香港特別行政區政府

The Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region

房屋及規劃地政局

香港花園道美利大廈



Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau

Murray Building, Garden Road, Hong Kong

By Fax & By Post

本局檔號 Our Ref.

來函檔號 Your Ref.

HPLB(P) 50/02/63

21 April 2005 tine Loh

Ms Christine Loh Chairperson Society for Protection of the Harbour Limited Room 602, Hoseinee House, 69 Wyndham Street Central, Hong Kong (Fax No.: 3101 9339)

Dear Ms Loh,

The Adventure of Victoria (維多利亞歷險記)

I refer to the story book entitled "The Adventure of Victoria" (「維多利亞歷險記」) published by the Society for Protection of the Harbour Limited, which is meant for wide distribution in Hong Kong. While we appreciate your intention in educating children on the need to protect the Victoria Harbour through this publication, I hope you would agree with us that young readers should be provided with correct facts and figures about the Harbour. Hence, it is important to ensure that the book's messages and contents are accurate.

We notice that the story book covers a number of issues related to harbour reclamation. A number of messages therein, however, do not tally with the facts. In this regard, we feel obliged to put on record the facts and draw to your attention. Our comments are attached at <u>Annex</u>. We would request your kind clarification in the form of an addendum for distribution together with the book and to make amendments when re-printing the book in the future so that readers can have the correct information.

Yours sincerely,

(Miss Christine Chow)

for Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands

c.c. Giordano International Limited (Fax no.: 2370 8864)

Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works

Director of Civil Engineering and Development

Director of Environmental Protection

Director of Planning

With enclosure – Annex

Government's comments on the story book entitled "The Adventure of Victoria" published by the Society for Protection of the Harbour Limited

1. The 2nd photo on the back of the book cover – The caption of the second photograph on "2004 年的維多利亞港 – 無止境的填海" is misleading. Footnote on page 28 – "根據政府已刊登憲報的填海計劃,香港正面臨失去總面積 3,800 公頃的海港…" is also misleading.

Here are the facts:

- (a) The Government has undertaken in the Policy Commitments to the Policy Addresses in 2004 and 2005 that apart from Central Reclamation Phase III (CRIII) and the proposed reclamation schemes at Wan Chai North and Kai Tak, there will be no further reclamation within the limits of the Victoria Harbour.
- (b) The proposed reclamations at Kowloon Point and Tsim Sha Tsui East have never been included in the outline zoning plan (OZP).
- (c) Green Island Reclamation Amendment to delete the proposed reclamation from the OZP was gazetted on 19 December 2003.
- (d) Tsuen Wan Bay Further Reclamation Amendment to delete the proposed reclamation from the OZP was gazetted on 19 December 2003.
- (e) The reclamation extent of Kai Tak had been reduced significantly from 299 to 133 hectares in 2001. The reclamation extent of Wanchai North had been reduced significantly from 43 to 26 hectares in 2002. These proposed reclamation schemes are being reviewed to ensure full compliance with the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (PHO) and the Court of Final Appeal (CFA)'s "overriding public need test".

2. Reference to Star Ferry on Page 11 on "天星碼頭和皇后像廣場很快就因填海要被拆毀" is misleading — The CRIII works will require the reprovisioning of the existing Star Ferry Piers which will enhance the value as a tourist attraction. In the course of construction, the contractor is required to ensure that the Star Ferry services will not be interrupted.

The Statue Square does not fall within the reclamation limit of CRIII at all. The statement that the square will be demolished as a result of reclamation and that tall buildings will be erected at the spot is factually incorrect. The Statue Square is zoned "Open Space" on the approved Central District OZP. There is no plan to change the use of the Statue Square.

3. Footnote on Page 13 -

- (a) "中環 3 期填海計劃, ...事實上主要目的是爲了賣地賺錢" is misleading CRIII is needed to provide land for essential transport infrastructure including the Central-Wan Chai Bypass (CWB), roads connecting CRI and II (the Road P2 network), the extended overrun tunnel of Airport Railway and the reprovisioning of the existing piers and sea-water cooling water pumping stations. It is factually incorrect to say that the purpose of reclamation is for land sale. The land uses contemplated on CRIII are consequential to the reclamation primarily determined by the alignment of the CWB and the reprovisioning of the existing waterfront facilities affected by the proposed reclamation.
- (b) "政府更不顧市民的反對聲音,於 2005 年重新提出灣仔填海建議" is also misleading In the light of the CFA judgment on reclamation, the Government is conducting a comprehensive planning and engineering review on Wanchai North to ensure full compliance with the requirements of the PHO and the CFA judgment. The proposed reclamation is to make provision for completing the missing strategic road link along the northern shore of Hong Kong Island, i.e. a trunk road comprising CWB and Island Eastern Corridor Link to alleviate the traffic congestion. Any possible reclamation will depend on the alignment, design and location of the trunk road and the extent of reclamation will be kept to the minimum. No land will be reclaimed

for the purpose of land sale. Any land reclaimed in connection with the trunk road will be put to public use.

- 4. Footnote on page 20 "維港的污染" is misleading The fact is that the dissolved oxygen in Victoria Harbour in December 2004 was 4.9mg/L the level is sufficient to sustain marine life.
- 5. Footnote on Page 25 "填海工程令尖沙咀至昂船洲一帶的航道變窄…… 傷及五名乘客" is misleading The Government notes the public concerns expressed on the problem with water flow and wave that may be brought about by reclamation in the Harbour. The Government has investigated the cumulative effect of the harbour reclamation and confirmed that wave agitation is mainly caused by the volume of marine traffic and speed of vessels. Reclamation itself does not cause waves. Although reclamation would reduce the area of water surface available for wave energy dissipation, such an effect would only be evident in localized areas along the coastline. This effect could be mitigated by the adoption of specially designed wave absorbing seawall which could absorb more than 50% of the wave energy. Seawall of this design will be installed in all new reclamations in the harbour including CRIII.

April 2005

(政府於 2005 年 4 月 21 日致保護海港協會的信件, 要求協會澄清

故事書「維多利亞歷險記」內誤導的資料,

信件原文爲英文,此乃信件附件的譯本)

政府對保護海港協會出版的故事書「維多利亞歷險記」的意見

一· 封面背頁第二幅圖片的說明指 "2004 年的維多利亞港 - 無止境的填海",以及第二十八頁的註釋指 "根據政府已刊登憲報的填海計劃,香港正面臨失去總面積 3,800 公頃的海港…",兩項說法都非常誤導。

以下爲事實的真相:

- (a)政府在二〇〇四及二〇〇五年施政報告的施政綱領曾作出 承諾,除了中區填海第三期工程,以及擬議的灣仔北和啓 德發展計劃外,在維多利亞海港的範圍內,不會再有其他 填海工程。
- (b) 擬議於九龍角及尖沙咀東進行的填海工程從未納入分區計劃大綱圖內。
- (c) 青洲填海 從分區計劃大綱圖刪除可能填海範圍建議的 修訂,已在 2003 年 12 月 19 日刊登憲報。
- (d)荃灣海灣進一步填海 從分區計劃大綱圖刪除填海建議的修訂,已在 2003 年 12 月 19 日刊登憲報。
- (e) 啓德的填海範圍於 2001 年已經大幅銳減,由 299 公頃減至 133 公頃,至於灣仔北的填海範圍亦於 2002 年由 43 公頃減至 26 公頃。政府現正檢討這兩項填海計劃,以確保符合《保護海港條例》和終審法院所訂"凌駕性公眾需要"的測試 進則。

二· 第十一頁有關天星碼頭的叙述 — "天星碼頭和皇后像廣場很快就因填海要被拆毀",這說法誤導讀者。中區填海第三期工程要求重建天星碼頭,這有助強化它作為旅遊景點的吸引力。 在工程進行期間,承建商要保證天星小輪的服務不受影響。

至於皇后像廣場,根本就不在中區填海第三期工程的範圍內。 因此,所謂"廣場會因填海而要拆卸,並且會興建高樓大廈" 的說法與事實並不相符。事實上,皇后像廣場在中區分區計劃 大綱核准圖內已劃作「休憩用地」,政府沒有計劃改變皇后像廣 場現時的用途。

三· 第十三頁的註釋:

- (a)「中環 3 期填海計劃, …事實上主要目的是爲了賣地賺錢」的說法亦甚爲誤導。事實上,中區填海第三期工程的目的是填取土地興建必需的交通基建,包括中環灣仔繞道、連接中區填海第一期與第二期的道路(P2 道路網)、機場鐵路掉頭隧道伸延段,以及重置目前的碼頭及海水冷卻用水抽水站。把填海的目的說成是爲了賣地,實在與事實不符。中區填海第三期工程涉及的填海土地,主要是由中環灣仔繞道的定線及重置受填海影響的現有海旁設施而決定的。
- (b) 「政府不顧市民的反對聲音,於 2005 年重新提出灣仔塡海建議」的說法很誤導。因應終審法院對塡海作出的裁決,政府在灣仔北正進行全面規劃和工程的檢討,以確保所有塡海建議完全符合《保護海港條例》及終審法院的裁決。有關的塡海建議是要完成港島北岸的主幹道,包括中環灣仔繞道及東區走廊連接路,以紓緩交通擠塞問題。任何可能涉及的塡海計劃,需視乎主幹道的走線、設計和位置,並且必須是最低限度的塡海。政府不會爲了賣地而塡海,因興建主幹道而由塡海取得的土地只會作公眾用途。
- 四· 第二十頁的註釋 「維港的污染」亦存在誤導。事實是二〇〇四年十二月維多利亞港的溶氧量爲每公升 4.9 毫克,此含量足以維持海洋生物的所需。

五· 第二十五頁的註釋一「填海工程令尖沙咀至昂船洲一帶的航道變得窄 ··· 傷及五名乘客」的說法很誤導。政府留意到有市民關心在維港填海後,可能引致水流和海浪的問題。對於這些問題,政府曾就填海的累積影響進行研究,結果顯示海浪主要由海上交通的流量和船隻行駛速度所引起。填海本身並不會引起海浪。雖然填海會減少供海浪能量消散的水面面積,但這些影響主要集中在沿岸的個別地方,若採用特別設計的吸浪海堤,將可減輕影響,吸去多於百分之五十的海浪能量,而維港所有的新填海地方,包括中區填海第三期工程,都會裝置這類海堤。

2005年4月