

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL
PANEL ON PLANNING, LANDS AND WORKS**

**Proposals for Preservation of Queen's Pier in Central
and the Way Forward**

Purpose

This paper informs Members of the details of our further discussions on the proposals for the preservation of the Queen's Pier with the professional bodies and the consultation with the concerned bodies/individuals, the conclusion we have made and the proposed way forward.

Background

2. At the Panel meeting held on 27 March 2007, we reported that three meetings had been held with four professional bodies (namely Association of Engineering Professionals in Society (AES), Conservancy Association (CA), Hong Kong Institute of Architects (HKIA) and Hong Kong Institution of Engineers (HKIE)). We also gave an analysis of the feasibility, possible additional cost incurred and delay caused to the Central Reclamation Phase III (CRIII) project in respect of the four proposals for the preservation of the Queen's Pier put forward by various parties. We considered Proposal (a) (i.e. in-situ preservation by shifting the alignments of the planned infrastructures which are in conflict with the Queen's Pier) and Proposal (b) (i.e. filling the void underneath the Pier by sand / grouting; constructing the underground Extended Overrun Tunnel (EOT) and drainage culvert by underpinning and tunneling method; and constructing a temporary road to buy time for completing the statutory procedures for the amendment scheme of Road P2 so as to preserve the Pier in-situ) not reasonably practical. For Proposal (c) (i.e. in-situ reinstatement by rolling the superstructure (roof and columns) away for construction of the underground infrastructure and rolling it back upon completion of the construction; and shifting Road P2 away from the Queen's Pier), there were doubts cast over its technical feasibility. We considered that Proposal (d) (i.e. preserving the above-ground structure of the Pier as far as practicable for reassembling in close proximity to its original location or at other appropriate location) presents a practical way forward, with relatively less delay to the CRIII works and less cost implications. We indicated that it

was our intention to start the preservation works in accordance with Proposal (d) as soon as practicable and that for this purpose a funding submission would be put to the Public Works Sub-committee (PWSC) in May 2007.

3. At the same meeting, we reported that we would relocate the marine operation of the Queen's Pier to the new Central Pier No. 9. We would now wish to advise Members that the completed Pier No. 9, which is a public pier located in the vicinity of the new Star Ferry Pier, will be opened for public use on 26 April 2007. When the new pier comes into operation, public vessels can no longer moor to the Queen's Pier, while the Pier facilities on land will continue to be opened for the public. Notices have been posted at the Central Pier No. 9 and the Queen's Pier to inform the public of the new arrangements for the marine operation. The Marine Department and the Transport Department have issued Marine Department Notice and Traffic Notice respectively to inform the public of the above arrangements.

Further Consultation

4. After listening to the views of Members expressed at the meeting held on 27 March 2007, we have decided to further exchange views with the professional bodies on the technical details in respect of the preservation of the Queen's Pier, and to exchange views with the concerned bodies and individuals on this matter. The Panel has also invited written submissions from community bodies following the last meeting, and we have duly considered all the submissions received by the Panel.

(A) Discussion with the Professional Bodies

5. Subsequent to the last Panel meeting, we held the fourth meeting with three of the professional bodies (representative of HKIE was absent due to other commitments) mentioned in paragraph 2 above and invited the representatives of the Mass Transit Railway Corporation (MTRC) to attend. At the meeting, the MTRC representatives provided detailed information to explain MTRC's considerations from the railway design, technical and safety perspectives, as well as from the railway planning and operation angles. It served to illustrate that the Airport Railway (AR) EOT would unavoidably conflict with the Queen's Pier. The professional bodies attended the meeting agreed unanimously that it was technically infeasible to preserve the Queen's Pier in-situ.

6. We note that CA, HKIE, and AES have made written submissions to the Panel, and the press has also reported HKIA's position at the fourth meeting. Based on the views expressed by these bodies at the fourth meeting and in their written submissions, the final views of these bodies on the four proposals are summarized as follows –

- **Proposal (a)** : The four professional bodies consider unanimously that this proposal is technically infeasible.
- **Proposal (b)** : The four professional bodies also consider unanimously that this proposal is technical infeasible.
- **Proposal (c)** : CA considers that this proposal may be feasible as there are successful examples in other places and that the additional time and costs could be worth spending. Nevertheless, HKIE considers that the risk of this Proposal is extremely high and that the Government should seriously weigh this highly risky proposal against the significant additional time and costs involved. AES also considers that this proposal would involve high risk and advises against trying such a highly risky engineering proposal.
- **Proposal (d)** : CA and HKIA do not object to this proposal and agree that the Queen's Pier could be relocated so as to allow the reclamation works to continue. Both bodies request that the Pier should be reinstated in-situ in future. CA also suggests appointing a Government architect who has proven experience in building preservation to take the lead in this job. HKIE and AES categorically express that, after considering the feasibilities of the four proposals, they accept Proposal (d). HKIE suggests reinstating the Pier at a suitable waterfront location in the new Central harbourfront.

7. In support of Proposal (d), HKIE stresses that Proposal (d) is a practically feasible option; demolishing the Pier structure first and reinstating it later on is a reasonable approach. HKIE also points out that while the Government has the duty to ensure that heritage buildings cherished by the public are preserved, it also has the responsibility to prevent undesirable consequences of works delay. A proper balance between the two should be struck. AES is confident that Proposal (d) is a feasible and rational option. It considers that the roof and the columns of the Queen's Pier should be dismantled and removed for storage. The Pier should be reinstated after a reprovisioned site has been identified. It considers that the Queen's Pier is

not a structure with special features and is not worth preserving. It requests an early relocation of the Queen's Pier to let the CRIII works continue, so as to avoid the unnecessary significant project delay costs to be borne by the public.

(B) Discussion with Concerned Groups and Individuals

8. We took the initiative to invite 11 bodies and individuals who had submitted their views on the preservation of the Queen's Pier to the Legislative Council or the Administration to meet with us. The Hong Kong Institute of Planners (HKIP) and the Curator (Education) of the University Museum and Art Gallery of the University of Hong Kong together with a few students and a part-time instructor of the university (HKU representatives) accepted our invitation to discuss with us respectively. During discussions, both sides exchanged views on the preservation of the Queen's Pier. Summaries of discussions¹ are at **Annex A**.

9. The purpose of the meeting with HKU representatives was mainly to explain our planning and consultation processes and to answer the queries raised by the students. HKIP's views have subsequently been presented in the written submission to the Panel. HKIP advocates a pragmatic approach to resolve the issue in order to facilitate the CRIII project without much delay. It hopes that the Queen's Pier could be preserved in-situ. However, if this is technically infeasible, it would also accept Proposal (d). HKIP also considers that if the Proposal (d) is to be adopted, consultation on the location of and the setting for the Pier should be carried out under the Planning Department's Central Reclamation Urban Design Study. This is in fact our next step forward (see paragraph 15 below).

(C) Discussion at the Town Hall Meeting

10. Some of the bodies on our invitation list were of the view that instead of organizing separate meetings with different bodies, a better arrangement was to convene a town hall meeting with the participation of these interested bodies and Government representatives. These bodies had also widely invited the public, through the Internet, to attend the town hall meeting. The town hall meeting was held at a community hall in Causeway Bay on April 4, attended by about 100 persons, including various groups,

¹ The summarized notes of various meetings mentioned in this paper were prepared by the Government and have not been exchanged with other participants of the meetings.

Government departments and individuals. A summary of the discussion at the town hall meeting prepared by the participating Government representatives is at **Annex B**.

(D) Written Submissions by Interested Bodies

11. We note that a total of six bodies have put forth their views to the Panel as at 19 April. CA, HKIE, AES and HKIP are among them, whose opinions have been summarized in paragraphs 5 to 9 above. Opinions expressed by the Hong Kong Federation of Students are mainly related to the Antiquities Advisory Board and the urban planning and procedures, many of which were raised at the town hall meeting on April 4, to which Government representatives responded on the spot. The Designing Hong Kong Harbour District has put forward some queries about the AR EOT and Road P2, which we already addressed in paragraph 7 of the paper we submitted to the Panel in March.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. Hong Kong is a diversified society. The fact that there are different opinions on the preservation of the Queen's Pier is fully understandable. Following the consultations outlined above, we consider that there have been adequate discussions on this issue in the community. It is the right time to conclude the matter and prepare for the next stage of work.

13. In evaluating the different options for preserving the Queen's Pier, the prime consideration is whether the options are technically feasible. After several rounds of debates/discussions, the four professional bodies have unanimously and categorically eliminated the feasibility of Proposals (a) and (b). For Proposal (c), given its high project risk and significant additional time and costs, we consider that it should not be pursued. The professional bodies also either do not support or do not insist on trying this Proposal. For Proposal (d), all the four professional bodies affirm its feasibility. Our conclusion is that Proposal (d) should be adopted to preserve the Queen's Pier. This option is the most practically feasible way forward, with minimum impact on project delay and least additional cost. We hope Members would indicate clear support for Proposal (d) so that we can start the next stage of work for the preservation of the Queen's Pier as soon as possible.

Funding Submission

14. We plan to seek funding from the PWSC of about \$50 million for the preservation of the Queen's Pier. The funding will cover the costs of storing the retainable parts of the above ground structures of the Queen's Pier, transportation and storage of the preserved parts at a temporary location, strengthening of the preserved parts and reassembly of the Pier in future. Subject to the funding approval by the Finance Committee, we will proceed with the work to preserve the Queen's Pier once the funding request is granted.

Next Step Forward

15. We note that the location and design for reinstating the Queen's Pier are matters of interest to some members of the public and bodies. There will be extensive discussions on these issues with the public under the Central Reclamation Urban Design Study recently commissioned by the Planning Department. The Stage 1 Public Engagement Programme of this Study will be conducted in early May.

**Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau
Civil Engineering and Development Department
Planning Department**

April 2007

**Notes of meeting with concerned groups on
Preservation of the Queen's Pier**

**The University Museum and Art Gallery (UMAG),
The University of Hong Kong (HKU)**
(Meeting on 2 April 2007)

Present

Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau (HPLB)
Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Highways Department (HyD)
Architectural Services Department (ArchSD)
UMAG, HKU
HKU

Summary of discussion

- UMAG said that the purpose of the meeting was to provide an opportunity for the students to learn more about the community's discussion and the decision-making process on the preservation of the Queen's Pier.
- HKU expressed that different groups of the community had different views on the preservation of the Queen's Pier. They asked how the government would consider the various views to arrive at a decision.
- HPLB said that individuals of the community had different views on the issue and that the role of the government was to make a decision having regard to the majority views of the community in an open and transparent way. The purpose of relocating/reprovisioning the Queen's Pier, being part of the Central Reclamation Phase III (CRIII) project, was to provide for the Central – Wan Chai Bypass and Island Eastern Corridor Link, which had been decided by the government after a due planning and consultation process. Such a mega project was planned in the 1990s. A long lead time and phased implementation were required. The project had already reached the final stage and thus there were many physical constraints on site.

HPLB encouraged the students to know more about the various views, factual data, decision-making process, etc through the organizations concerned, Internet, TV, radio, newspapers, etc. The Government recognized that public aspirations had changed over the years. The appeal for preserving the Queen's Pier only emerged recently. The Government was trying to balance the development needs and public wishes.

- UMAG asked about the impact of the various railways under planning on the preservation of the Queen's Pier. HyD and CEDD explained to UMAG that once the railways were planned, there was a need to protect the network planned before implementation and hence little scope to change the alignment. This was irrespective of the timing of actual implementation.
- HKU said that from conservation point of view in-situ preservation of the Queen's Pier should be adopted.
- HPLB said the proposal submitted to the Legislative Council (LegCo) Panel on Planning, Lands and Works (PLW Panel) did not preclude the possibility of in-situ reinstatement. The Central Reclamation Urban Design Study being conducted by the Government was to engage the public to consider where the Queen's Pier should be relocated/reprovisioned. Under this feasible proposal, the Queen's Pier would be disassembled first and reassembled at an appropriate location to be identified under the Central Reclamation Urban Design Study. Any slippage in the reclamation works would result in claim from the contractor and delay in the completion date.
- HKU suggested that Government should provide more information to the public and that a platform should be provided so that the public could have the avenue to express their views directly to the Government. HPLB explained that in fact the Government was highly transparent nowadays. All the information we provided to LegCo could be found in the Internet. CEDD cited another example that information related to the public consultation/engagement activities for Kai Tak and Wan Chai Development Phase II Reviews were fully uploaded on the website of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee. HPLB supplemented that any citizens could write to us any time and in fact we had received a lot of enquiries from members of the public through various means.

- UMAG and HKU thanked the government for giving the opportunity for them to understand more about the planning and consultation process of the preservation of the Queen's Pier.

The Hong Kong Institute of Planners (HKIP)
(Meeting on 4 April 2007)

Present

HPLB
CEDD
HyD
ArchSD
HKIP

Summary of discussion

- CEDD introduced the four options on preservation of Queen's Pier through a PowerPoint presentation.
- HKIP said they supported the in-situ preservation of the Queen's Pier. Other options should be considered only when the in-situ preservation option was proved to be impractical.
- In response to HKIP's enquiry, CEDD said that according to legal advice, gazetting was required for the re-alignment of Road P2. HPLB said such gazetting was not a critical consideration as compared with the constraints imposed by the Airport Railway Hong Kong Station Extended Overrun Tunnel (AR EOT) and the extension of the existing drainage box culvert.
- HKIP said there was a general mistrust over what the Government said. On the constraints imposed by the AR EOT, which the Government said was the critical issue, it would help to dispel the mistrust if Mass Transit Railway Corporation Ltd. (MTRCL) could come to the forefront to clarify the issue and their position. CEDD and HyD said they understood that MTRCL was planning to do so.
- Upon request of HKIP, CEDD explained in details how the Queen's Pier could be removed and reassembled under option (d).
- HKIP suggested elevating the future pier and enclosing it with a water body in-situ. HKIP also enquired about the proposed deletion of Road D6. CEDD said that the proposed arrangements of the Queen's Pier would be subject to the findings of the Central Reclamation Urban Design Study to be conducted by the government,

which would engage the public to consider where the Queen's Pier should be relocated/reprovisioned among other things. CEDD said Road D6 was not part of the CR III project and it was a matter subject to the deliberation of the Transport Department.

- HKIP said if in-situ preservation was proved to be impractical, they requested that the Queen's Pier should be reprovisioned in-situ in future. HPLB said the proposal submitted to the LegCo PLW Panel did include the possibility of in-situ reprovision. Indeed, under option (d), there could be three variations, namely in-situ reprovisioning, reprovisioning at a nearby site, and reprovisioning at a harbour-front site. This could be considered further under the Central Reclamation Urban Design Study.
- HKIP said that to show its commitment, the Government should gazette Road P2 re-alignment to provide for in-situ preservation/reprovisioning of the Queen's Pier. HPLB repeated that whether Road P2 was re-aligned or not, it could not resolve the constraints imposed by the AR EOT and the extension of the existing drainage box culvert.
- HKIP said that given the historical meaning of the Queen's Pier, they considered that the remaining heritage should be treasured and that in-situ preservation was most appropriate for it. ArchSD considered that the essence of the Queen's Pier as a heritage might be its historical values, spatial arrangement with the City Hall, or materials and design, and therefore in-situ preservation might or might not be the best form to keep the essence. ArchSD said that the HKIP might have a role to cultivate the community's ability to evaluate heritage in a logical sense. HKIP said that as a professional body, they had a role to enhance the communication and understanding between the Government and the public.
- HKIP said public opinions should converge and it would not be helpful to the society for the arguments to drag on. They thought it was quite clear that the public wanted to preserve the existing pier location.
- HPLB said that individuals of the community had different views on the issue and that the role of the Government was to make a decision having regard to the majority views of the community in an open and transparent way. According to the opinion poll conducted by the Government, not all the respondents supported in-situ

preservation/reprovision of the Queen's Pier. Indeed, quite a large proportion suggested reprovisioning the Queen's Pier at the water-front. The Government would take into account the views to be gauged under the Central Reclamation Urban Design Study before deciding on the proposed location site of the Queen's Pier. HPLB encouraged the HKIP to provide their views on the preservation of the Queen's Pier to the PLW Panel.

Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau
April 2007

**Notes of the Town Hall Meeting on the
Preservations of the Queen's Pier**

Date: 4 April 2007

Time: 6:00-9:45 pm

Venue: Leighton Hill Community Hall, Wan Chai

No. of Participants: About 100

Moderators

- (1) Mr K Y Leung, President, Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
- (2) Dr W K Chan, Member, Heritage Watch

NGOs Representatives /Individuals who spoke on the stage

- (1) Hong Kong People's Council for Sustainable Development Ms Kay Ku
- (2) SEE Network Ms Patsy Cheng
Ms Veronica Luk
- (3) Citizen Envisioning @ Harbour Mr Vincent Ng
- (4) Local Action Mr Chu Hoi-dick
Ms Cheung Choi-wan
- (5) Community Cultural Concern Dr Mirana May Szeto
- (6) Community Museum Project Mr Tse Pak-chai
- (7) Hong Kong Federation of Students Mr Li Yiu-kee
- (8) Green Sense Mr Roy Tam

- | | | |
|------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|
| (9) | Conservancy Association | Professor Hung Wing-tat |
| (10) | Civic Act-up | Ms Ada Wong Ms King Pui-wai |
| (11) | Individual | Mr Hai Tuen-tai, Freddie |
| (12) | Individual | Ms Ho Loy |

Government Representatives who spoke on the stage

- | | | |
|-----|--|--|
| (1) | Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau | Miss Annie Tam, Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands) ¹ |
| (2) | Home Affairs Bureau | Ms Esther Leung, Deputy Secretary (3) |
| (3) | Civil Engineering and Development Department | Mr L T Ma, Project Manager (Hong Kong Island & Islands) |
| (4) | Highways Department | Mr M L Wan, Principal Government Engineer/Railway Development |
| (5) | Leisure and Cultural Services Department | Dr Louis Ng, Assistant Director (Heritage & Museums) |

Summary of Discussion

- Mr L T Ma presented the four options of preserving the Queen's Pier with the aid of a powerpoint presentation. He explained that the first and second options were considered not reasonably practical and that the technical viability of the third option was very dubious, as the Pier was a flimsy and aged structure. The fourth option, i.e. to preserve the above-ground structure of the Pier as far as practicable and store for reassembling in close proximity to its original location or at other appropriate location, was a technically feasible option

although it would incur a delay of about four months to the Central Reclamation Phase III (CRIII) works and would result in an additional cost of \$50 million. The Government had informed the Legislative Council (LegCo) that we would be prepared to proceed on the basis of this fourth option. If the Pier was to be reinstated at the exact location instead, there would be a need for advance works for the Airport Railway Extended Overrun Tunnel (EOT) with an extra (advance) construction cost of about \$100 million.

Session 1: Heritage, Public Engagement and Policy Formulation Issues

SEE Network

- The SEE Network asked if there should be a fifth proposal of preserving the Queen's Pier.
- It considered that the Government proposal (i.e. Proposal (d)) was for resolving technical constraints, but not for preserving the Queen's Pier.
- It also queried whether the width of Road P2 and the length of the EOT could be reduced to avoid the conflict with the Queen's Pier.
- The SEE Network considered that the utmost importance was to evaluate the cultural value of the Queen's Pier. It suggested that the old Star Ferry clock tower and the Queen's Pier should be considered together.
- It alleged the Government's motive of demolishing the old Star Ferry clock tower and the Queen's Pier was to provide land for the CDA development.

Hong Kong People's Council for Sustainable Development (HKPCSD)

- The HKPCSD advocated a balanced social, economic and the environmental development. It emphasized the importance of stakeholders engagement.
- It enquired about the way forward, in particular the EOT programme.

Citizen Envisioning @ Harbour (CE@H)

- CE@H considered that it was reasonable to link the preservation of the Queen's Pier with the CRIII contract. It enquired whether Road P2, the drainage box culvert and the EOT were all included in the CRIII contract, CE@H considered that only the infrastructures included in the CRIII contract would be affected by the in-situ preservation of the Queen's Pier.
- It considered that if the construction works of the infrastructures were not to be commenced, no provisions for those infrastructures should be made in order to make way for the in-situ preservation of the Queen's Pier.
- It emphasized the totality of the Queen's Pier, City Hall and Edinburgh Place as a cluster and requested the Government to consider an ultimate proposal for preserving the Queen's Pier, i.e. to relocate the Queen's Pier back to its original location even it had to be dismantled temporarily in order to carry out the reclamation and underground works.
- It noted that the Town Planning Board (TPB) had deferred consideration of a Section 12A application for on-site preservation of the Queen's Pier, without indicating when this would be discussed at the TPB.

Local Action

- The Local Action considered that it was important for public to participate in the discussion of the preservation of the Queen's Pier and hence the proposed private meeting between the Government and the Local Action was not acceptable. It also considered that a session of 30 minutes for meeting each concerned group was insufficient.
- It requested the Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO) and the Antiquities Advisory Board (AAB) should start evaluating the grading of the Queen's Pier immediately.

- The Local Action held six public forums concerning the Star Ferry Pier and Queen's Pier. About 500 people took part in the forums. It found that the majority of the public supported in-situ preservation of the piers. It requested the Government to continue to engage the public and conduct a six-month consultation on the proposals to preserve the Queen's Pier.
- It criticized the administration for failing to provide sufficient information and data on the proposals of preserving the Queen's Pier.

Community Cultural Concern (CCC)

- The CCC presented its views with the aid of a powerpoint presentation.
- It queried whether there was any overriding public need for reclamation which led to the demolition of the old Star Ferry Pier and the Queen's Pier. It considered that the Central and Wan Chai Bypass could be constructed by an immersed tunnel which would not require reclamation. It also considered that the Road P2, groundscraper, EOT or the North Hong Kong Island Line (NIL) did not meet the overriding public need test for reclamation.
- It noted that the submission of the grading of the Queen's Pier to the AAB and the funding submission to the LegCo were both scheduled for May 2007. It requested the funding application should not be submitted to the LegCo before the grading of the Queen's Pier was available.
- It also queried the independence of the AAB.

Community Museum Project (CMP)

- The CMP suggested that the Government should conduct a social impact assessment (i.e. who gained and who lost) on the demolition of the Queen's Pier.
- It criticized the black-box type of consultation process of planning issues.

- It also queried the independence of the AAB and requested that the Board should consider the grading of the Queen's Pier from the cultural and historical angles.

Hong Kong Federation of Students (HKFS)

- The HKFS queried the impartiality of the AAB given the business background of its incumbent Chairman. It requested the AAB should grade the Queen's Pier based on its cultural and historical values rather than the business value.
- It considered that the Government should be accountable to the public over the issue of preserving the Queen's Pier.
- It requested in-situ reprovisioning of the Queen's Pier with its marine function retained.

Green Sense

- The Green Sense requested that the Government should take full account of public views over the preservation of the Queen's Pier.

Civic Act-up

- The Civic Act-up considered a distinction between the values and costs of preserving the Queen's Pier should be made clear. The data presented by the Government were the costs only. The public should consider whether they were willing to pay such costs in view of the values of the Queen's Pier.

Members of the Public

- One member of the public objected to reclamation.
- Another member of the public suggested that the Queen's Pier should not be demolished before a consensus had been reached between the Government and the community groups, which was committed by the Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands. She also queried whether there would be any interdepartmental meeting to coordinate the TPB's and AAB's consideration of the planning application and grading evaluation of the Queen's Pier under their respective purviews as well as HAB's consultation on the built heritage

conservation policy.

- Another member of the public said that the Government should consult the public extensively including those not supporting the preservation of the Queen's Pier.

Government's Responses

- Miss Annie Tam clarified the background leading to the Town Hall Meeting. The Government gathered two lists of community groups and individuals, which/who had expressed interest about the preservation of the Queen's Pier, from the LegCo and from government consultation forum respectively. The Government approached those community groups and individuals and offered meetings with them on the four proposals of preserving the Queen's Pier. The organizers of the Town Hall Meeting were among those community groups invited by the Government to meet on the four proposals. They suggested instead a town hall meeting and this was accepted by the Government. A Government team comprising the relevant bureaux/departments was here to exchange views with the interested groups/persons present.
- In response to some queries that the demolition of the old Star Ferry Pier and the Queen's Pier was not made clear in the LegCo and the public, Miss Tam clarified that the works covered by the CRIII were set out clearly in the funding submission to LegCo in 2002. The Administration's paper to the LegCo Panel on Planning, Lands and Works (PLW Panel) in January 2007 also recapitulated the past consultation of the CRIII project, including the arrangements for the old Star Ferry Pier and the Queen's Pier.
- Regarding CE@H's request for an ultimate proposal, Miss Tam said that the possible locations for the reinstated the Queen's Pier would be considered in PlanD's Central Reclamation Urban Design Study which would include public engagement activities. The Government noted so far there were split views in the community: some preferred the original location, some accepted a location near the original one and some favored the new waterfront. The issue

would be carefully studied in PlanD's Central Reclamation Urban Design Study.

- On the way forward, Miss Tam said that after meeting the community groups and individuals, the Administration would report their views to the LegCo PLW Panel in end April 2007. The marine operations of the Queen's Pier would be relocated to the new Central Pier No. 9 around end April. The location and design for the reinstated the Queen's Pier would be studied in the Central Reclamation Urban Design Study by PlanD in end April/early May. Meanwhile, the Administration would prepare a funding submission to LegCo in May 2007.
- Dr Louis Ng clarified that the AAB considered the Built Heritage Impact Assessment Report of CRIII in 2002. The Board recognized the value of the Queen's Pier and agreed to the proposal of preserving the valuable components of the Queen's Pier for reconstruction. The AAB reexamined such decision again in December 2006 and agreed with the conclusion made in 2002. At its meeting on 6 March 2007, AAB agreed that a study on the heritage value of the Queen's Pier should be conducted. AAB would in due course consider the grading assessment of the Queen's Pier on the basis of the study.

Session 2: Technical and Financial Issues

Mr Hai Tuen-tai, Freddie

- He considered that the grading system of AAB was unreasonable.
- He considered that the architectural value of the Queen's Pier was low. However, the location of the pier was important. AAB should take into account the value of the location of the Queen's Pier.
- He enquired how the public space would be best used after reclamation was completed.
- He requested MTRCL to meet with the professional bodies and the public to explain their requirement over the EOT.

Conservancy Association (CA)

- The CA has already taken a step backward in the preservation of the Queen's Pier with the most practical way. It did not consider CA's preferred option (Proposal (c)) was too different from the option (Proposal (d)) preferred by the Government.
- As there was no timetable to complete the NIL, which meant that the NIL project was not fixed, the EOT should not be a constraint to the in-situ preservation of the Queen's Pier.
- The Government had not said that the alignment of Road P2 could not be changed. If the Government started the gazettal of amending the Road P2 alignment now, it could still have enough time to handle the objections before the completion of the CRIII project in mid-2009.
- The CA requested the Government to pursue the proposal with the original roof, outlook and materials of the Queen's Pier preserved, moved and relocated back to its current location. It also suggested the Government to assign some preservation experts to handle the preservation of the Queen's Pier.

Ms Ho Loy

- Ms Ho queried the need for the EOT and asked, even the EOT was needed, whether it could be realigned to avoid conflicting with the Queen's Pier. She said that the dual-2 Road P2 only required 23.5 meters (but not 40 meters). She queried whether the 40-meter provision for Road P2 could be reduced to avoid conflicting with the Queen's Pier.
- She proposed lifting the whole pier structure to let Road P2 and the underground infrastructure works to continue.
- She also queried whether the transport need could override the need for a curved harbourfront.

Local Action

- The Local Action urged for an early completion of the grading of the Queen's Pier. As there was precedent for AAB to hold special meeting, there was no need to wait until May 2007 for AAB to consider the grading of the Queen's Pier.
- It requested the Government to consult the public on all preservation proposals, but not just Proposal (d).
- The ex-CE committed that all reclaimed land would not be used for commercial use. The Local Action requested that the reclaimed land should be returned to the public.

Community Museum Project (CMP)

- The CMP requested MTRCL to provide more information on the EOT and meet with the professional bodies and community groups.
- It has also requested to see Government's contract with the CRIII contractor.

Members of the Public

- A member of the public (who was an engineer) said that despite the "rolling" method was successful in the Mainland, those building structures were not the same as that of the Queen's Pier and hence the same method could not be applied to the Queen's Pier. He agreed that provision should be made for the planned infrastructures.
- A member of the public was disappointed with the participating community groups which took a negative attitude throughout the whole Town Hall Meeting refusing to listen to Government's viewpoints. She also found that some of the views expressed were subjective and prejudicial and were not conducive to a constructive dialogue on the future of the Queen's Pier.
- A few other members of the public and the community groups requested for further public consultation on the preservation proposals of the Queen's Pier in an extensive and thorough way.

- A member of the public (a SCMP reporter) enquired about the timetable regarding the transfer of the marine function of the Queen's Pier to Pier No.9, the demolition of the Queen's Pier as well as the commencement date of the Central Reclamation Urban Design Study.

Government's Response

- Ms Esther Leung said that the AMO had already commenced the study on the heritage value of the Queen's Pier, which was preliminarily aimed for submission to the AAB in May 2007. She added that the urgency of the public works should be considered.
- Mr L T Ma advised that the CRIII contract include Road P2, the stormwater culvert extension and 40 meters of the EOT. He also commented that the proposal by CA had yet to cover details on the connections of the rolled off structures to the new deck structure and proposal (d) by Government would provide certainty on reassembling.
- Mr M L Wan pointed out that the section of overrun at the location of Queen's Pier serves two purposes. The overrun for the Airport Express Line is needed for turn-back of trains to meet the future increased demand. The overrun for the Tung Chung Line is needed for the turn-back of trains as well as forming part of the future NIL. Government had consulted MTRCL. Even if the minimum design standard is adopted, the overrun tunnel still cannot avoid the Queen's Pier. The railway route has to be protected irrespective of the timing of the actual construction.

Conclusion

Community Groups

- Ms Ada Wong clarified that she had helped convening this Town Hall Meeting not in her capacity as Wan Chai District Council Chairman.
- Ms Ada Wong considered the Town Hall Meeting a constructive step taken on the Queen's Pier issue. She nevertheless said that there was no consensus reached on the consultation procedures, timetable and grading of the Queen's Pier. The Government emphasized the

costs for preserving the Queen's Pier. However, the community was talking about the Pier's value. Further public consultation on the preservation options was required.

- She highlighted the importance of the existing location of the Queen's Pier, which formed an axis with the Edinburgh Place and the City Hall.

Government

- Miss Annie Tam said that the Government took an open attitude in meeting the community groups and individuals to discuss the preservation of the Queen's Pier. This Town Hall Meeting was part of this process. The Government had been prepared to take over the organization of this Town Hall Meeting including the cost thereof, but the community organizations preferred to take up the task instead for which she was grateful. She noted that the organizers had invited the media and members of the public to attend this Town Hall Meeting and indeed some members of the public were present.
- The Government would report the discussions with the community groups and individuals to the LegCo PLW Panel in end April and prepare for the funding submission to LegCo in May 2007.
- There would be public engagement exercise over the possible locations and design ideas of the reinstated the Queen's Pier and the old Star Ferry clock tower under PlanD's Central Reclamation Urban Design Study in end April/early May 2007.
- Miss Tam thanked Ms Ada Wong for convening the Town Hall Meeting, and all participants for taking time to attend the Meeting to share their views with the Government on the Queen's Pier.

Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau
April 2007