

677CL – Wan Chai development phase II, engineering works

(A) Details of Objections and Administration’s Responses under the Foreshore and Sea-bed (Reclamations) Ordinance (Cap. 127)

- (a) One objector expressed concern that the proposed works may pose an adverse impact upon its sailing activities and the impact of the construction traffic on the at-grade Hung Hing Road.

We explained to the objector that the proposed works at Wan Chai North and at Victoria Harbour would have little impact on its sailing activities and that those at North Point would be beyond the sailing routes. Furthermore, we explained to the objector that impact on traffic along the at-grade Hung Hing Road during construction should not be significant as the contractor would consider transport by sea. We promised to maintain close liaison with the objector during detailed design and construction stages. Despite our explanation, the objector did not withdraw its objection.

- (b) One objector was of the view that the proposed works would fundamentally affect the harbour and alleged that the Administration had failed to demonstrate that the proposed works comply with the requirements of the PHO as adumbrated by the CFA Judgment.

We explained to the objector that the Administration had compiled with the requirements under the PHO and satisfied the “overriding public need test” laid down in the CFA Judgment in planning the proposed works. The objector was referred to the CCM Report of which the objector had before received a copy and had been briefed on its content on 3 April 2007 in the capacity as a member of the HEC. Despite our explanation, the objector did not withdraw its objection.

- (c) Two objections were received from the registered owner and the tenant of two lots in North Point. The objectors stated that the proposed works would result in the loss of the marine right and hence would significantly reduce the use and value of the lots and the

income that could be earned from the sand depot being operated there. The objectors also enquired about the arrangement for relocation and compensation of the affected lots.

We explained to the objectors that the proposed works would provide land for the construction of the Trunk Road. The planning of the Trunk Road had to comply with the PHO and the Tunnel Option being adopted would serve best in protecting and preserving the harbour. The lots in question would be required for constructing the connection of the Trunk Road to the IEC so as to minimize the extent of reclamation. We also explained the relevant procedures of claim for compensation under the Ordinance. Despite our explanation, the objectors maintained their objections.

- (d) One objector objected to the adoption of the Tunnel Option for the Trunk Road leading to resumption and temporary occupation of part of its lots in North Point. It alleged that the proposed reclamation to accommodate the construction of the Trunk Road would frustrate the approved planning intention and use of its lot and it would suffer loss as a result. It also expressed concern about the potential environmental impacts during construction. The objector opined that the Flyover Option for the construction of the Trunk Road should be adopted and requested that its Objection Statement submitted to TPB in relation to its further objection/representation to the relevant OZPs should be considered handling of its objection under this Ordinance.

We explained to the objector that the justifications and the supporting reasons for adopting the Tunnel Option. The Tunnel Option was the option serving best to protect and preserve the harbour. The objector's Objection Statement had been considered but we still concluded that adoption of the Tunnel Option satisfied the "overriding public need test" laid down in the CFA Judgment and we had satisfied the Administration's internal circular in planning the proposed reclamation and Trunk Road schemes. In this respect, we referred the objector to the CCM Report and the Comparison Report. We also pointed out that there was a clear preference from the public to the Tunnel Option. For the environmental impacts arising from the

Tunnel Option, we explained that they were acceptable during both the construction and operation stages. Despite our explanation, the objector did not withdraw its objection.

(B) Details of Objections and Administration's Responses under the Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance (Cap. 370)

- (a) One objector alleged that the proposed slip roads of the Trunk Road, the proposed Exhibition Station of the Shatin to Central Link project, and the proposed Phase III extension of the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre (HKCEC), reported in the media, would introduce an unacceptably large volume of additional traffic in the Wan Chai North area. The objector considered that the road system should be reassessed to reduce the potential traffic increase in the Wan Chai North area.

We explained to the objector that a district traffic study concluded that the implementation of the Trunk Road and its associated slip roads would improve the traffic in the Corridor as part of the east-west traffic from the Corridor would be diverted to the Trunk Road. The slip roads of the Trunk Road would not increase the traffic in Wan Chai North, rather it would facilitate the traffic diversion from the heavily trafficked spots, especially Fleming Road. Together with the proposed improvement works on the local road network, the road network as proposed would be adequate to cope with the anticipated traffic flow in the area. The proposed Phase III extension of the HKCEC was not included in the proposed amendments to the draft Wan Chai North OZP No. S/H25/1 gazetted on 27 July 2007. Despite our explanation, the objector maintained its objection.

- (b) One objector objected to the proposed footbridge along Wan Shing Street alleging that it was close to a sewage screening plant which would affect the walking environment. The objector proposed to shift the footbridge to run along Marsh Road and link it to the existing footbridge at the south of Hong Kong Automobile Association (HKAA). The objector considered that this alternative proposal would provide a better pedestrian walking environment and facilitate

crowd dispersion during major public events.

We explained to the objector that the proposed footbridge was at a certain distance from the sewage screening plant and was partially shielded by the buildings in between and thus the sewage screening plant would not cause negative impact on the walking environment. We also explained that the proposed footbridge is preferred as it was the more cost-effective solution for optimizing pedestrian connectivity between the hinterland area and the new waterfront and would be more effective in crowd dispersion as it would be closer to the Causeway Bay Station. We also pointed out that there were technical difficulties to extend, as proposed by the objector, the existing footbridge at the south of HKAA across the Marsh Road Flyover. The objector accepted our explanation and withdrew its objection subsequently.