

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)1185/06-07
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/PL/PLW/1

Panel on Planning, Lands and Works

Minutes of meeting
held on Tuesday, 23 January 2007 at 2:30 pm
in the Chamber of the Legislative Council Building

Members present : Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBM, GBS, JP (Chairman)
Prof Hon Patrick LAU Sau-shing, SBS, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Hon James TIEN Pei-chun, GBS, JP
Hon Albert HO Chun-yan
Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai, SBS, S.B.St.J., JP
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon Bernard CHAN, GBS, JP
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP
Hon Mrs Sophie LEUNG LAU Yau-fun, SBS, JP
Hon WONG Yung-kan, JP
Hon Miriam LAU Kin-yee, GBS, JP
Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, GBS, JP
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, JP
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon LEE Wing-tat
Hon LI Kwok-ying, MH, JP
Hon Daniel LAM Wai-keung, SBS, JP
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming, SBS, JP

Members attending : Hon CHAN Yuen-han, JP
Dr Hon YEUNG sum
Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung

Members absent : Dr Hon LUI Ming-wah, SBS, JP
Hon CHOY So-yuk, JP
Hon Vincent FANG Kang, JP

Public officers attending : **Agenda item IV**

Mr Michael SUEN, GBS, JP
Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands

Ms Annie TAM, JP
Deputy Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands
(Planning and Lands) 1

Ms Lydia LAM
Assistant Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands
(Planning) 3

Mr John CHAI, JP
Director of Civil Engineering and Development

Mr MA Lee-tak, JP
Project Manager (Hong Kong Island & Islands)
Civil Engineering and Development Department

Mr LAU Ka-keung, JP
Deputy Commissioner for Transport/
Planning & Technical Services

Ms Phyllis LI
Chief Town Planner/Special Duties (1)
Planning Department

Dr Louis NG
Assistant Director of Leisure and Cultural Services
(Heritage & Museums)

Attendance by invitation : **Agenda item IV**

Hong Kong People's Council for Sustainable Development

Mr Albert LAI
Chairman

The Hong Kong Institution of Engineers

Ir WONG Kwok-lai
President

The Conservancy Association

Dr HUNG Wing-tat
Director

The Hong Kong Institute of Architects

Mr Edward LEUNG
Member, Board of Local Affairs

Mr Michael CHIANG
Member, Board of Local Affairs

Community Cultural Concern

Ms Loy HO
Representative

Hong Kong Federation of Students

Mr LI Yiu-kee
Representative

Mr LEUNG Kam-wai
Representative

Designing Hong Kong Harbour District

Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN
Convenor

Clerk in attendance : Ms Anita SIT
Chief Council Secretary (1)4

Staff in attendance : Mr WONG Siu-yee
Senior Council Secretary (1)7

Ms Christina SHIU
Legislative Assistant (1)7

I Confirmation of minutes

(LC Paper No. CB(1)454/06-07 -- Minutes of special meeting on 20 October 2006

LC Paper No. CB(1)666/06-07 -- Minutes of special meeting on 14 November 2006)

The minutes of the special meetings held on 20 October 2006 and 14 November 2006 were confirmed.

II Information papers issued since last meeting

(LC Paper Nos. CB(1)470/06-07(01) and (02) -- Concerns over the enforcement policy for cases involving breach of lease conditions raised at a case conference held between the Legislative Council Members and the Administration on 7 November 2006 to consider a complaint about the lack of regulation on the operation of animal crematoriums in Hong Kong and the Administration's response

LC Paper No. CB(1)492/06-07(01) -- Information paper on "PWP Item No. 714CL - Engineering infrastructure works for Pak Shek Kok development, Stage 2B - improvement and extension of Yau King Lane" provided by the Administration

LC Paper No. CB(1)516/06-07(01) -- Supplementary Note on "120CD - Drainage improvement in Sai Kung 126CD - Drainage improvement in East Kowloon - package B phase 2" provided by the Administration

LC Paper Nos. CB(1)569/06-07(01) and (02) -- Submission dated 5 December 2006 from Designing Hong Kong Harbour District on "Design and construction of the Tamar development project" and the Administration's response

LC Paper Nos. CB(1)576/06-07(01), (02), (03) and (04) -- Issues relating to the rural development strategy raised at the meeting between the

- Legislative Council Members and Heung Yee Kuk Councillors on 31 October 2006 and the Administration's response
- LC Paper Nos. CB(1)577/06-07(01), -- Issues relating to the new nature
(02), (03) and (04) conservation policy raised at the meeting between the Legislative Council Members and Heung Yee Kuk Councillors on 31 October 2006 and the Administration's response
- LC Paper No. CB(1)582/06-07(01) -- Issue of "Review of the land sale policy" referred by the Panel on Financial Affairs
- LC Paper No. CB(1)583/06-07(01) -- Memorandum dated 15 December 2006 from Complaints Division on matters relating to the impact of the construction of the Central Kowloon Route on the community
- LC Paper No. CB(1)637/06-07(01) Memorandum dated 27 December 2006 from Complaints Division on "Proposal to lower the compulsory sale threshold for specified classes of lots under the Land (Compulsory Sale for Redevelopment) Ordinance"
- LC Paper Nos. CB(1)689/06-07(01), -- Issues relating to overall
(02) and (03) planning for Lantau raised at the meeting between the Legislative Council Members and Islands District Council Members on 23 November 2006
- LC Paper Nos. CB(1)690/06-07(01), -- Issues relating to planning
(02) and (03) framework for Tung Chung New Town raised at the meeting between the Legislative Council Members and Islands District Council Members on 23 November 2006
- LC Paper Nos. CB(1)691/06-07(01), -- Issues relating to nuisance
(02), (03) and (04) caused by the Tsuen Wan Slaughterhouse raised at the meeting between the Legislative Council Members and Tsuen

- Wan District Council Members
on 9 November 2006
- LC Paper No. CB(1)757/06-07(01) -- Information paper on "102CD - Drainage improvement in Tuen Mun and Sham Tseng - package B" provided by the Administration
- LC Paper No. CB(1)757/06-07(02) -- Information paper on "108CD - West Kowloon Drainage Improvement - Lai Chi Kok Transfer Scheme " provided by the Administration
- LC Paper No. CB(1)757/06-07(03) -- Information paper on "128CD - Drainage Improvement in Southern Lantau" provided by the Administration)

2. Members noted the information papers issued since last meeting.

III Items for discussion at the next meeting

- (LC Paper No. CB(1)780/06-07(01) -- List of outstanding items for discussion
LC Paper No. CB(1)780/06-07(02) -- List of follow-up actions)

3. Dr KWOK Ka-ki and Mr Albert CHAN suggested that the item on "Work of the Urban Renewal Authority" be discussed at the next meeting scheduled for 27 February 2007. They also suggested that relevant concern groups and the University of Hong Kong which had recently put up a proposal on the urban renewal of Mong Kok should be invited to attend the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: The Urban Renewal Authority requested and the Chairman agreed that the said subject would be discussed at the meeting scheduled for 27 March 2007 instead of 27 February 2007. The item on "Developments creating the wall effect" proposed by Mr Alan LEONG and Mr LEE Wing-tat subsequent to the meeting would be discussed at the meeting scheduled for 27 February 2007.)

4. Dr KWOK Ka-ki further suggested that issues relating to the planning for the Comprehensive Development Area adjoining Central Piers No. 4 to No. 6 and the commercial site to the north of Two International Finance Centre be discussed.

(Post-meeting note: The said subject would be discussed at the meeting of the Subcommittee to Review the Planning for the Central Waterfront (including the Tamar Site) scheduled for 8 March 2007.)

IV Planning arrangements for the existing Queen's Pier and the relics of the former Star Ferry Pier in Central

- (LC Paper No. CB(1)677/06-07(01) -- Letter dated 4 January 2007 from Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
- LC Paper No. CB(1)677/06-07(02) -- Information paper provided by the Administration
- LC Paper No. CB(1)677/06-07(03) -- Background brief on "Planning arrangements for the Star Ferry Pier and Queen's Pier in Central" prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat)

Briefing by the Administration

5. The Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (SHPL) said that the Administration agreed to the view of The Hong Kong Institution of Engineers that in pursuing the preservation of the Queen's Pier, contractual obligations and additional time required for any changes to the works programme were important factors for consideration. The Administration welcomed the Conservancy Association's suggestion of relocating temporarily the Queen's Pier so as to allow the reclamation works under Central Reclamation Phase III (CRIII) to continue to proceed and then rebuilding the pier. The Administration was prepared to discuss with relevant professional bodies on specific options for salvaging the components of the Pier for rebuilding at a suitable location.

Presentation by deputations

Hong Kong People's Council for Sustainable Development (HKPCSD)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)803/06-07(01), tabled and subsequently issued to members on 24 January 2007)

6. Mr Albert LAI, Chairman of HKPCSD, delivered his presentation, the details of which were given in the relevant submission. He stressed that preservation of the Queen's Pier in-situ would only affect one to two lanes of Road P2, which could be moved to the north by less than 10 metres to solve the problem. The Central-Wan Chai Bypass (CWB), to be built in the form of a tunnel in the area and located far away from the Queen's Pier, would not be affected. The low-rise developments, such as festive markets, to the north of Road P2 would not be affected either. He emphasized the importance of the principle of cross-generational equity.

The Hong Kong Institution of Engineers (HKIE)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)802/06-07(01), tabled and subsequently issued to members on 24 January 2007)

7. Ir WONG Kwok-lai, President of HKIE, delivered his presentation, the details of which were given in the relevant submission. He emphasized that while

there was no doubt that the aspiration for heritage conservation should be respected, the public funds required for conservation should also be considered. The Administration should strike the right balance in this regard.

The Conservancy Association (CA)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)780/06-07(03))

8. Dr HUNG Wing-tat, Director of CA, delivered his presentation, the details of which were given in the relevant submission. He commended the Administration for its assurance of preserving the components of the Queen's Pier as far as practicable instead of only the plaque. He also appreciated that the Administration would discuss with experts in the community technical arrangements for retaining the roof slab and columns of the pier. However, he entirely disagreed to the Administration's view that until recently, the public had not raised objection to the demolition of the Queen's Pier and stressed that CA had all along been striving for preservation of the Queen's Pier. He said that the Administration had not carried out any consultation specifically on whether to preserve the Central Star Ferry Pier and the Queen's Pier. CA considered that the Queen's Pier should be reinstated in-situ.

The Hong Kong Institute of Architects (HKIA)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)802/06-07(02), tabled and subsequently issued to members on 24 January 2007)

9. Mr Michael CHIANG, Member, Board of Local Affairs of HKIA, delivered his presentation, the details of which were given in the relevant submission. He stressed that it was possible to preserve the Queen's Pier in-situ without affecting reclamation works by introducing slight, or even no, amendments to the alignment of the Airport Railway Extended Overrun Tunnel and the box culvert extension through engineering methods such as underpinning. The Queen's Pier could also be relocated as suggested by CA and an auditorium in Shanghai had been relocated using such a method.

Community Cultural Concern (CCC)

10. Ms Loy HO, Representative of CCC, said that the Star Ferry Pier and the Queen's Pier could be preserved by moving Road P2 to the north by 20 metres. She had no intention to stop the developments at the waterfront, but opposed to building a replica of the clock tower of the Star Ferry Pier. It was wrong to demolish the Star Ferry Pier because it was an international landmark. The Administration failed to understand community wisdom and the public felt being insulted. The relocation of the Star Ferry Pier did not take into consideration of public need and it was a mismanagement of public transport. Instead of safeguarding public interest, the Administration adopted a mentality which was in favour of commercial interest. Hong Kong people would feel ashamed of the standard of urban planning in Hong Kong when they compared it with urban planning in other Asian cities like Singapore and Macau. The previous

consultations with the Central and Western District Council and the Antiquities Advisory Committee did not represent the view of the majority of Hong Kong people.

*Hong Kong Federation of Students (HKFS)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)780/06-07(04))*

11. Mr LI Yiu-kee, Representative of HKFS, delivered his presentation, the details of which were given in the relevant submission. He added that HKFS would not accept replicas of heritage structures or relocation of the Queen's Pier. HKFS insisted on preserving the Queen's Pier as it was. The Administration should respect the public's rights and views. HKFS would not compromise on the matter and demanded SHPL and other relevant officials to apologize for having demolished the Star Ferry Pier and to provide an explanation on who had made the decision.

*Designing Hong Kong Harbour District (DHKHD)
(LC Paper No. CB(1)803/06-07(02), tabled and subsequently issued to members on 24 January 2007)*

12. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN, Convenor of DHKHD, delivered his presentation, the details of which were given in the relevant submission. He pointed out that issues on heritage protection and public participation had been raised during the comprehensive review of the Town Planning Ordinance in 1991 and in 2005, the Town Planning Board (TPB) had requested the Administration to conduct a study on refinement of the urban design framework in Central. The due process claimed to have been completed by the Administration might need to be reviewed. He queried why according to the various plans provided by the Administration, the proposed dual two-lane Road P2 was wider than that of the existing dual three-lane Connaught Road and it was obvious that technically, the Queen's Pier could be preserved in-situ.

Response from the Administration

13. SHPL said that the key issue was that any changes to the alignment of Road P2 would have to go through the statutory planning process which involved the consideration of representations, if any, because the current alignment was specified in the relevant approved outline zoning plan (OZP). Such changes could not be dealt with administratively. Hong Kong was proud of itself for respecting the rule of law and due statutory process. The current task was to identify an option to demolish the Queen's Pier first and then rebuild it so as to avoid delays in the works under CRIII and possible claims of unknown amounts from the contractor. The Administration was studying the technical feasibility of various options for preserving the Queen's Pier, including in-situ preservation, raised by various organizations with a view to working out a feasible and acceptable arrangement.

Discussion

14. Mr LEE Wing-tat pointed out that the Administration had yet to provide an explanation on why it was impossible to change the alignment or width of Road P2 slightly so as to preserve the Queen's Pier in-situ. While works under CRIII could continue, funding application for CWB had yet to be submitted. As there was no immediate need to construct Road P2, there should be enough time for further discussion on the technical aspects of how to preserve the Queen's Pier. He urged the Administration to adopt a "can do" spirit.

15. In response, SHPL said that the Administration had held discussions with some organizations on how to preserve the Queen's Pier and the Administration had already changed its original thinking of preserving only the plaque to retaining the components of the Queen's Pier as far as practicable. There was urgency to carry out the remaining reclamation works under CRIII. The reclamation works could not continue as scheduled without demolishing the Queen's Pier. There would be more time for handling issues about Road P2, but any changes to its alignment or width would have to go through the statutory planning process. He agreed to CA's view that measures should be taken to avoid delaying the reclamation works under CRIII. The Queen's Pier could then be rebuilt in-situ or at another location later.

16. Dr KWOK Ka-ki pointed out that deputations including HKIE did not consider that there were technical difficulties in preserving the Queen's Pier in-situ. The Administration should not use legal or contractual obligations as excuses. He commented that the Chairman of TPB was the Permanent Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning & Lands) and all its members were appointed by the Administration. The Administration had the ability and could take the initiative to propose amendments to the approved OZP. The Administration should provide information on the arrangements agreed with the contractor and explain the technical and contractual difficulties in changing the alignment of Road P2. He queried whether the Administration had expedited the award of the contract in view of the litigation initiated by the Society for the Protection of the Harbour, Limited. He asked what specific steps the Administration would take to respond to the demand of the community for preserving the Queen's Pier in-situ and pointed out that an organization had submitted an application to TPB in this regard.

17. In response, SHPL pointed out time constraint was an important factor and it would be difficult to estimate the time required for the suggested changes to the alignment of Road P2 to go through the statutory planning process. It would depend on the number of representations received and how they should be handled. He objected to Dr KWOK Ka-ki's view that the Administration was using the statutory planning process as an excuse. As for CRIII, he clarified that the works contract was awarded before the said litigation. The new Star Ferry Pier was already in operation, and the marine operations of the Queen's Pier's would be reprovisioned at Central Pier No. 9. The Administration would consider the

options proposed by CA and HKIA. The most important point was to set a work target and identify options to achieve that target. As regards the application submitted to TPB, it was another process unrelated to Road P2 and TPB would process the application within the statutory time limit in accordance with the Town Planning Ordinance.

18. Prof Patrick LAU sought clarification on whether the Administration would consider changing the alignment of Road P2 through the statutory planning process. He enquired whether the works contract had included the cost for preserving the components of the Queen's Pier and if not, he urged the Administration to discuss with the contractor on what components to keep so as to arrive at a reasonable cost estimate. He also enquired about the schedule of the demolition works, and sought clarification on the width of Road P2 and how it compared with Connaught Road.

19. In response, SHPL said that while the Administration would review various OZPs from time to time, the developments under the current by approved OZP had not even been implemented. As such, there was insufficient justification to initiate the process at present. As for the works contract, it did not include the costs for any additional works required for preserving the components of the Queen's Pier, but as such works would probably be of a small scale, the costs should not be too high. The priority task was to identify a feasible and acceptable option for rebuilding the Queen's Pier. The Administration was discussing with experts on the matter. The Queen's Pier was a large and heavy structure with a length of some 60 metres. Arrangements for handling and storing the components, the roof slab and the 34 columns of the pier had to be worked out first before a cost estimate could be made. According to the original plan, the Queen's Pier was due to be demolished shortly. However, the Administration was trying to seek consensus and identify an option for rebuilding it first. While he did not have detailed information on the width of Road P2 on hand, it seemed that DHKHD's width measurement for Connaught Road covered only the vehicle lanes but that for Road P2 covered the footway as well. There was certainly a practical basis for the width of Road P2.

20. Dr Fernando CHEUNG considered that the majority view at the meeting was to preserve the Queen's Pier in-situ. Apart from the considerations from historical and cultural perspectives, the Queen's Pier should be preserved in-situ because it formed an integrated complex of structures with the former Star Ferry Pier, City Hall and Edinburgh Place. Professional organizations attending the meeting did not see technical difficulties that would make the preservation of the Queen's Pier in-situ impossible. He disagreed to the idea that the Queen's Pier should be demolished first because there would then be no timeframe or legal basis for in-situ preservation. The Administration should explain the technical difficulties and the contractual arrangements which prevented in-situ preservation and provide relevant documents to substantiate its explanation. He asked whether the Administration would consider in-situ preservation as one of the possible options.

21. In response, SHPL said that it would be too optimistic to say that there would be no technical difficulties in preserving the Queen's Pier in-situ. The Queen's Pier was in the harbour and no reclamation works could be carried out if it was not relocated. He reiterated CA's view that the Queen's Pier should first be relocated and then rebuilt. The Administration had to study the technical feasibility of options for rebuilding the Queen's Pier in-situ or at another location, and identify alternatives if those options were found to be infeasible. The other factors requiring consideration were cost and time implications especially if the statutory planning process was involved. The arrangements under the relevant works contract were not the crux of the issue.

22. Mr Albert HO considered that the Administration should set a target and then explore possible options for achieving that target, starting with optimistic options first and proceeding to complicated ones. For various options, such as reducing the width of Road P2, moving Road P2 to the north by 20 metres or moving the Queen's Pier to another location temporarily and rebuilding it later, the Administration should provide an explanation on the work procedures and costs required, and technical issues involved. He considered that the Administration should work towards the target of preserving the Queen's Pier in-situ without destroying the completeness of its structure and reducing the space of Edinburgh Place.

23. In response, SHPL reiterated the need to demolish the Queen's Pier first so as to allow reclamation works to continue to proceed without delay. While there could be different options for constructing Road P2, the alignment of Road P2 was determined in accordance with the relevant OZP and any changes to its alignment would affect the land uses of the affected areas. The Administration had to consider all the possible implications and study whether the planning and land uses, if so amended, were reasonable. If the grounds for amendments were found to be reasonable, the statutory planning process would have to be triggered.

24. Ir Dr Raymond HO considered that the Administration's explanation on the complications involved in initiating the statutory planning process was clear enough. Works projects were often delayed due to such statutory complications. He commented that the Administration had given sufficient latitude in the preservation of the Queen's Pier by retaining its components as far as practicable. He pointed out that demolishing the Queen's Pier first and then rebuilding it later was a practical solution and such a method had been adopted for heritage preservation in other places. There would be cost and time implications and public funds would be involved, but if the reclamation works could be proceeded with, the effects should not be too substantial. He said that HKIE had pointed out that contract obligations should be honoured and claims arising from changes in the works should be kept to a minimum. He considered that the consultation on the preservation of the Queen's Pier should be as wide and transparent as possible. As for the width of Road P2, he believed that the Administration had a practice of adopting minimum standards while ensuring safety in the design. The design of a

road was not a simple matter and there were stringent technical standards governing elements such as curvature and gradient. He asked whether it was really impossible to change the alignment of Road P2. As long as the Administration could provide an explanation on the relevant parts of the works contract, he did not see any need for the Administration to provide the works contract documents.

25. In response, SHPL said that the alignment, curvature or gradient of any road must be designed in compliance with relevant safety standards and there must be no compromise in this regard. There was a need to provide a smooth connection of the roads in the area with other parts of the road infrastructure. The planning was an integrated one and the design of any road could not be considered in isolation.

26. Mr Albert CHAN commented that the stance of SHPL on the preservation of the Queen's Pier had changed and wondered whether it was due to the lesson from the Star Ferry Pier incident. He however was worried that conducting consultation was just the Administration's tactic to avoid confrontations and delay the handling of the matter for political reasons. The Administration should present specific options with the necessary work procedures, details and design plans on how to preserve the Queen's Pier. There should also be a timeframe for conducting consultation on those options. He suggested that there should at least be three options, namely preservation in-situ, relocation and then reinstating in-situ, and permanent relocation to another location.

27. In response, SHPL said that the first option mentioned by Mr Albert CHAN was infeasible due to the need for carrying out reclamation works. As for the other two options, the common point was how to identify a method to demolish the Queen's Pier first and store the retainable components properly for future rebuilding. The Administration would continue to discuss with CA on how best to achieve the objective. The Administration's consultant would recommend the design of the waterfront and the preferred locations for rebuilding the Queen's Pier and the clock tower of the Star Ferry Pier in around April 2007 under the forthcoming Central Reclamation Urban Design Study. Subject to the views of CA, the outcome of the discussions on its proposed options was expected to be available within two to three weeks. Whether to rebuild the Queen's Pier in-situ or at another location would depend on technical feasibility.

28. Dr HUNG Wing-tat, Director of CA, said that if in-situ preservation of the Queen's Pier was the common target, the work would be easier. The work would be more complicated if relocation at other locations had to be considered. In-situ preservation should be considered first and if it was infeasible, relocation at another location would be considered.

29. Mr Michael CHIANG, Member, Board of Local Affairs of HKIA, pointed out that a possible option which would allow reclamation works to continue to proceed without demolishing the Queen's Pier was to construct a U-shaped retaining wall around the Queen's Pier. A preliminary drawing on this option was

attached to HKIA's submission. Reclamation works could be carried out outside the retaining wall and discussions about how to preserve the Queen's Pier could continue.

30. In response, SHPL said that the Administration would consider the feasibility of the option.

31. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung commented that the Administration should have a vision and a target in preserving the Queen's Pier. The demand for in-situ preservation was clear enough but the Administration had failed to gauge the views of the public. The key issue was whether the Administration was willing to do so and the Administration should indicate whether it intended to follow the public's aspiration in this regard. He considered that the matter was not a technical issue and was worried that the Administration was adopting a delaying tactic. He considered that a museum should be set up for the Star Ferry Pier and Queen's Pier incidents.

32. Ms Audrey EU queried why in the Star Ferry Pier incident, the Administration had held a strong view that works contracts should not be varied for preservation of the pier but now, the Administration was prepared to change the works contracts for the preservation of the Queen's Pier. Noting that in-situ preservation would be possible, she urged the Administration to establish a working group comprising Government experts and experts in the community to discuss options for preserving the Queen's Pier in-situ, and provide the necessary technical information to experts in the community. She requested the Administration not to demolish the Queen's Pier before the outcome of the discussions of the working group was available.

33. In response, SHPL said that so far his understanding was that the Queen's Pier could not stay at the present location without obstructing the reclamation works. The Administration had already held two meetings with experts in the community to identify and study the feasibility of various options, such as whether the construction of the Airport Railway Extended Overrun Tunnel would be affected by the presence of a U-shaped retaining wall around the Queen's Pier. The discussions would continue and it was expected that the initial outcome would be available within two to three weeks, before which the Queen's Pier would not be demolished.

34. Dr YEUNG Sum commented that there should be more community participation in the discussion of the preservation of the Queen's Pier because the public was very concerned about heritage preservation nowadays. He mentioned that a survey conducted by the Democratic Party revealed that 70% of the respondents supported preserving the Queen's Pier in-situ while 30% supported relocating it to another location. He urged the Administration to adopt in-situ preservation as the direction of future work. He emphasized the historical value of the Queen's Pier citing that the pier was associated with student movements for protecting the sovereignty of the Diaoyu Islands. In-situ preservation was

important and it should be the common target. The Administration should state its direction on the issue. Before resolving technical issues for preserving the Queen's Pier, it should not be demolished.

35. Dr KWOK Ka-ki supported the idea of establishing a working group to discuss the preservation of the Queen's Pier and considered that the Administration should report the outcome of the discussions within two to three weeks.

36. Mr Alan LEONG considered that the Administration should have a new mentality and inform the community how the public could participate in the discussion of the preservation of the Queen's Pier. The Administration should not use consultation as a tactic to delay the handling of the matter.

Admin

37. The Chairman requested the Administration to provide a paper to report on the outcome of its discussions with the experts in the community within two to three weeks, and the Panel would see if it was necessary to further discuss the subject.

V Any other business

38. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 4:40 pm.