, about 85% of the world's commercial helicopters were single-engine ones which would require ground level helipads for landing/take off. He said that therefore, RHWG's alternative proposal with the multi-pads facilities could meet the demand of both the Government, domestic and cross-boundary commercial uses.

- 3.8 Regarding noise issue, **Mr. John Leigh** pointed out that it had to be considered in the context of existing ambient noise levels. He said that at many locations, heliport noise would largely be overtaken by the existing ambient noise levels. As a result, people might not notice the helicopter movements. In addition, the proposed site was far away from residential areas and other noise sensitive receivers. He said that a noise test conducted by a consultant to compare the helicopter noise and the existing ambient noise indicated that noise arising from helicopter movements would dissipate quickly over the waterfront. To further reduce the noise impact, it was proposed that all approach/departure routes would be over the water.
- 3.9 In response to the presentation by RHWG, **Mr. Darryl Chan** pointed out that the Government was proposing to meet the growth of cross-boundary services through the expansion of the MFT heliport for two reasons. Firstly, utilizing existing customs, immigration and quarantine (CIQ) facilities at MFT would be desirable from cost effectiveness point of view. Secondly, twin-engine helicopters, suitable for the roof-top landing/take-off, were broadly used for the existing cross-boundary services. Expansion of landing facilities at MFT roof top would avoid taking up valuable harbour-front land. With the expansion being planned at MFT, it was expected that future demand for cross-boundary services up to at least 2015 could be met. Thereafter, it would still be possible to construct additional pads at the outer pier of MFT to meet the much longer-term demand. On the issue of reclamation, he said that the Government was fully aware of the public's deep concern about reclamation and had indeed reduced the size of the proposed Government helipad in order to avoid any reclamation. He stressed that Government's proposal was the least intrusive and well-balanced solution between harbour-front protection and provision of necessary helicopter landing facility.
- 3.10 In response to **Mr. Stephen Chan**, **Captain West Wu** said

that the proposed Government helipad (90m x 30m) was only about 2/3 in size of the existing temporary helipad at the PCWA (160m x 33m). Usage of the temporary helipad was about 14 movements per day. To ensure that GFS's services would not be affected by commercial operations and the safe operation of the helipad, he said that detailed safety and operational procedures would be established in due course.

- 3.11 **Mr. Charles Nicholas Brooke** opined that while the site at Sheung Wan was rejected due to adverse noise impact, both Government's and RHWG's proposals at HKCEC would also have adverse noise impact to the surrounding as well as the waterfront. As noise impact would be the key concern, he asked for information on the flight frequencies. He would also like to be briefed on the reasons for not considering converting the existing temporary helipad at the former Wan Chai PWCA into permanent use, which in his opinion would be more economical and environmental friendly as the temporary helipad would not need to be demolished.
- 3.12 **Mr. John Leigh** responded that the road traffic noise was comparable to that from helicopters. He said that results of past test conducted at the Academy of Performing Arts indicated that helicopter noise would be greatly reduced by double-glazed windows. As for movements, he said that their own company would have 30 movements per day and allowance had to be made for the other commercial operators currently in the market. He also pointed out that the Harcourt Road heliport originally had two pads, but was expanded due to ingress and egress requirements. He opined that two pads would not be sufficient even for current demands.
- 3.13 **The Chairman** commented that while people inside buildings with double-glazed windows might be protected, people within open spaces, especially visitors at Golden Bauhinia Square, would still be affected by the noise.

- 3.14 Regarding the previous proposed site at Sheung Wan, **Mr. Darryl Chan** responded that the noise impact was not the only reason for rejecting that site. There were other considerations, such as the site not being located exactly in the CBD and the public's preference for shared-use between the government and commercial operators to optimize the use of valuable harbour-front area. Moreover, some members of the HEC, when consulted in January 2005, were of the view that helipads should be distant from residential buildings and preferably be close to tall commercial buildings which were glazed.
- 3.15 Regarding converting the existing temporary heliport at the ex-PCWA into permanent use, **Mr. Darryl Chan** said that, as compared to the HKCEC site, the existing temporary helipad was closer to residential development. After it was put into operation, a number of complaints on helicopter noise were received by the Government. Wan Chai DC had also expressed concerns about the noise impact of this helipad. Regarding the site search for the permanent helipad, he pointed out that 19 other sites along the waterfront from Sheung Wan to Wan Chai had been assessed, but all were considered not suitable for helipad development for various reasons.
- 3.16 Regarding the number of flights, **Mr. Darryl Chan** said that GFS utilisation was estimated to be in the region of 5000 movements per year. This figure should remain relatively stable in the foreseeable future. For commercial uses, there were about 8000 movements in 2004. With a shared use arrangement at the HKCEC site, time slots could be made available to commercial uses up to about 20,000 movements per year, which were about 2.4 times of the commercial traffic volume recorded in 2004. The HKCEC site was expected to be able to meet demands up to 2020.
- 3.17 In response to **Dr. Greg Wong's** question of retaining the existing ferry pier structure at the HKCEC site and beautifying the area, **Mr. Darryl Chan** said that for safety reason, it was not feasible for single-engine helicopters to

land on roof-top. The existing ferry pier structure could not be retained. The project was at concept planning stage and both noise mitigation and harbour enhancement issues would be carefully addressed at the detailed design stage. **Captain West Wu** reiterated that roof-top helipad would limit the efficiency and effectiveness for both emergency services and police operations due to operational and safety requirements. In addition, due to structural restriction, a roof top helipad usually allows less loading when compared to a surface level helipad.

3.18 **Mr. Stephen Chan** agreed that the Sheung Wan site was close to residential buildings and therefore was not suitable for developing into a helipad.

3.19 **Mr. Hardy Lok** said that planning of the harbour-front sites should be reviewed with a view to enhancing the harbour-front. He requested Planning Department (PlanD) to re-examine those 19 sites that had been considered for helipad development, especially those rejected due to planning grounds, to see whether there was a better site. Ms. Christine Tse confirmed that PlanD had reviewed the 19 sites along the waterfront from the gala point to the CRIII area and no suitable site could be identified. The assessment took into account land use planning and other technical considerations, in particular safety.

(Post-meeting note: Mr. Hardy Lok raised a request after the meeting for information regarding the location of those 19 sites considered by the Government for developing a permanent domestic heliport and the reasons why they are not suitable. Such information was set out in a paper submitted to LegCo for consideration by the Panel on Economic Services and the Panel on Planning, Lands and Works at a joint meeting held on 25 July 2005. The LegCo paper was circulated to all HEC members on 20 July 2005.)

3.20 **Mr. Donald Wong** said that the Wan Chai DC objected to commercial uses at the temporary Government helipad due

to concerns about noise nuisance and the frequency of the movements. For the same reasons, he expected the Wan Chai DC would also object to commercial uses at the HKCEC site, especially because of the impact on the adjacent Golden Bauhinia Square.

- 3.21 **Mrs. Sandra Mak** said that Government's overall plan for meeting demands for helicopter services was inconsistent with the said approach of centralizing the heliports. She also expressed doubts on Government's conclusion that the MFT heliport would be sufficient to meet the future demand for cross boundary services. She explained that the majority of helicopters employed for commercial uses were single-engine ones, which would not be suitable for landing on roof top. She said that both single-engine as well as twin-engine helicopters would be required for commercial uses. Single-engine helicopter served like taxi and twin-engine helicopter served like bus. Regarding the public objections to commercial uses at the Government helipad, she said that the public had not been fully explained the arrangements. She reminded that it was the LegCo which asked for a shared use arrangement at the HKCEC site and the RHWG would consult the Wan Chai DC in September 2005 on that matter. She re-iterated the RHWG's proposal could enhance the harbour-front.
- 3.22 **Mr. Joseph Wong** declared that he was involved in the MFT extension project. He asked, taking into account the required safety margins, whether the drawings of the RHWG's proposal indicated exactly the land requirements as he was given the impression that the Civil Aviation Department (CAD) would only accept rectangular helipad instead of circular helipads. He also questioned on the need for 4 pads of different sizes to suit different types of helicopters.
- 3.23 In response, **Mr. John Leigh** said that the tender for operating the temporary heliport at West Kowloon had specified a minimum of four pads. He opined that the need for multi-pads to meet the demands had been demonstrated.

Sharing the two pads proposed by the Government for commercial uses would not be practical. He also confirmed that the proposed heliport appeared in their proposal indicated the actual land requirements and square helipad was not mandatory.

3.24 In response to the question from **Dr. Ng Mee-kam, Mr. Darryl Chan** said that the cross-boundary services provided at the MFT were operated between Hong Kong and Macau with twin-engine helicopters. There was no single-engine helicopter providing cross-boundary services at present.

3.25 In response to the same question from **Dr. Ng Mee-kam, Mr. John Leigh** said that demands for cross-boundary services were expected to increase dramatically, especially for those for the Pearl River Delta areas once the services were available in the market.

3.26 Regarding the noise impact, **Mr. Cliff Dunnaway** said that noise generated from helicopters would be about 85dB(A) at about 300m from the heliport, which would drop to about 80dB(A) in between 300m and 450m from the heliport. Beyond 450m from the heliport, the helicopter noise would be down below 80dB(A) and would merge with the ambient noise. In response to the question from **the Chairman** about noise levels at the Golden Bauhinia Square and waterfront during take off and landing, he said that an assessment would be conducted to further investigate the impact of the helicopter noise on the surrounding areas. The results would be circulated to concerned parties in due course.

RHWG

3.27 **Miss Lister Cheung** said that the proposed usage at the helipad at HKCEC was confusing. She opined that a helipad near a major tourist attraction might not be suitable and that the proposed location of the helipad at HKCEC was not close to any hospital on Hong Kong Island. She said that the noise levels quoted by Mr. Dunnaway would be hazardous to health. She also expressed concern on noise

impact caused by helicopters waiting for landing.

- 3.28 In response, **Ms Amy Wong** said that besides emergency services, the Government helipad would also provide support to the Police. Therefore, it had to be close to the Police Headquarters as well. The proposed site was the most optimal location for meeting various needs. **Captain West Wu** supplemented that although there was a roof top helipad at Pamela Youde Nethersole Eastern Hospital (PYNEH), it was close to tall buildings and for safety reasons was reserved for extremely emergency situations. He further added that if the PYNEH helipad were precluded from operations, for example due to adverse weather, an alternative site would be needed. The proposed HKCEC helipad would provide a necessary back up for emergency services as well as allow GFS to deliver other essential services.
- 3.29 **Mr. Robert Hill** explained that for commercial uses it was essential for the helicopters to be able to wait for their passengers at the heliport. It would not be commercially viable to wait for calls elsewhere and fly to the heliport to pick up the passengers. For that reason, the Government's proposal was not suitable for commercial uses. **Mrs. Sandra Mak** supplemented that helicopters waiting for passengers would have their engines shut down and would not generate any noise. Under the RHWG's proposal, the target was to use single-engine helicopters, which would be cheaper, for both domestic and cross-boundary services.
- 3.30 Noting that different number of pads was provided under the two proposals, **the Chairman** asked whether the key difference was that RHWG's proposal could allow helicopters to park at the heliport but not under Government's proposal. **Mr. Darryl Chan** responded that whilst detailed operational arrangement would be worked out, the overriding principle was that priority use at the proposed Government helipad would be given to emergency services. The Government would ensure safe operations and minimize potential impact to the

surrounding area. **Mr. John Leigh** said that experience demonstrated that multi-pads would be required for multi-users. Two pads could accommodate either the government or one commercial operator only. Sharing the use of two pads between government and a commercial operator would not be commercially viable.

- 3.31 In response to the question of **Dr. Ng Mee-kam** on the planning of future cross-boundary services, **Mr. Darryl Chan** said that apart from the provision of infrastructure, the Government was also discussing the issues of flight paths and CIQ clearance with the Mainland authorities to facilitate the development of cross-boundary helicopter services between Hong Kong and the PRD. Timing of launching the services would therefore depend on the progress of discussion. **Mr. John Leigh** said that liberalization of air space served by single-engine, rather than twin-engine, helicopters should be the sustainable way forward.
- 3.32 In view that both proposals might have potential noise impact to the Golden Bauhinia Square, **Mr. Charles Nicholas Brooke** asked whether it was technically feasible to convert the existing temporary helipad at ex-PCWA for permanent use. **Captain West Wu** said that solely from a technical point of view, a shared use arrangement could be implemented at the temporary helipad. However, he stressed that public concerns should also be considered.
- 3.33 **Mr. Greg Wong** said that he had no objection to a helipad for emergency services. Regarding RHWG's proposal, he said that although RHWG alleged that their proposed heliport would be formed by unconventional reclamation method, a part of the Harbour would be covered up under the proposal. This should be a matter of concern for HEC, being a committee on harbour-front enhancement. He opined that before further discussing the proposal, the need had to be established first. On this aspect, the Government had pointed out that there was not yet any programme for implementing the cross-boundary services between Hong

Kong and PRD that RHWG's proposed heliport was targeting at. Unless the immediate need for the heliport proposed by RHWG could be demonstrated, he would conclude that RHWG's proposal was not a reasonable proposal.

- 3.34 **Mr. Stephen Chan** said that as the Wan Chai DC preferred the HKCEC site to the temporary helipad site, he had no comments on the site selection aspect. However, he said that the HKCEC site was too small for shared use with the commercial operators. A better site should be identified for long-term commercial helicopter services. He stressed that he did not support any reclamation or covering part of the Harbour in order to form a heliport.
- 3.35 **Miss Lister Cheung** said that she was still not convinced that the HKCEC site was the most suitable one. In response, **Mr. Darryl Chan** said that the HKCEC site was identified after careful thorough site search for emergency and security services. The Government's current proposal was in response to the consensus of the LegCo joint Panels.
- 3.36 **Mr. Charles Nicholas Brooke** suggested putting both proposals for public engagement at the next stage of HER. He also suggesting including a third proposal of converting the temporary helipad into permanent use.
- 3.37 As there was no comment on his question, **the Chairman** concluded that a helipad, irrespective of whether it would be for government use only or shared use, would be included in the concept plans to be produced at the Realization Stage of HER. **Mr. Joseph Wong** asked whether the meeting would agree to the principle that the helipad should not induce any form of reclamation, be it in the form of conventional or unconventional reclamation. The meeting confirmed agreement to that principle.
- 3.38 In response to the question of **Dr. Ng Mee-kam** on the use of the existing pier structure at the HKCEC site, **Ms. Amy Wong** said that the structure was being used for domestic

cruise services which would need to be relocated to other piers.

3.39 In response to **the Chairman**, **Ms Iris Tam** suggested including the proposed heliports, i.e. the one by RHWG and that by Government, as options in the concept plans to be formulated at the Realization Stage for evaluation together with other ideas identified in the Envisioning Stage.

3.40 **Mr. L T Ma** said that the concept plans to be produced by the consultant in the Realization Stage should preferably not include any element that would have doubts in complying with the Protection of Harbour Ordinance (PHO) to avoid confusion and misunderstanding. **The Chairman** suggested seeking legal advice on whether a pontoon, as suggested by RHWG, would be regarded as reclamation under PHO. **Dr. Greg Wong** said that for the purpose of expressing a view, it is not necessary to seek legal advice on whether the covering up of the harbour is reclamation or not reclamation according to the PHO. The sub-committee can hold a view of against the covering of part of the harbour at Wanchai irrespective of the legal definition of "covering up" because covering up of the harbour reduces the area of the harbour by the same degree as reclamation; furthermore the "covering up" is not meant to be temporary. **Mr. Joseph Wong** said that the RHWG's proposal might also be included in the concept plans to be formulated so as to allow further opportunities for public engagement. **Dr. Ng Mee-kam** pointed out that it was clear from the public forums that the public was keen to minimize reclamation and to preserve the Harbour as far as possible. **The Chairman** then concluded that the RHWG's proposal would not be included in the concept plans to be formulated. In response to **Mr. Charles Nicholas Brooke**, **the Chairman** confirmed that two proposals, the Government's proposal and the idea of converting the temporary helipad at the former Wan Chai PCWA for permanent use, would be incorporated into the concept plans.

Item 5 Progress report on HER (Paper No. WD 13/2005)

4.1 **The Chairman** said that the HER Task Force had recommended holding a “Stage 1.5” forum after the report of Expert Panel Forum was available, for presenting to the public comments and proposals received at the Envisioning Stage prior to commencing the Realization Stage. **The meeting** agreed. **The Chairman** asked the Consultant to follow up.

City Planning

4.2 **The Chairman** said that **the Secretary** had circulated the framework for the Expert Panel Forum on 8 August 2005. The forum was suggested to be held on 3 September 2005 (Saturday) afternoon. Three venues, namely the Trade Development Council SMC Training Centre, St. James Settlement and Scout Association of Hong Kong, would be available. **Mr. Stephen Chan** proposed holding the forum at the HEC meeting room at Edinburgh Place. **The Chairman** responded that for the Forum, a lecture theatre was preferred to a meeting room. As the meeting had no preference on the venue, **the Chairman** asked the **CEDD** to follow up on the matter.

CEDD

4.3 **The Chairman** said that the comments from the public to the Expert Panel would be invited and the deadline for submission would be 26 August 2005 so that the Expert Panel could have time to consider the submissions. As there were different views on whether the attendance should be allowed to express further views at the Forum, **the Chairman** suggested leaving the matter to the Expert Panel to decide.

4.4 **Mr. K K Lau** said that the original concern was that an overseas expert might not be familiar with the background and constraints in Hong Kong. As members preferred to have an overseas expert at the Expert Panel, he suggested considering Professor Michael Bell and Mr. Michael Clark. He said that Professor Bell should be suitable as he was involved the electronic road pricing (ERP) in London.

However, as his expertise was on transport planning only, he would not comply fully with the requirements set out in the framework that the last member of the Expert Panel should be one in both transport planning and environment protection. He suggested that amending the requirement to allow the expert to be selected in one of the two fields mentioned. As for Mr. Michael Clark, **Mr. Lau** said that he was involved in Government's Third Comprehensive Transport Study and the Hong Kong ERP feasibility study. After discussion, **the meeting** agreed that the following experts, in descending order of priority, would be invited as the last member of the Expert Panel: Professor Michael Bell, Mr. Michael Clark, Dr. Hung Wing-tat and Professor Bill Baron.

4.5 **The Chairman** said that the Forum would tentatively be advertised on 12 August 2005 and details would be uploaded onto the HEC website. As the Panel members might not be confirmed by that date, the Panel membership would be published later.

4.6 For 'quick-win' project of opening the ex-PCWA site for public enjoyment, **the Chairman** reported that **CEDD** was investigating the possibility of providing a linkage through the water pumping station compound and would work out a proposal for further consideration by the HER Task Force.

CEDD

4.7 In response to question of **Mr. Hardy Lok** on the draft report for the Envisioning Stage of HER, **the Chairman** said that the consultants produced a draft report which was circulated to HER Task Force members for consideration. The HER Task Force would discuss the draft report before submitting it to the Sub-committee. He also said that the report would take into account the conclusion of the Expert Panel Forum.

Item 5 Any Other Business

5.1 **The Chairman** said that the next meeting was scheduled for 10 October 2005 at 2:30pm. There being no other

All to note

business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:45pm.

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