

1. The meeting was resumed at 9:10 a.m. on 4.12.2013.
2. The following Members and the Secretary were present at the resumed meeting:

Mr Thomas T.M. Chow

Chairman

Mr Stanley Y.F. Wong

Vice-chairman

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Dr C.P. Lau

Ms Anita W.T. Ma

Dr W.K. Yau

Mr H.W. Cheung

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Ms Janice W.M. Lai

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Mr F.C. Chan

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection

Mr C.W. Tse

Deputy Director of Lands (General)

Mr Jeff Y.T. Lam

Presentation and Question Session

[Open Meeting]

3. The following Government representatives and the commenter were invited to the meeting at this point:

- |                 |   |   |
|-----------------|---|---|
| Miss Elsa Cheuk | - | Chief Town Planner/Special Duties (CTP/SD), Planning Department (PlanD) |
| Mr Timothy Lui  | - | Senior Town Planner/Special Duties (STP/SD), PlanD                      |
| Mr C.T. Lam     | - | Senior Engineer/2 (SE/2), CEDD  |

C4749

- |                |   |           |
|----------------|---|-----------|
| Ms Vivian Shek | - | Commenter |
|----------------|---|-----------|

4. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the special arrangements for hearing the large number of representations and comments in respect of the OZP. Each representer/commenter was allocated a total of 10 minutes' speaking time. If an authorised representative was appointed by more than one representer/commenter of the same session to represent them, that authorised representative might use the cumulative time allotted to all the persons he represented to make his oral submission. Request for further time for oral submission from a representer/commenter or his authorised representative would be considered by the Board. If his request was allowed by the Board, he would be either given further time in the same allotted session to make his submission (if time permitted), or notified of the date when he would be invited to return for such purpose. He then invited the representatives of PlanD to brief Members on the background to the case.

5. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Miss Elsa Cheuk (CTP/SD, PlanD) repeated the presentation which was made in the hearing session on 4.11.2013 as recorded

in paragraph 21 of the minutes of 4.11.2013.

[Ms Anita W.T. Ma and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau returned to join the meeting at this point.]

6. The Chairman then invited the commenter to elaborate on her comments. The Chairman said that the presentation should be confined to an elaboration of the written submission.

C4749

7. Ms Vivian Shek made the following main points:

- (a) locating the military dock at the waterfront promenade in Central District was not supported. Hong Kong people very often did not know whether an area was a public open space (POS) and were not fully aware of their right to enjoy such POS. Although the land area of the military dock would be open to the public, it was likely that the public would not know that the concerned area was a POS that the public could gain access to. There were a lot of POS in Hong Kong but many of them were located in commercial areas, such as Times Square and the one near Flower Market, where street activities such as music performance would not be allowed. Whilst the Garrison had agreed to open the CMD site for public use when it was not in military use, it was doubtful whether the public would have courage to get close to the area;
- (b) the location of CMD would also impose great pressure on Hong Kong people. There were already many military sites in Hong Kong such as Stonecutters Island. The intention of military sites was to protect Hong Kong and should be located at the periphery of the city, such as Sai Kung, and should not be located in the city centre. It was doubtful whether a military site in the city centre could protect the safety of the people. PLA's facilities in the city centre would arouse fear;

[Mr C.W. Tse returned to join the meeting at this point.]

- (c) the Government always reminded Hong Kong people to focus on developing our economy, and not to focus too much on politics. However, the military dock at the city centre would imply that Hong Kong was not only an economic city but also a city of military significance. Whilst the recent population policy encouraged increasing fertility, it was doubtful whether Hong Kong people would have the incentive to do so if Hong Kong would increase its military significance in future; and
  
- (d) the public should not only be allowed to stroll along the Tsim Sha Tsui harbourfront, but should also have a chance to do so along the Central harbourfront.

[Actual speaking time of C4749: 4 minutes]

8. As the presentation from the Government representatives and the commenter had been completed, the Chairman invited questions from Members.

9. Noting that the commenter had raised concern on the public not knowing whether the site was a POS open to the public or not, a Member asked PlanD's representatives to explain the opening arrangement of the CMD site when it was not in military use. As regards the other POS that the commenter had mentioned, such as Times Square, this Member asked about the general opening arrangement of POS within private developments.

10. Miss Elsa Cheuk said that an OZP primarily showed the land use zones for major land uses such as residential, commercial, etc. If a private development involved any open space that would be open to the public, the management and opening arrangements of the concerned open space would normally be undertaken by the management of the private development. For the CMD site, it was part of the military facilities in Hong Kong and would be managed by the Garrison in future. As regards the opening arrangement of the CMD site to the public when it was not in military use, the Government would liaise with the Garrison on the detailed arrangements and would announce them to the public in

future.

11. Miss Elsa Cheuk continued to explain that the CMD site would be used for berthing of military vessels, military ceremonies, training and rehearsal, and maintenance of the military dock, etc. The height restriction imposed on the site under the OZP was 10mPD and the ground level was about 4.2mPD. The building height of the ancillary structures within the site did not exceed 4.5m (i.e. 8.7mPD). A folding gate design would be adopted for the CMD site. During the public consultation of UDS in 2007/08, the design concept of the CMD site including its integration with the waterfront promenade and the folding gate hidden in the ancillary structures when the dock was not in military use was discussed.

[Dr C.P. Lau returned to join the meeting at this point.]

12. With the aid of the powerpoint, Miss Elsa Cheuk showed the extracts of relevant documents available to the public that had mentioned CMD. The design of CMD (including the four ancillary structures), its integration with the waterfront setting, and/or the arrangement of opening the CMD site to the public when not in military use were mentioned/shown in the different consultation documents/plans of UDS including page 25 of the Stage 2 Public Engagement Consultation Digest of UDS (April 2008), page 17 of the Information Digest of UDS (July 2011), para. 17 of the paper submitted to the LegCo Panel on Development in April 2008 and para. 15 of the LegCo Brief on UDS in November 2009. These documents clearly demonstrated that the public had been informed of the location and conceptual design of CMD. Furthermore, the CMD site was included in Site 7 (waterfront promenade) under the UDS, and the public were consulted on the conceptual design of the whole Site 7 including the location and design of the CMD site during the previous public engagement process. The current OZP amendments had not changed the conceptual design of the harbourfront POS in Site 7 including the integration of the CMD site which was previously made known to the public. She reiterated that if the CMD site was closed for military use, the public could make use of the pedestrian walkway to the immediate south of the CMD site for east-west linkage along the waterfront.

13. The Chairman asked PlanD to explain why the military dock had to be located

in Central but not elsewhere. With reference to an aerial photo of the Former Tamar Basin taken in 1986, Miss Elsa Cheuk responded that DLA set out the military buildings and fixed facilities to be reprovisioned for the Garrison (Annex III of DLA). Before the reunification, the headquarters of the British Garrison used to have a naval basin and dock facilities in the former Tamar Basin. As Tamar Basin was planned to be reclaimed under the Central Reclamation, DLA provided that a naval base should be reprovisioned on the south shore of Stonecutters Island and a military dock should be reprovisioned near the Central Barracks. Annex III of DLA provided that the then Hong Kong Government would “leave free 150 metres (m) of the eventual permanent waterfront in the plans for the Central and Wanchai Reclamation at a place close to the Prince of Wales Barracks (i.e. the Central Barracks) for the construction of a military dock after 1997”. When OZP No. S/H24/2 was first approved by the Chief Executive in Council in 2000, the design of and the exact area the CMD site would occupy were not decided at the time. Therefore, it was represented by a straight line annotated “150m Military Berth (subject to detailed design)” on the OZP in accordance with the usual practice of the annotation on the OZP. As the detailed design and delineation of the military dock had been confirmed and the construction works were near their final stage, in accordance with the established practice, technical amendment was made to the OZP to reflect the final delineation and the land use of the CMD site.

14. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairman thanked the commenter and the Government representatives for attending the meeting. They all left the meeting at this point.

15. As no more commenters had arrived to attend the session of the meeting, the meeting was adjourned at 10:00 a.m..