

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

Minutes of 8th Meeting

Date : 26 October 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
Mr. Paul Zimmerman	Representing Business Environment Council
Dr. Ng Mee-kam	Representing Citizen Envisioning@Harbour
Dr. Alvin Kwok	Representing Conservancy Association
Dr. Greg Wong	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr. Hardy Lok	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour Limited
Dr. Chan Wai-kwan	
Mr. Stephen Chan	
Mr. Steve Chan	
Mr. Patrick Lau	
Mr. Robin Ip	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands) 1, Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau
Mr. Thomas Chow	Deputy Secretary (Transport) 1, Environment, Transport and Works Bureau
Mr. L T Ma	Project Manager/Hong Kong Island and Islands, Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr. Anthony Kwan	Assistant Director/Metro and Urban Renewal, Planning Department
Mr. Wan Man-leung	Deputy Project Manager (Major Works) 2, Highways Department
Mr. Kwan Chi-wai	Chief Engineer/Traffic Engineering (Hong Kong), Transport Department

Mr. Donald Wong Assistant District Officer (Wan Chai), Home
Affairs Department
Mr. Bosco Chan Secretary

In Attendance

Miss Wong Yuet-wah Principal Assistant Secretary (Planning and Lands)
2, Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau
Ms. Sharon Ho Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport) 5,
Environment, Transport and Works Bureau
Ms. Lydia Lam Assistant Secretary (Planning) 3, Housing,
Planning and Lands Bureau
Ms. Christine Tse District Planning Officer/Hong Kong, Planning
Department
Mr. S K Lam Chief Engineer/Hong Kong (2), Civil Engineering
and Development Department
Ms. Iris Tam Representing City Planning Consultants Ltd
Ms. Betty Ho Representing City Planning Consultants Ltd
Dr. Winnie Law Representing City Planning Consultants Ltd
Dr. Sujata S Govada Representing City Planning Consultants Ltd
Miss Flora Lai Representing City Planning Consultants Ltd
Mr. Peter Cheek Representing Maunsell Consultants Asia Ltd
Prof. William Lam Representing Expert Panel
Dr. Lo Hong-kam Representing Expert Panel
Dr. S C Wong Representing Expert Panel
Dr. Timothy Hau Representing Expert Panel
Dr. James Wang Representing Expert Panel
Ir. Wilfred Lau Representing Expert Panel

Absent with Apologies

Mr. Charles Nicholas Brooke

Action

Item 1 Confirmation of minutes of 7th meeting

- 1.1 The revised draft minutes of the 7th meeting circulated on
15 October 2005 were confirmed with no amendments.

Item 2 Matters Arising

- 2.1 **The Chairman** said that as most of the matters arising from the last (7th) meeting held on 9 August 2005 would be covered by this meeting, he suggested not to discuss them separately.
- 2.2 **The Chairman** reported that the Secretariat had received two letters dated 11 August 2005 and 7 October 2005 from the Hong Kong Regional Heliport Working Group (RHWG) and copies of the letters were tabled at the meeting. In their first letter of 11 August 2005, RHWG requested for further opportunities to discuss their proposal with the Sub-committee. In their second letter of 7 October 2005, RHWG alleged that the Chairman had unilaterally imposed his position on the meeting.
- 2.3 **The Chairman** invited members' views on (i) whether the Sub-committee should invite the RHWG to further explain their proposal and (ii) members' views on the allegation in RHWG's letter dated 7 October 2005. As the allegation related to the Chairman, he asked whether there was the need for another to chair the discussion. **Dr. Greg Wong** said that it would not be necessary to have another member to chair the discussion as the Chairman had no conflict of interest on this issue. **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** supported the Chairman to stay in his seat. The meeting agreed.
- 2.4 In response to the Chairman, **the Secretary** said that the audio record of last meeting had been uploaded onto the HEC website and a relevant clip of the audio record had been circulated to the members.
- 2.5 **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** suggested not to address those two letters from RHWG but requested members to express views again on the proposal.
- 2.6 **Dr. Chan Wai-kwan** declared that he was absent last meeting. Judging from the minutes, he was of the view that

the Chairman had simply summarized the discussions. So, he did not agree to the allegation that the Chairman had unilaterally imposed his position on the meeting. Dr. Chan pointed out paragraphs 3.37 and 3.40 of the minutes seemed to suggest that two conclusions, which might be inconsistent with each other, were reached at the last meeting. He said that the immediate issue was whether RHWG's helipad proposal would be included in the concept plans to be formulated at the Realization Stage, rather than the merits of the proposal. On that issue, he said that he had no objection to including RHWG's proposal as well since the proposal had to be discussed if the public so wanted.

- 2.7 **Dr. Alvin Kwok** also declared that he was absent last meeting. He considered that two issues had to be considered, namely, whether the minutes of the last meeting correctly reflected the discussion at the meeting and whether there was a need for the Sub-committee to reconsider the decision reached. For the first issue, he said that as the meeting minutes have been confirmed without amendments by the members, it should reflect the discussion correctly. Regarding the second issue, he was of the opinion that it could be reconsidered.
- 2.8 **Dr. Ng Mee-kam** suggested including the RHWG's helipad proposal in the Envisioning Stage - Consolidation Forum to be conducted as one of written submissions received during the Envisioning Stage.
- 2.9 **Dr. Greg Wong** pointed out that the conclusion of not including RHWG's proposal into the concept plans to be prepared was reached at the last meeting as members were against having part of the harbour covered up. He said that by their letters, it seemed that RHWG would simply like to clarify that the Sub-committee did not support their proposal with 4 pads, which would result in covering part of the sea, rather than the idea of having a helipad for commercial use.
- 2.10 **Mr. Steve Chan** said that he had not attended the last

meeting. He pointed out that the Wan Chai District Council (DC) had resolved at the meeting held in September 2005 that the DC would object to both the government's and the private's heliport proposals for commercial use.

- 2.11 **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** expressed the concern that the Sub-committee's discussions had been selectively used by the Government. He then said that his request for a comprehensive proposal of heliport development was still not responded by the Government. He pointed out that Business Environment Council, which he represented, supported that the RHWG's proposal as a commercial helipad near the central business area was needed. Therefore, he opined that the RHWG's proposal should be included in the concept plans to be formulated.
- 2.12 In response to Mr. Paul Zimmerman, **the Chairman** reminded him that the focus of the discussion should be on how to address RHWG's letter of 7 October 2005 rather than to discuss the heliport proposal again. In addition, **Mr. L T Ma** pointed out that relevant information regarding the selection of a suitable site for helipad in Hong Kong was included in a paper submitted to the Legislative Council and the Secretariat had circulated that paper to all Sub-committee members on 20 July 2005.
- 2.13 In response to Dr. Alvin Kwok, **the Secretary** reported that section 3 of the draft minutes of the last meeting that recorded the discussion on RHWG's proposal had been sent to RHWG for comments and RHWG was also informed that the audio record had been uploaded in the HEC's web site. He added that RHWG had made one comment on the draft minutes which related to a statement made by Mr. Joseph Wong. After checking with Mr. Joseph Wong, the RHWG's comment was incorporated in the revised draft minutes.
- 2.14 **The Chairman** summarized that members agreed that there was no need to amend the draft minutes of the last meeting that had already been confirmed. As to the issue of whether RHWG's proposal should be included in the concept plans,

he noted that there were different views; some suggested discussing the issue again at the meeting but some suggested including it in the coming Consolidation Forum.

2.15 **Dr. Greg Wong** said that the conclusion reached at the last meeting was an informed one after sufficient discussion. He opined that there was no need to discuss the issue again.

2.16 **Mr. Robin Ip** said that it might not be appropriate to discuss the topic again as the relevant bureaux and departments were not represented in the meeting to provide sufficient information to facilitate members' discussion. In response, **the Chairman** said that if the issue was to be included in the Consolidation Forum, the government representatives concerned could provide the relevant information at the Forum.

2.17 **Mr. Steve Chan** supported including the matter in the Consolidation Forum. **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** supported including RHWG's helipad proposal in at least one of the concept plans to be formulated.

2.18 **The Chairman** summarized that most of the members supported including RHWG's proposal in the Consolidation Forum scheduled for 12 November 2005. He then suggested adopting that arrangement and asked whether there was contrary view. No objection was received.

All to note

2.19 **Mr. L T Ma** suggested that the Secretariat would prepare a reply to RHWG informing them the conclusion of the meeting. **The meeting** agreed.

Secretary

(Post-meeting note: RHWG were informed by e-mail on 10 November 2005.)

Item 3 Expert Panel report

3.1 **The Chairman** welcomed **Prof. William Lam**, the Chairman of Expert Panel on Sustainable Transport

Planning and Central – Wan Chai Bypass (CWB), and other members of the Expert Panel and thanked them for their work. The Chairman said the report of the Expert Panel had been circulated to all Sub-committee members on 25 October 2005.

3.2 **Prof. William Lam** introduced the Panel members who attended the meeting and thanked the Secretariat for its support to the Panel.

3.3 **Prof. William Lam** said that besides attending the Expert Panel Forum on 3 September 2005 to hear views from the public, they had held five meetings and conducted one site visit. He then presented the Panel's report with the aid of powerpoint. He pointed out that the terms of reference (TOR) of the Panel were to review and make recommendations on sustainable transport planning for the northern shore of the Hong Kong Island.

3.4 On sustainable transport planning, **Prof. William Lam** said that the Panel regarded it as being able to meet our present and future social, economic and environmental goals, to manage the transport demand and to provide adequate transport infrastructure in a timely manner. The key issues that the Panel had considered in sustainable transport planning included integrated land use and transport planning, consideration of environmental, economic and social factors and their interaction, multi-modal and multi-faceted approach, use of appropriate means or technology, balance of demand and supply and efficient use of existing infrastructure.

3.5 In assessing the need for CWB, **Prof. William Lam** said that the Panel had addressed several key questions, as follows:

1. Is doing nothing sustainable?

The Panel's answer was 'no' as, on the basis of traffic forecast provided by Transport Department, the traffic congestion would be getting worse in the near future.

2. Is the provision of CWB alone sustainable?

While the Panel considered that building CWB was a medium-term solution, the problems could not be solved by CWB alone; a package of measures including road pricing would be needed to alleviate the problems.

3. Can implementing road pricing per se solve the problem?

The Panel was of the view that road pricing alone was not a solution unless the charging was very high which might not be acceptable to the society.

4. Is CWB and accessibility to the waterfront mutually exclusive?

The Panel's answer was obviously 'no'.

5. Is stopping development an acceptable and sustainable solution to road congestion?

The Panel did not consider that an acceptable and sustainable solution as sustainable transport required supporting economical development while minimizing the environmental impacts.

6. Are the Bypass and electronic road pricing mutually exclusive?

The Panel believed that they were complementary to each other.

3.6 **Prof. William Lam** said that based on the above investigations, the Panel had recommended the following short-term, medium-term and long-term measures.

- (i) Short-term measures included implementing a package of transport management measures, reviewing the cross harbour tunnel toll charges, managing development programme along the corridor before the opening of the CWB and not to overlook opportunities for enhancing pedestrian access to the waterfront.

- (ii) For medium-term measures, the Panel supported the construction of the CWB to improve the reliability of the transport network and to make use of the opportunity for enhancing the multi-modal transport network. The Panel also supported the provision of the slip roads in order to magnify the effectiveness of the CWB but required Government to address the related environmental and social concerns. While supporting the Road P2, the Panel called for a review of its scale to match the gradual land development programme. It also recommended conducting a comprehensive study on the issues related to and the social acceptability on the implementation of road pricing.
- (iii) Long-term measures included reinforcing the holistic approach towards transport/land use planning, provision an area-wide pedestrian network to the harbour-front, strengthening Government's traffic incident management capability, and maintaining a suitable reserve capacities in the transport infrastructure and devising a sustainable transport system suitable for Hong Kong.

3.7 **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** asked why electronic road pricing (ERP) could not be implemented as soon as possible as it had already been studied by the Government in 1999. He also asked whether the recommendations of that study had been taken into account by the Panel. **Prof. William Lam** pointed out that there were experts on ERP in the Panel. He said that different road users might have different views on the social acceptance on ERP, which was still uncertain at this stage. In addition, there were unresolved issues regarding the design of a congestion charging scheme that would suit Hong Kong and its associated impacts. Those issues would necessitate a careful study.

3.8 **Mr. Thomas Chow** said that the ERP study conducted in 1999 by Transport Department was mainly on technical

feasibility and technologies available at that time to see whether ERP could be considered further for implementation in Hong Kong. The study did not include assessment on social acceptance of ERP and various charging methods. In the past few years, there were new developments on technologies on ERP such as those which could address the concern over privacy. So, an update on the previous study on ERP, a sensitivity analysis on different charging scenarios was being carried out. He agreed with the Expert Panel's conclusion that ERP alone could not solve the traffic congestion problems; and a package of measures including provision of necessary transport infrastructure would be required to achieve sustainable transport. In this respect, he pointed out that CWB would be needed to provide an alternative route before ERP could be implemented. He also noted the Panel's view that the opening of CWB would be a good timing for introducing ERP. Government had commenced further work on ERP and would consult the public as soon as possible.

- 3.9 **Dr. Chan Wai-kwan** requested the Panel to elaborate on their supports on the slip roads at HKCEC and Causeway Bay and on the recommendation to review the scale of Road P2 to match with the gradual land development programme. **Prof. William Lam** replied that these slip roads were needed for reducing the traffic flow along Gloucester Road and to magnify the benefits of the CWB. He added that Road P2 is also needed as it could resolve the traffic congestion in Central before the opening of CWB. Based on information provided by the Government, the traffic flow along Road P2 would reduce after the opening of CWB. Therefore, the Panel suggested reviewing the scale of Road P2 after the opening of CWB to match the gradual development programme.
- 3.10 **Dr. Alvin Kwok** asked which of those short-term, medium-term and long-term measures recommended by the Panel were core elements that must be implemented. **Prof. William Lam** said all the recommended measures including the short-term, medium term and long-term ones,

if implemented, would improve the traffic congestion situation along the Corridor to certain extent and therefore all these measures should be taken into consideration for resolving the traffic issue.

- 3.11 **The Chairman** noted the Panel considered that CWB alone as well as road pricing alone could not solved the traffic congestion problems and asked whether it implied that those two measures must be implemented for sustainable transport planning. **Prof. William Lam** agreed.
- 3.12 **Dr. Ng Mee-kam** referred to the Panel's recommendation of adopting a volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratio of 0.9 as the signal for stemming land use development. She said that according to traffic data provided by the Government, that ratio was already reached at certain locations. She asked whether it would imply that further development along the corridor should stop. **Prof. William Lam** pointed out that traffic data provided by the Government had not included the effect of implementing ERP. The Panel believed that the v/c ratio would drop when ERP was in place.
- 3.13 **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** asked whether a bypass or the Bypass referred in the Report was the one being proposed by the Government and whether the Panel has considered the design of the bypass. **Prof. William Lam** said that the design of the Bypass was not included in the TOR of the Panel. Nevertheless, the Panel considered that a bypass of a similar capacity being proposed by the Government was needed.
- 3.14 In response to **Mr. Paul Zimmerman**, **Prof. William Lam** said that one of the Panel member, Dr. Timothy Hau, had extensive research experience in ERP and the Panel had considered the sustainable transport planning principles in arriving at the recommendations. He said that the Panel agreed that there was a need to enhance the pedestrian network and for that reasons thorough investigation in that respect was recommended.

- 3.15 Mr. Paul Zimmerman further raised the issue of the north-south connecting roads required. He said that the CWB would draw traffic north, creating the need for high capacity roads running north-south, increasing land use by roads and segregating the land restricting east-west movements. He asked whether the Panel had taken those into account. **Prof. William Lam** pointed out that the assumptions adopted in the traffic forecast had been set out in the submission from Transport Department which could be viewed on the website. **Mr. Kwan Chi-wai** supplemented that the traffic forecast provided to the Panel had included all planned land use known at that time.
- 3.16 In response to **Mr. Paul Zimmerman's** question on the scale of Road P2, **Prof. William Lam** said that Road P2 being proposed was a dual-2 road and on that basis the Panel considered that space should be reserved for its full-scale development, but there should be room for reviewing its scale after the opening of the CWB to match the gradual development programme. **Mr. L T Ma** said that the Panel had been asked to consider the sustainable transport planning and the need of CWB. The design of the CWB, its supporting slip roads and land use planning etc would be issues to be considered separately. He added that sufficient pedestrian facilities could be provided along the Road P2. In this respect, he said that there would be about 7 to 8 pedestrian crossing facilities being proposed in the CRIII area. **The Chairman** also said that the TOR for the Panel did not include detailed design matters and it would be unfair to ask them to address those matters.
- 3.17 **Dr. Chan Wai-kwan** suggested inviting the Government to respond to the report of the Expert Panel after they had considered the recommendations, but not necessarily at that meeting. He considered that the Sub-committee had to come to a view on the report in due course.
- 3.18 In response to **Mr. Hardy Lok**, the Secretary said that the submission from Transport Department, including the supplementary information requested by the Panel, and

those submissions from the public had been uploaded onto HEC's website.

- 3.19 **Mr. Steve Chan** asked for explanation on the impacts if the slip roads to the CWB were not built. **Prof. William Lam** replied that the slip roads were needed for reducing the traffic flows along the Gloucester Road and for magnifying the benefits of the CWB. The relevant information could be found at the HEC's website.
- 3.20 **Mr. Patrick Lau** asked whether CWB would improve the north-south traffic and whether it would result in harbour-front enhancement. He also asked for responses from the Government. **Prof. William Lam** said that the CWB was essential for improving the reliability of the east-west road network as well as improving the whole road network of the Hong Kong Island. So, the north-south traffic conditions would be improved with the CWB in place.
- 3.21 **Mr. Thomas Chow** said that according to traffic forecast of Transport Department, the traffic conditions in 2016 along Victoria Park Road would be improved significantly when the CWB was in place with the v/c ratio reduced from 0.86 to 0.58. That would in turn improve the north-south traffic as well as the local traffic conditions. Regarding the short-term measures recommended by the Panel, **Mr. Thomas Chow** said for the time being, only buses were allowed to load/unload along the Corridor and the number of bus trips going into and out of the Central Business District had been reduced by 17% since 1999. The Government would continue those improvement works and requested those HEC members who were also DC members to assist Government's work in rationalizing bus routes and trips. He said that Transport Department would continue to explore possibilities for junction improvement. As for the tunnel toll adjustment, he added that Government had employed a consultant to look at possible tunnel toll arrangements of the three cross harbour tunnels that could achieve a better distribution of cross-harbour traffic. Three objectives were set, namely to improve the current traffic conditions, to benefit the

community as a whole and fair to tax-payers. However, he remarked that as traffic congestion along the Corridor was not solely caused by the cross-harbour traffic, adjusting the tunnel tolls might improve but could not resolve the traffic congestion problems. On the possible impact on traffic caused by proposed developments at CRIII, including developments at Tamar, **Mr. Thomas Chow** said that the traffic generated by those developments going into and out of the Central Business District would be less than 5%. So, the CWB would be needed even if there were no further developments at CRIII. He assured Members that enhancing pedestrian facilities would be looked into in designing CWB. He said that Road P2 should more appropriately be described as a local road with ingresses/egresses to future developments. For that reason, a dual-two arrangement would be required; otherwise, those turning movements would affect the main traffic flow. As for the recommendation to strengthen Government's ability for managing traffic incidents, **Mr. Thomas Chow** said that after the traffic incident on 9 May 2005 in Kowloon, the Government had established a set of new guidelines on management of traffic incidents which had been proved to be effective in the recent incidents. Summing up, **Mr. Thomas Chow** said that the recommendations of the Panel were generally agreeable to the Government.

- 3.22 **Dr. Alvin Kwok** said that provision of slip roads to CWB might be in conflict with the meaning of the word "bypass" which was originally intended for the east-west through traffic to bypass the areas concerned. He also said that Prof. Lam seemed to have suggested that there would be reserve capacity in the CWB in case slip roads were not built. He asked whether it would mean that the scale of CWB could be reduced. **Mr. Thomas Chow** pointed out that many "bypasses" in Hong Kong had intermediate entrance/exit. Slip roads to CWB would have the effect of diverting as much of the east-west traffic away from the Corridor, which was in practice a local road, onto the CWB so as to relieve the traffic congestion along the Corridor. **Dr. Hong Lo** said slip roads would be able to reduce the circulating traffic and

thus reducing the overall traffic flows of the road network. He also said that maintaining a suitable reserve capacity would be needed for sustainable transport planning. It would also have a cushion effect on the price of ERP if implemented. **Prof. William Lam** added that slip roads would also be needed for that lengthy CWB, if built in the form of a tunnel, from safety point of view.

3.23 **Mr. Stephen Chan** thanked the Panel for reaffirming the need of CWB and the slip roads for which the Central & Western DC had been pursuing for a long time. He agreed to the Panel's recommendation of investigating on the issues related to the implementation of ERP as part of sustainable transport planning.

3.24 **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** said that the harbour planning principles and indicators, vibrancy, pedestrian accessibility, north-south traffic and rationalization of local roads etc. were not mentioned in the report, as those matters were not included in the brief for the Panel. He also said that further time would be required to consider the report.

3.25 **Mr. Hardy Lok** expressed his concern on the Panel's recommendation regarding reserve capacity. He said that allowance for reserve capacity might not be able to comply with the Protection of Harbour Ordinance (PHO) as that need was a future need, not present and immediate need. **Prof. William Lam** said based on information provided by Government, the v/c ratio of the whole screen line, including the Corridor, CWB and Road P2, would approach 0.8 to 0.9 in 2016. However, without the slip roads, the distribution of traffic would be uneven. So, the Panel supported the provision of the slip roads as they would improve the reliability of the road network. Matters related to PHO should be addressed in the detailed design stage. **Dr. S C Wong** added that the reserve capacity was only a design margin that would be provided in normal road design. It should be distinguished from over-designing the road. Indeed the recommendation of the Panel was to manage the reserve capacity, with the meaning that when

the v/c was approaching the threshold value, it should be regarded as a signal for reviewing the pace of land use development. **Dr. Hong Lo** said that it must be clarified that the “do-nothing” scenario, i.e. not building the CWB and not allowing further developments, was obviously not sustainable as the traffic forecast indicated that v/c ratios up to 1.5 would be reached. One of the reasons for incorporating reserve capacity in the design to was to cope with the natural variations in traffic that would occur from time to time. It did not amount to build an extra lane for future use. **Dr. James Wang** also clarified that the Panel was not just concerned about satisfying traffic demand and stressed also on enhancing the pedestrian accessibility to the waterfront.

3.26 In response to **Dr. Alvin Kwok, Mr. Thomas Chow** reiterated that CWB was the missing link in the planned strategic road along the northern shore of Hong Kong Island. When completed, vehicles could travel from Chai Wan in the east all the way to the Hong Kong International Airport and North West New Territories without having to use the Corridor. As regard Mr. Paul Zimmerman’s comments that a number of matters were not mentioned in the report, he said that the ToR of the Expert Panel, as given to it by the WDII Subcommittee, was to address whether CWB was needed for solving the traffic congestions and sustainable transport. It would be unfair to criticize the Panel for not examining issues such as harbour-front enhancement, vibrancy and land use planning, which would be discussed at the next stage.

3.27 **Dr. Ng Mee-kam** said that the Panel’s recommendation relating to reserve capacities was a revolutionary suggestion as it concerned traffic growth management rather than the traditional approach of satisfying traffic demand. She also pointed out that the Panel was indeed in support of enhancing the harbour-front and recommended that the visual and environmental impacts arising from the construction of the CWB should be properly addressed.

- 3.28 In response to **Mr. Paul Zimmerman, Prof. William Lam** said that the adverse impact of not having a reserve capacity had been clearly demonstrated by the traffic incident in Kowloon on 9 May 2005. He suggested that the reserve capacity across the whole screenline should be capped to a v/c ratio of 0.9. **Mr. Thomas Chow** added that the current Government's policy was to implement necessary transport and traffic measures or infrastructure projects when the v/c ratio of a road was forecast to exceed 1.2. He pointed out that the v/c ratio of Gloucester Road had already exceeded 1.2. So, there was a present, not future, need for the CWB. **Mr. Kwan Chi-wai** supplemented that reserve capacities for CWB and Road P2 would be different due to their difference in nature, CWB being a free-flow highway whereas Road P2 having signalized junctions, and the Government had all along been adopting a "trigger point" mechanism in planning the road network for the whole territory. **Mr. L T Ma** remarked that setting the reserve capacity at a v/c ratio of 0.9, instead of 1.0, would not amount in any increase in the road width. The Panel's recommendation was just to trigger off investigation on necessary measures to address traffic congestion earlier.
- 3.29 **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** said that it was reported at the Expert Panel Forum that the v/c ratio for some roads would approach 0.9 in 2016 even with the CWB. If so, he suggested that further developments at Central should be stemmed. **Mr. Thomas Chow** reiterated that the estimated v/c ratio of 0.9 for Connaught Road Central by 2016 with the CWB was estimated taking into account the new developments on CRIII as well as Tamar redevelopment. Therefore, the road was forecast to be running at a v/c ratio below 1.2 by 2016. **Prof. William Lam** said that with the implementation of road pricing as recommended by the Panel as well as the opening of the CWB, the Panel believed that the v/c ratio would be reduced to below 0.9. **Ir. Wilfred Lau** added that for that reason, the Panel had recommended a full range of short, medium and long-term measures for sustainable transport planning which should be considered or investigated further.

- 3.30 **Mr. Hardy Lok** asked whether the reserve capacity recommended was absolutely necessary. **Dr. Hong Lo** remarked that the social impact arising from traffic congestion should also be considered in deciding what v/c ratio should be adopted as the triggering point. **Dr. S C Wong** supplemented that the v/c ratio of 0.9 recommended by the Panel would be equivalent to a safety factor of 1.1 only. He reminded that the Panel had recommended a whole range of measures and maintaining a reserved capacity of 0.9 was only one of them. He recommended that all measures should be considered. **Dr. Greg Wong** supported Dr. S C Wong's view and pointed out that the Panel had performed their role in making good recommendations on sustainable transport planning and the need of CWB. He opined that the issue of reserve capacity was an additional point that the Panel recommended the Sub-committee to consider further and the Sub-committee could decide whether to accept it.
- 3.31 In response to the question of **the Chairman** whether the Panel had considered a dual-2, instead of a dual-3, arrangement for CWB, **Prof. William Lam** responded that there would still be traffic congestion along Gloucester Road, with v/c ratio exceeding 1.0, if the CWB was built with less than a dual-3 arrangement.
- 3.32 **Mr. Steve Chan** suggested the Government to consider a better name for the CWB which could reflect its function more properly. Sub-committee
- 3.33 As members had no further questions, on behalf of the Sub-committee **the Chairman** thanked the Expert Panel for their hard work.
- 3.34 On the way forward, **the Chairman** suggested the Sub-committee to discuss and come to a stance on the recommendations of the Expert Panel shortly after the Consolidation Forum to be held on 12 November 2005. However, he pointed out that an additional Sub-committee

meeting would have to be convened. In response **Ms. Iris Tam** pointed out that the Panel's recommendation regarding the need of CWB was quite clear and unless that recommendation was flawed by the Sub-committee, preparation of the concept plans could proceed accordingly. For the other recommendations, she opined that they might not materially affect the concept plans and the Sub-committee could consider them further in due course.

- 3.35 **Mr. Hardy Lok** reiterated the need to provide opportunities for the public to comment on the report. **Mr. Thomas Chow** reminded that the Expert Panel Forum held on 3 September 2005 was opened to the public. There were opportunities for the public to express their views before and at the Forum and their views had been considered by the Panel. **Mr. Steve Chan** said that discussions at Expert Panel Forum might not be sufficient for such issue of territory-wide importance. He suggested preparing concept plans for scenarios of with the CWB, with the CWB but not the slip roads and "do-nothing", for further public input. **The Chairman** said that the Sub-committee should come to a stance on the report before going back to the public. **Mr. L T Ma** suggested uploading the report onto the HEC's website as soon as possible. He also pointed out that public engagement had been carefully planned throughout the whole process which was open and transparent. He said that public's reaction could also be gauged at the Consolidation Forum. The Sub-committee could take into account the outcome of the Consolidation Forum in giving directives on the concept plans to be prepared. **Dr. Greg Wong** said that the term of reference for the Panel was very clear and the Panel almost embraced all the eminent experts on that field in Hong Kong. He opined that the recommendation of the Panel, especially on the need of the CWB would be the best expert advice that could be obtained. He suggested allowing more time for members to consider the report more thoroughly before Sub-committee deciding on its stance the main recommendations. **Mr. Stephen Chan** pointed out many of the recommendations of the Panel were actually reached at the Forum. He supported uploading the report,

onto the HEC's website as soon as possible. He also agreed that the Consolidation Forum would be a useful opportunity to gauge the public's view on the report. **Dr. Ng Mee-kam** supported.

- 3.36 **The Chairman** concluded that the report of the Expert Panel would be uploaded onto the HEC's website as soon as possible. Although the public could still comment on the report at the Consolidation Forum, he stressed that there was no need to have another round of public engagement on the Expert Panel's recommendations, especially on the need of the CWB. Should members have strong views on the recommendations, they could request for an additional Sub-committee meeting, otherwise, the concept plans to be prepared would include the CWB. **Mr. Steve Chan** supported and suggested issuing a press release on the availability of the report.

(Post meeting note: The report of the Expert Panel was uploaded onto the HEC website in the afternoon of 26 October 2005 and a press release was also issued on that date. The press release issued was circulated to members by e-mail on 27 October 2005.)

- 3.37 In response to **Dr. Sujata S Govada, Mr. Thomas Chow** suggested the Secretariat to prepare the Chinese translation of the report for uploading onto the HEC's website. **Mr. L T Ma** supported the suggestion. Secretary

(Post-meeting note : Chinese translation of section 3.3 of the report was uploaded onto the HEC's website on 5 November 2005.)

- 3.38 **Mr. L T Ma** reminded that **Mr. Hardy Lok** raised at the last HEC meeting the issue of preparing transcript of the Expert Panel Forum and he recalled that Mr. Lok had said that if the report was considered by the Sub-committee before it was published, there would not be any need to prepare a transcript. He would like the matter be clarified. **The meeting** agreed that a transcript was not needed. All to note

- 3.39 On whether there was the need to upload the audio record of Expert Panel Forum on HEC's website, **Mr. L T Ma** said that the approach should be unified. He pointed out that audio record might not be available for some forums or part of them. **The Chairman** suggested provided that the audio records could be made available on requests, there was no need to upload them onto the HEC's website. **Mr. Hardy Lok** agreed. All to note

Item 4 Draft report on Envisioning Stage of HER

- 4.1 **The Chairman** said that the consultant had prepared a revised draft report for the Envisioning Stage of the HER, which had incorporated all the comments of the HER Task Force members. The Task Force had suggested at the meeting held on 10 October 2005 to exclude the section on conclusion and recommendation from the revised draft report pending acceptance of the recommendations of the Expert Panel and the outcome of the Consolidation Forum. He asked whether members have comments on that suggestion or the revised draft report. No comments were raised. All to note
- 4.2 **Mr. Hardy Lok** suggested allowing opportunities for comments from the public on the revised draft report. **Ms. Iris Tam** said the first draft was circulated in end July 2005 and members' comments received had been incorporated in the revised draft. The report would be wrapped up after incorporating the recommendations of the Expert Panel and the outcome of the Consolidation Forum and comments of the public would be incorporated through the Sub-committee. **The Chairman** said that as the current report was still in draft, it would not be disclosed to the public. **The meeting** agreed.

Item 5 Work plan for Consolidation Forum (Paper No. WD 14/2005)

5.1 **Ms. Iris Tam** explained the draft work plan for the Consolidation Forum. She pointed out that the draft work plan was discussed at the HER Task Force meeting held on 10 October 2005 and comments from the Task Force had been incorporated. **The meeting** endorsed the consultant's draft work plan. All to note

5.2 **The Chairman** then requested the Secretariat and the consultants to proceed with the preparation work for the Forum and invited the members to attend the Forum. All to note

Item 6 Progress report on HER (Paper No. WD 15/2005)

6.1 Members noted the progress report.

Item 7 Any Other Business

7.1 The proposed meeting schedule for 2006 was tabled at the meeting and no comments were received. **The Chairman** suggested circulating to all members again for information. Secretary

(Post meeting note: The meeting schedule was circulated to members by e-mail on 18 November 2005.)

7.2 Regarding the press release on the report of the Expert Panel, **the meeting** agreed that there was no need to comment on the draft as it would be on factual matters. The meeting also agreed that the press release on the Consolidation Forum would be a separate one. All to note

(Post meeting note: The press release was issued on 26 October 2005. The press release issued was circulated to members by e-mail on 27 October 2005.)

7.3 As the meeting had reservation on the proposed Chinese title of the Consolidation Forum, the Chairman asked the Secretariat to proposed alternatives for members' consideration. All to note

(Post meeting note: The title of “構想階段 - 意見整合論壇” was subsequently agreed.)

7.4 In response to **Mr. Donald Wong**, the Chairman said that it would be more useful to report to the DCs after the report of the Envisioning Stage of HER was finalized.

7.5 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:57pm.

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