

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. CB(2)2659/06-07  
(These minutes have been seen  
by the Administration)

Ref : CB2/PS/2/06

**Panel on Home Affairs**

**Subcommittee on Heritage Conservation**

**Minutes of meeting**  
**held on Tuesday, 26 June 2007, at 1:00 pm**  
**in the Chamber of the Legislative Council Building**

- Members present** : Hon CHOY So-yuk, JP (Chairman)  
Hon James TO Kun-sun  
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP  
Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, GBS, JP  
Hon LI Kwok-ying, MH, JP  
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung  
Prof Hon Patrick LAU Sau-shing, SBS, JP  
Hon TAM Heung-man
- Member attending** : Hon CHAN Yuen-han, JP
- Members absent** : Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBM, GBS, JP  
Hon Daniel LAM Wai-keung, SBS, JP  
Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming, SBS, JP
- Public Officers attending** : Home Affairs Bureau  
  
Ms Esther LEUNG  
Deputy Secretary for Home Affairs (3)
- Leisure and Cultural Services Department  
  
Dr Louis NG  
Assistant Director (Heritage and Museums)

Planning Department

Miss Ophelia WONG  
Deputy Director of Planning/District

Ms Phyllis LI  
Chief Town Planner/Special Duties

Mr Kyran SZE  
Aedas Limited

Ms Santafe POON  
Aedas Limited

Professor Andrew LEUNG  
CityU Professional Services Limited

**Clerk in attendance** : Ms Joanne MAK  
Senior Council Secretary (2)2

**Staff in attendance** : Miss Vivien POON  
Council Secretary (2)3

Ms Anna CHEUNG  
Legislative Assistant (2)2

---

Action

**I. Preservation of the Queen's Pier**

[LC Paper Nos. CB(2)2263/06-07(01) & (02), CB(2)2290/06-07(01) & (02) and CB(2)2333/06-07(01)-(04)]

The Subcommittee deliberated (index of proceedings attached at **Annex**).

2. Members noted the letters both dated 25 June 2007 issued by the Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands and the Chairman of the Antiquities Advisory Board respectively in reply to invitations by this Subcommittee for their attendance at this meeting.

Possible locations and design ideas for reconstructing the Clock Tower and reassembling the Queen's Pier

3. The consultant engaged by the Planning Department (PlanD) for conducting the Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (the Study) gave a Powerpoint presentation on the Study and the four alternative

Action

concepts for reassembling the Queen's Pier and reconstructing the old Star Ferry Clock Tower.

4. The Chairman requested the Administration to explore alternative concepts which attempted to reassemble the Queen's Pier and to reconstruct the old Star Ferry Clock Tower at their original locations taking into account the following suggestions raised by members -

- (a) a clear view towards the Harbour from the Queen's Pier should be maintained;
- (b) to explore constructing an artificial lake at the Queen's Pier so that the Pier could be reassembled at its original location with a compatible surrounding environment; and
- (c) to review the "groundscraper" development at the "Comprehensive Development Area" site to the north of Statute Square to allow reconstructing the old Star Ferry Clock Tower at its original location.

Admin

The Chairman requested the Administration to provide illustrative drawings of these concepts to the Subcommittee for members' consideration at a future meeting, and to include these concepts in the next stage of public engagement.

5. The Administration pointed out that there were many possibilities in reconstructing the old Star Ferry Clock Tower and reassembling the Queen's Pier. In order to facilitate public discussion, the PlanD's consultant had proposed four alternative concepts to illustrate the various ideas. These alternative concepts were not exhaustive and the Administration welcomed views and other ideas from the public. On the basis of public views, the consultant would also work out other options regarding the locations and design ideas for reconstructing the old Clock Tower and reassembling the Queen's Pier for the next stage of public engagement in the later part of 2007, while the Study would last until the end of 2007. The Administration agreed to consult the Subcommittee on other options worked out by the consultant regarding the locations and design ideas for reconstructing the old Clock Tower and reassembling the Queen's Pier.

Admin

Implementation details of the preservation of the Queen's Pier

6. The Administration informed members that it would be ready to report on the implementation details of the preservation arrangements for the Queen's Pier around mid-July 2007. The Subcommittee agreed to schedule a meeting for 8:30 am on 18 July 2007 to discuss the subject.

Action

*(Post-meeting note: the Subcommittee held a joint meeting with the Panel on Planning, Lands and Works on 24 July 2007 to discuss the implementation details of the preservation of the Queen's Pier)*

**II. Any other business**

Withdrawal of application for late membership

7. Members noted that Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong had withdrawn his application for late membership of this Subcommittee.

Date of next meeting

8. The Subcommittee agreed to schedule the next meeting for 8:30 am on 11 July 2007 to discuss conservation issues relating to Nga Tsin Wai Village, Wan Chai Market, and the market area at Tai Yuen Street and Cross Street.

9. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 2:33 pm.

Council Business Division 2  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
31 August 2007

**Proceedings of the meeting of the  
Subcommittee on Heritage Conservation  
on Tuesday, 26 June 2007, at 1:00 pm  
in the Chamber of the Legislative Council Building**

Time marker	Speaker	Subject	Action required
000000 - 000526	Chairman	Opening remarks [LC Paper Nos. CB(2)2290/06-07(01)-(02) and CB(2)2333/06-07(01)-(04)]	
000527 - 000714	Admin	The Administration's remarks that it would continue to receive public views beyond the deadline for the Stage 1 Public Engagement of the Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (the Study) on 30 June 2007.	
000715 - 001650	Consultant	<u>PowerPoint presentation on the Study - Stage 1 Public Engagement by Aedas, the consultancy firm</u> [LC Paper No. CB(2)2263/06-07(01)]  Four alternative concepts for reassembling the Queen's Pier and reconstructing old Star Ferry Clock Tower.	
001651 - 003216	Chairman Professor Patrick LAU Admin	Professor Patrick LAU's queries of whether reconstructing the Star Ferry Clock Tower at its original location had been pre-empted by the "Comprehensive Development Area" (CDA) north of Statute Square; and whether it was premature at this stage to study the precise locations in the alternative concepts, as the planning for the said CDA and other factors (e.g. Road P2) which might impact on the locations might be subject to review.  The Administration's response that -  (a) the four alternative concepts presented were not exhaustive and served only to facilitate public consultation;  (b) reconstructing the Clock Tower at its original location had been considered. Such a design was not preferred as it fell on the same axis with the new Clock Tower and the two clock towers would be relatively close. However, if such an idea was supported by some members of the public, it could be included as one of the options for next stage of public consultation; and	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject	Action required
		<p>(c) design concepts of the CDA site in question had yet to be refined. On the basis of public views, the consultant would also work out other options regarding the locations and design ideas for reconstructing the old Clock Tower and reassembling the Queen's Pier for the next stage of public engagement in the later part of 2007.</p> <p>The Chairman's concern about the storage of the retained parts of the old Clock Tower and the Administration's confirmation that the retained clock faces, chimes and mechanical parts of old Clock Tower had been preserved properly for reassembly in the re-constructed Star Ferry Clock Tower.</p>	
003217 - 004711	Mr James TO Admin Chairman Consultant	<p>Mr James TO's statement that he or the Democratic Party were still actively considering seeking a judicial review of the Administration's decision not to declare the Queen's Pier a monument, and what he said at this meeting should not be taken to mean that he had already accepted the proposed ideas for the preservation of the Queen's Pier.</p> <p>Mr TO's expression of concurrence with Professor Patrick LAU's concerns. Mr TO's query of whether any of the four alternative concepts would still be applicable if the Queen's Pier was declared a monument. The Administration's response that, in that case, Concept A1 would be applicable. More design concepts could also be proposed in the course of the Study.</p> <p>Mr TO's enquiry of whether the consultant had ever been requested to explore an option which attempted to reconstruct the Clock Tower at its original location and reassemble the Queen's Pier also at the original location. The consultant's reply that they had considered reconstructing the Clock Tower at its original location but had not recommended so because the effect would be that the old and new Clock Towers would be along the same axis and, visually too close together. Moreover, the sound of their chimes would overlap.</p>	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject	Action required
		<p>Mr TO's view that the Administration should have due regard to the elements of collective memory and historical interest of the old Clock Tower, and should have requested the consultant to include an option of reconstructing the Clock Tower and reassembling the Queen's Pier at their original locations for Stage 1 public consultation.</p> <p>Mr TO's criticism that the caption "Concept A1: Reassembling at the Original Location" in PlanD's pamphlet was misleading. The Administration's explanation that the expression "at the original location" referred only to the Queen's Pier as explained in the pamphlet. The Administration's reiteration that, subject to public's comments, it was possible to explore options which included reconstructing the Clock Tower and reassembling the Queen's Pier at their original locations for the next stage of public engagement.</p>	
004712 - 005820	Miss CHAN Yuen-han Admin	<p>Concerns raised by Miss CHAN Yuen-han -</p> <p>(a) whether Road P2 could be realigned to facilitate the in-situ reassembly of the Queen's Pier, whether an unobstructed view of the Harbour from the reprovisioned Pier could be provided; the timeframe for the reassembly of the Queen's Pier which, in her view, should be implemented within one to two years; and</p> <p>(b) whether planning for the "groundscraper" development at the "CDA" site to the north of Statute Square could be reviewed to allow for reconstructing the Clock Tower at the original location so that the Clock Tower and Queen's Pier would remain in the vicinity of the City Hall Precinct.</p> <p>The Administration's response that -</p> <p>(a) professional works departments were considering the technical aspects of Mr Tony CHAN's proposal e.g. the water levels, the area of the proposed artificial lake, the impact on the planned infrastructure etc.;</p>	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject	Action required
		<p>(b) the timetable for the reassembly of the Queen's Pier remained as that set out in paragraphs 9 to 11 in the paper submitted to the Public Works Subcommittee [LC Paper No. PWSC(2007-08)15] as follows -</p> <p>(i) if the location for reassembly of the Queen's Pier was on land and was cleared of the planned infrastructures, the proposed reassembly works could start around December 2009 for completion in December 2010;</p> <p>(ii) if the Queen's Pier was to be reassembled at its original location, advance works for the Airport Railway Extended Overrun Tunnel would be required. The reassembly works would start around December 2011 for completion around December 2012; and</p> <p>(c) design concepts of development in the CDA site had yet to be refined, and the consultant might be asked to prepare design concepts which attempted to reassemble the Queen's Pier and reconstruct the Clock Tower at their original locations for the next stage of public consultation.</p> <p>Further concerns raised by Miss CHAN -</p> <p>(a) the Administration should give due regard to the professional comments of the Hong Kong Institute of Architects, which strongly supported in-situ preservation of the Queen's Pier;</p> <p>(b) early implementation of the reassembly works for the Queen's Pier was necessary; and</p> <p>(c) the Administration should provide implementation details of the preservation arrangements for the Queen's Pier to the Subcommittee for comments.</p>	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject	Action required
005821 - 010720	Ms Emily LAU Chairman Admin	<p>Ms Emily LAU's concern that there might be too much commercial development at the new Central waterfront. Her view that this could run counter to public aspirations and the principle set out in the Court of Final Appeal (CFA) judgment.</p> <p>The Administration's clarification that development of the "CDA" site to the north of Statute Square would be restricted to low-rise buildings. Ample open space would be provided to develop a vibrant waterfront promenade for direct access and enjoyment by the public.</p> <p>Ms LAU's comments that she only agreed to provide cafes at the waterfront and not any commercial buildings; and that the Administration had to brief LegCo prior to commencing the demolition works for the Queen's Pier.</p> <p>Ms LAU's concerns that the public was generally dissatisfied with the design of the new Clock Tower and her question of what would be reconstructed since the old Clock Tower had been demolished.</p> <p>The Administration's response that the mechanical parts of the old clock had been carefully preserved and the Administration had pledged to re-erect the old clock onto the reconstructed Clock Tower. If the old Clock Tower was reconstructed at its original location, the design concept would need to be suitably adjusted.</p>	
010721 - 011639	Dr Fernando CHEUNG Admin Chairman	<p>Dr Fernando CHEUNG's disagreement to the reason given by the consultant against reconstructing the old Clock Tower at its original location; and his query of the following -</p> <p>(a) what purpose the Antiquities Advisory Board's (AAB's) grading of a historical building served if priority was not given in planning to conserving a graded historical building; and</p> <p>(b) how the decision would be made in choosing which idea to be adopted with regard to the location of the Queen's Pier and its relationship with the City Hall Precinct.</p>	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject	Action required
		<p>Response of the Administration that -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>(a) as the Queen's Pier was a Grade I historical building, the best possible effort should be made to preserve it, but in-situ preservation was only one of the options;</li><li>(b) the Administration respected AAB's grading given to the Queen's Pier in May 2007, but it was unable to factor it into the Study which commenced in March 2007. The Administration would strive for in-situ reassembly of the Pier if this was what the public preferred; and</li><li>(c) The entire Study should last until the end of 2007. Upon completion of the Study, the recommendations of the Study would be reported to LegCo in early 2008.</li></ul> <p>Dr CHEUNG's view that reconstructing the Clock Tower and reassembling the Queen's Pier at their original locations were essential to the preservation of the heritage value of the Queen's Pier, the Clock Tower and City Hall Precinct. It should be noted that Murray House lost its Grade I status after being relocated to Stanley. Dr CHEUNG's view that the Administration's planning policies should be revised to give priority to the in-situ preservation of all Grade I historical buildings.</p> <p>The Administration's undertaking that AAB's grading would be taken into account in the implementation of the preservation arrangements for the Queen's Pier, and AAB could be consulted for their advice in the course of the implementation works.</p>	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject	Action required
011640 - 012415	Chairman Admin	<p>The Chairman's objection to the "groundscraper" development which she considered would block the view of the Harbour.</p> <p>The Chairman's request for the Administration to also explore other options which attempted to reconstructing the Clock Tower and reassembling the Queen's Pier at their original locations, taking into account members' suggestions raised at this meeting.</p> <p>The Administration's agreement to consult the Subcommittee on other options worked out by the consultant regarding the locations and design ideas for reconstructing the old Clock Tower and reassembling the Queen's Pier in the future.</p>	<p><b>Admin to also explore alternative concepts which attempted to reassemble the Queen's Pier and to reconstruct the old Star Ferry Clock Tower at their original locations and to take into account members' suggestions in these concepts</b> (para. 4-5 of the minutes)</p>
012416 - 012749	Professor Patrick LAU Mr James TO Miss CHAN Yuen-han	<p>Professor Patrick LAU's comments that the Study would serve no purpose if the Study found that public views objected to certain commercial land use of the key development sites and the approved Central District (Extension) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) and the approved Central District OZP would not be amended.</p> <p>Mr James TO's reiteration of the importance of in-situ reprovisioning of the Queen's Pier (i.e. where new governors of Hong Kong took their oaths upon arrival) so that the historical significance of the Pier could be preserved. He also supported reconstructing the Clock Tower at its original location.</p> <p>Ms CHAN Yuen-han's suggestion that the Administration should draw upon the experience of the design of the Lake Michigan project to beautify the Queen's Pier by controlling the water levels with a water-storage facility.</p>	
012750 - 013232	Chairman Mr James TO Admin Ms Emily LAU	<p>Dates of next two meetings.</p> <p>Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong's withdrawal of application for late membership as informed by the Chairman.</p>	