

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)2328/06-07
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref: CB1/PS/1/05

Panel on Planning, Lands and Works

**Subcommittee to Review the Planning for the
Central Waterfront (including the Tamar Site)**

**Minutes of the meeting on
Thursday, 28 June 2007, at 9:00 am
in the Chamber of the Legislative Council Building**

Members present : Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBM, GBS, JP (Chairman)
Hon WONG Yung-kan, JP
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, JP
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
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 James TO Kun-sun
Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP
Prof Hon Patrick LAU Sau-shing, SBS, JP

Members absent : Hon Albert HO Chun-yan
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP
Hon CHOY So-yuk, JP
Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, GBS, JP
Hon LEE Wing-tat

Public officers attending : **Agenda item II**
Miss WONG Yuet-wah
Principal Assistant Secretary for Housing, Planning and
Lands (Planning & Lands) 2

Ms Sharon HO
Principal Assistant Secretary for the Environment,
Transport and Works (Transport) 5

Miss Ophelia WONG
Deputy Director of Planning/District

Ms Phyllis LI
Chief Town Planner/Special Duties
Planning Department

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

Mr CHAN Chung-yuen
Senior Engineer/Housing & Planning
Transport Department

**Attendance by
invitation**

: Agenda item II

Aedas Limited

Mr Kyran SZE
Representative

Ms Santafe POON
Representative

CityU Professional Services Limited

Professor Andrew LEUNG
Representative

Individual

Mrs Margaret BROOKE

Association of Engineering Professionals in Society

Mr LEE Ping-kuen
Senior Vice Chairman

Individual

Mr Rob PENDLETON

Action Group on Protection of the Harbour

Mr CHONG Wing-fai
Member

Individual

Mr Norman de BRACKINGHE

Designing Hong Kong Harbour District

Mr LEE Yuet
Representative

Designing Hong Kong

Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN
Convenor

Save Our Shorelines

Ms Annelise CONNELL
Spokesperson

The Hong Kong Institute of Architects

Mr Ivan HO
Deputy Chairman, Planning and Lands Committee

The Hong Kong Institute of Planners

Ms PONG Yuen-yee
Vice-President

Society for Protection of the Harbour

Mr Dennis K W LI
Director

Civic Exchange

Dr Bill BARRON
Representative

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

Action

I Confirmation of minutes

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1954/06-07 -- Minutes of meeting on 7 May 2007)

The minutes of the meeting held on 7 May 2007 were confirmed.

II Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1917/06-07(01) -- Submission received from Central & Western District Council on 28 May 2007

LC Paper No. CB(1)1917/06-07(03) -- Submission dated May 2007 from Hong Kong Construction Association

LC Paper No. CB(1)1917/06-07(04) -- Submission received from The Conservancy Association on 13 June 2007

LC Paper No. CB(1)1952/06-07(03) -- Submission dated 18 June 2007 from The Hong Kong Institution of Engineers

LC Paper No. CB(1)1952/06-07(04) -- Information paper provided by the Administration

LC Paper No. CB(1)1952/06-07(05) -- Background brief on "Planning for the new Central waterfront" prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat

LC Paper No. CB(1)1962/06-07(01) -- The Administration's response to the motion passed at the meeting on 7 May 2007 on the design and alignment of Road P2

LC Paper No. CB(1)1976/06-07(01) -- Summary of views of deputations made at the meeting on 7 May 2007 and the Administration's response

Action

- LC Paper No. CB(1)1648/06-07(01) -- Letter dated 11 May 2007 from Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
- LC Paper No. CB(1)2219/05-06(01) -- Information paper on "Refinement of the Urban Design Framework for the Central Reclamation and Preparation of Planning/Design Briefs for Key Development Sites" provided by the Administration)

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

Briefing by the Administration

3. The Administration briefed members on the Administration's paper.

Presentation by deputations and discussion

4. The deputations made their presentations. At the request of Designing Hong Kong and with the concurrence of the Chairman, Designing Hong Kong became the last organization to present views. The Chairman remarked that transfer of unused presentation time from one deputation to another deputation should not be permissible, but on account of Designing Hong Kong's enthusiasm in the subject matter under discussion, he would exceptionally accede to the request of some deputations that more time, i.e. 10 minutes vis-à-vis five minutes for other deputations, be given to Designing Hong Kong for its presentation.

5. After the deputations had presented their views, members raised questions for response by the Administration.

6. The Administration was requested to provide the following information --

- (a) the consultancy brief and agreement for the Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (the Study); and
- (b) updated figures on the gross floor areas (GFAs) of planned developments in the study area together with a comparison with the previous figures.

(Post-meeting note: The Administration's information paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)2192/06-07(01)) was issued to members on 24 July 2007.)

7. Members agreed that the Chairman should write to the Chief Executive to convey the suggestion of organizing an international design competition for the new Central harbourfront.

Action

(*Post-meeting note:* The letter (LC Paper No. CB(1)2101/06-07(01)) from the Chairman to the Chief Executive dated 12 July 2007 was issued to members on 13 July 2007.)

8. Members suggested that the subject should be discussed again in September 2007. The Administration responded that whether September 2007 was the appropriate timing would depend on the progress of the Consultants in processing the views received during Stage 1 Public Engagement and formulating the urban design proposals for the Stage 2 Public Engagement. If the Consultants had not yet completed their work by September 2007, then October 2007 might be a more appropriate timing. The Chairman advised that the Clerk would liaise with the Administration on the matter.

III Any other business

9. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 12:10 pm.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
6 September 2007

Panel on Planning, Lands and Works

**Subcommittee to Review the Planning for the
Central Waterfront (including the Tamar Site)**

**Proceedings of the meeting
on Thursday, 28 June 2007, at 9:00 am
in the Chamber of the Legislative Council Building**

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
000000 - 000028	Chairman	Confirmation of minutes of the meeting held on 7 May 2007 (LC Paper No. CB(1)1954/06-07)	
000029 - 000252	Chairman Mr Abraham SHEK Clerk	Opening remarks In response to an enquiry from Mr Abraham SHEK, the Clerk said that Mr SHEK's letter to the Administration (LC Paper No. CB(1)1415/06-07(01)) in relation to his objection to the proposed commercial developments at the Comprehensive Development Area adjoining Central Piers No. 4 to No. 6 and the commercial site to the north of Two International Finance Centre (Two IFC) was not listed on the agenda for the meeting but had been listed out in the background brief (LC Paper No. CB(1)1952/06-07(05)).	
000253 - 002026	Administration	Briefing by the Administration (LC Paper Nos. CB(1)1952/06-07(04) and CB(1)2020/06-07(01))	
002027 - 002128	Chairman	Inviting deputations to present views	
002129 - 002531	Mrs Margaret BROOKE	Presentation of views (LC Paper No. CB(1)1952/06-07(01))	
002532 - 002845	Association of Engineering Professionals in Society (AEPS)	Presentation of views (LC Paper No. CB(1)2019/06-07(01), tabled and issued to members on 29 June 2007)	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
002846 - 003356	Mr Rob PENDLETON	<p>Presentation of views</p> <p>Decentralizing Government offices to a well-connected transport hub in the New Territories would release part of the committed office floor space at the Tamar site for letting as commercial space to relieve the rents in Central, and this would be beneficial to the economy.</p> <p>The Administration could negotiate with the People's Liberation Army for surrendering the site of the headquarters of the Hong Kong Garrison in Central for commercial use or allow part of the site to be used for commercial purposes. More office developments would be beneficial to Hong Kong's service-oriented economy.</p> <p>Better utilization of the Tamar site and nearby area would increase traffic, but it could provide better opportunities to meet the land demand in Central and the aspirations of the community in the protection of the harbour. The area could also become a railway hub for several railway lines.</p>	
003357 - 003933	Action Group on Protection of the Harbour (AGPH)	<p>Presentation of views</p> <p>The results of a survey conducted by AGPH showed that out of the 351 respondents, nearly 70% knew that there was public consultation on the reassembling of the Queen's Pier and the reconstruction of the clock tower of the old Star Ferry Pier; 60% however did not know that the Administration was conducting public consultation for the planning for the Central harbourfront; 57% considered that a review on the 9.8 million square feet of proposed commercial developments was necessary; 76% considered that commercial developments in Central should be reduced and green areas and open space should be increased; and the Administration received an average mark of 39 out of 100 for its work</p>	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		<p>in protecting the harbour, with 21 respondents giving zero mark.</p> <p>There were calls from the public for in-situ reconstruction of the clock tower of the old Star Ferry Pier and in-situ preservation of the Queen's Pier but the Administration's consultation document did not include such a proposal.</p> <p>AGPH mentioned the motion passed by the Panel on Planning, Lands and Works on 25 October 2005, and expressed concern that Road P2 would be saturated by 2016 and further harbour reclamation would be required to construct more roads.</p>	
003934 - 004206	Mr Norman de BRACKINGHE	<p>Presentation of views</p> <p>The Administration was far too restrictive in considering rezoning requests and the proposals put forward by Designing Hong Kong, which would provide more space by breaking up the groundscraper, were more sensible than the plans prepared by the Administration</p> <p>Vehicle-oriented town planning would lead to more vehicles, and people-oriented town planning would attract more people.</p>	
004207 - 004847	Designing Hong Kong Harbour District (DHKHD)	<p>Presentation of views (LC Paper No. CB(1)2019/06-07(02), tabled and issued to members on 29 June 2007)</p>	
004848 - 005127	Save Our Shorelines (SOS)	<p>Presentation of views (LC Paper No. CB(1)2019/06-07(04), tabled and issued to members on 29 June 2007)</p>	
005128 - 005859	The Hong Kong Institute of Architects (HKIA)	<p>Presentation of views (LC Paper No. CB(1)2019/06-07(05), tabled and issued to members on 29 June 2007)</p>	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
005900 - 010511	The Hong Kong Institute of Planners (HKIP)	Presentation of views (LC Paper No. CB(1)2039/06-07(01), received subsequent to the meeting and issued to members on 3 July 2007)	
010512 - 010826	Society for Protection of the Harbour (SPH)	Presentation of views (LC Paper No. CB(1)1917/06-07(02))	
010827 - 011239	Civic Exchange (CEX)	Presentation of views (LC Paper No. CB(1)1952/06-07(02))	
011240 - 012303	Designing Hong Kong (DHK)	Presentation of views (LC Paper No. CB(1)1861/06-07(01); LC Paper No. CB(1)2019/06-07(03), tabled and issued to members on 29 June 2007; and LC Paper No. CB(1)2070/06-07(01), received subsequent to the meeting and issued to members on 6 July 2007)	
012304 - 013117	Administration Chairman Mr Abraham SHEK	<p>The Administration made the following response to the views of deputations --</p> <p>(a) deputations and the Administration had the same objective of creating a high quality harbourfront, and the Administration would adopt a people-oriented approach and widely canvass public views in achieving that objective;</p> <p>(b) the Outline Zoning Plans (OZPs) showed the land use zones. The footprints of buildings to be developed would not necessarily fully occupy the sites concerned; the drawings of DHK showing 100% site coverage might be misleading;</p> <p>(c) the developments on the 5.23-hectare Comprehensive Development Area could be in the form of several smaller buildings and one of the objectives of the Study was to identify an appropriate form and design of the development;</p>	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		<p>(d) proposals from DHK related mainly to the urban design aspects and could be accommodated without amendments to the relevant existing OZPs;</p> <p>(e) the maximum allowable GFA of all the proposed developments would only be about 500 000 m² and not all the developments were commercial developments; and</p> <p>(f) the Administration did not have any pre-determined stance on the locations for the reconstruction of the clock tower of the old Star Ferry Pier and the reassembling of the Queen's Pier.</p> <p>Mr Abraham SHEK commented that developers always developed a site to its maximum allowable development intensity.</p>	
013118 - 014435	Dr KWOK Ka-ki Administration	<p>Dr KWOK Ka-ki expressed the following views --</p> <p>(a) the Administration had failed to introduce enhancements to waterfront areas and reduce commercial developments in Central;</p> <p>(b) adding some 500 000 m² of commercial developments would aggravate traffic congestion of the Central-Wan Chai Bypass (CWB) and Road P2;</p> <p>(c) there were many high-rise buildings in waterfront areas and it was difficult for the public to access the waterfront;</p> <p>(d) the Administration always developed a site to its maximum allowable limit;</p> <p>(e) consultation on the reconstruction of the clock tower of the old Star Ferry Pier should have been conducted before its demolition;</p>	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		<p>(f) the public should be given sufficient time to participate in genuine consultation on the planning for the Central harbourfront; and</p> <p>(g) the survey conducted by AGPH showed that the Administration received 39 marks only with 21 respondents giving zero mark.</p> <p>The Administration responded that --</p> <p>(a) there had been extensive consultations on the planning for the Central harbourfront and objections and public comments had been considered by the Town Planning Board (TPB) before approval was given by the Chief Executive in Council to the relevant existing OZPs. The extent of reclamation had been substantially reduced and the land use proposals were significantly adjusted. The OZPs were accepted by various parties concerned;</p> <p>(b) it was necessary to construct CWB to alleviate traffic congestion;</p> <p>(c) the Administration did not necessarily maximize the development potential of all sites. For instance, the development intensities of the Police Married Quarters site in Hollywood Road and the Oil Street site had been reduced, and the relevant District Councils supported these moves; and</p> <p>(d) the Administration would continue to listen to the views of the public and strike a proper balance.</p>	
014436 - 015144	Mr Abraham SHEK	<p>Mr Abraham SHEK expressed the following views --</p> <p>(a) the Administration had failed to demonstrate and explain its planning for the harbourfront;</p>	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		<p>(b) he supported the construction of CWB but considered that adding some 500 000 m² GFA for commercial developments would be problematic;</p> <p>(c) TPB was Government-led because its Chairman was a Permanent Secretary and its secretariat was served by Government staff;</p> <p>(d) the Administration should progress with the times because the public demanded more participation in the planning process;</p> <p>(e) the waterfront should be for public enjoyment and should be designated for open space use, but the current planning could not achieve the objective;</p> <p>(f) the commercial site near Two IFC should be used as a park; and</p> <p>(g) the Study would not accomplish its objectives of guiding the development of a quality waterfront and there should be an international design competition for the Central harbourfront.</p>	
015145 - 015508	Mr James TO Administration	<p>Mr James TO expressed the following views --</p> <p>(a) the Administration should not be discouraged because the current planning was in principle not bad;</p> <p>(b) some people might object to the commercial developments near Two IFC on consideration of the effects of those developments on Two IFC, but the views of Two IFC and Four Seasons Hotel would not be much affected because the proposed developments were much lower; and the stepped heights would not create a</p>	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		<p>significant "wall effect"; and</p> <p>(c) disagreed to the view that the current planning and layout for Central would deprive the public's enjoyment of the waterfront and open space.</p> <p>The Administration thanked Mr James TO for his encouragement and comments. It would consider the views of deputations carefully and would give an explanation if some of the views could not be accepted.</p> <p>On Mr Abraham SHEK's earlier comments, the Administration pointed out that the Study had yet to put forward the urban design proposals for the area and the various development sites, it was too early to conclude at this stage whether the Study could accomplish its objectives.</p>	
015509 - 020446	Prof Patrick LAU Administration DHK	<p>Prof Patrick LAU asked whether the relevant OZPs would be amended to reduce the development intensity if there was such a demand from the public and such a recommendation from the Consultants. It would be meaningless to conduct the Study if the development intensity could not be reduced and the results of the international design competition organized by DHK would not be taken into consideration.</p> <p>The Administration responded that --</p> <p>(a) the Study would identify the appropriate design concepts and built form for the various development sites and the public would be duly engaged in the process;</p> <p>(b) based on the planning parameters of the relevant approved OZPs, the Study aimed to derive an optimum design that was also feasible for development and could meet public aspirations; and</p> <p>(c) the Consultants were independent in</p>	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		<p>providing their advice and the study findings and recommendations would be submitted to TPB for consideration.</p> <p>DHK queried whether it was possible for the Consultants to propose amendments to the relevant OZPs because the consultancy brief stated that the existing OZPs should be used as a starting point in conducting the Study.</p> <p>The Administration responded that although the Consultants' main task was to refine the urban design based on the existing planning framework of the relevant OZPs, if they found it technically infeasible to achieve an optimum design under the OZP parameters, they could reflect their views which would be submitted to TPB for consideration.</p>	
020447 - 021237	Mr Albert CHAN Administration	<p>Mr Albert CHAN expressed the following views --</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) when compared with the 1990s, the planning for the Central reclamation area at present had already shown a lot of improvements and changes; (b) the Administration should inspire confidence in the public that the planning for Central would be high quality and could meet their aspirations; (c) the design of many waterfront areas, such as Tsim Sha Tsui East, was not satisfactory; and (d) a master layout plan should be obtained through an international design competition and the Administration could then implement the planning accordingly to create a design that Hong Kong people would accept and take pride in. <p>The Administration responded that</p>	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		<p>international competition was just one of the means to produce a quality design for the harbourfront. It would not rule out the possibility of adopting innovative mechanisms such as through competition to implement some of the development proposals and it would take into consideration the results of the international design competition organized by DHK where appropriate.</p>	
021238 - 021757	DHKHD Administration	<p>DHKHD expressed the following views --</p> <p>(a) the Administration should consider the results of the international design competition organized by DHK, and whether the Administration would organize another international design competition should be a separate matter to be decided later; and</p> <p>(b) the relevant OZPs should be updated in response to changing circumstances, such as increase in traffic flow.</p> <p>The Administration clarified that --</p> <p>(a) it had been using updated traffic figures and the need for CWB had been repeatedly confirmed;</p> <p>(b) CWB and Road P2 would not become saturated in 2016 and the volume to capacity ratio of CWB would only be 0.7 by then; and</p> <p>(c) the traffic arising from the proposed developments should be some 3 000 passenger car units (pcu) per hour instead of 7 000 as cited by some deputations.</p>	
021758 - 022953	Mr Alan LEONG Administration	<p>Mr Alan LEONG expressed the following views --</p> <p>(a) it was frustrating that the Administration only repeated its decisions and policies when members</p>	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		<p>and deputations presented data for rational discussion;</p> <p>(b) some professionals had revealed that discussions at the workshops organized under the Study were constrained by the pre-conditions set by the Administration;</p> <p>(c) the Administration should keep up with the times and try to understand the aspirations of members and deputations and respond to those aspirations in a concrete way;</p> <p>(d) the solution to traffic congestion was to halt further developments; and</p> <p>(e) the proposed commercial developments near Two IFC were not shown in earlier plans provided by the Administration.</p> <p>He also asked to what extent the Administration agreed to HKIA's views and how it would respond to the point made by SOS that 70% of the public expressed support for Electronic Road Pricing (ERP) or were neutral on the issue.</p> <p>The Administration responded that --</p> <p>(a) views expressed by deputations were not in conflict with the objectives of the Study. The Administration would carefully consider their views, including those of HKIA which also aimed to improve the urban design for the area;</p> <p>(b) the Administration would carry out the Study in a pragmatic way and a clearer picture on the urban design proposals for the area and the various development sites would emerge at Stage 2 Public Engagement when models and options would be presented; and</p>	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		<p>(c) the Expert Panel on Sustainable Transport Planning and Central-Wan Chai Bypass (Expert Panel), which was independent and consisted of academics and professionals, considered that ERP alone could not solve traffic congestion completely and agreed on the need to construct CWB. The two measures were complementary.</p>	
022954 - 023813	Dr KWOK Ka-ki Administration AGPH	<p>Dr KWOK Ka-ki asked whether the Administration had consulted the public on the construction of massive commercial developments at the Central harbourfront.</p> <p>The Administration responded that the public was consulted on the various land uses at the Central harbourfront during the preparation of the relevant OZPs and the Study itself had also included public engagement on the urban design proposals during different stages of the study process.</p> <p>Dr KWOK Ka-ki considered that the previous consultation was not genuine consultation because of the limited channels for dissemination of information. He sought clarification on the total GFA of the proposed developments in the study area and queried whether the planning parameters specified in the relevant OZPs had to be adhered to in conducting the Study. He requested the Administration to provide the consultancy brief and agreement for the Study.</p> <p>The Administration responded that the total GFA cited by some deputations was not up-to-date because the GFAs for some developments, such as the Central Government Complex and the Legislative Council Complex, had been substantially reduced. GFAs for ancillary car parks should also be excluded from the calculation of GFAs for commercial</p>	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		developments. It would provide updated figures on the GFAs of planned developments in the study area together with a comparison with the previous figures.	
023814 - 024510	Mr Abraham SHEK Administration	<p>Mr Abraham SHEK expressed the following views --</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) he was pleased to note that the relevant OZPs could be amended if necessary; (b) the Administration should provide a response to the suggestion of organizing an international design competition; (c) he disagreed to Mr James TO's views concerning the proposed commercial developments near Two IFC; (d) the subject should be discussed again; and (e) there should be a review on the composition of TPB. <p>The Administration responded that --</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) OZPs were updated from time to time and any public views requesting to amend the relevant OZPs would be considered by the TPB; and (b) the suggestion of organizing an international design competition would be relayed to the relevant Bureau Secretary. 	
024511 - 024847	Mr Albert CHAN Administration	<p>Mr Albert CHAN expressed the following views --</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) many conflicts emerged at the late stage of the planning for the Central harbourfront because the Administration did not present any master layout plan during the initial stage of the planning; and 	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		<p>(b) there would still be many disputes and conflicts in the planning for the Central harbourfront even at the implementation stage if the Administration did not change its planning approach.</p> <p>The Administration responded that there were different approaches in planning greenfield areas like West Kowloon and developed areas like Central. The planning for the Central harbourfront would adopt an appropriate approach and a master layout plan and an urban design framework setting out the master design would be produced under the Study.</p>	
024848 - 025337	CEx SOS Administration	<p>CEx commented that carpark structures that would block the view and have an impact on the waterfront; and asked whether the figure of 3 000 pcu per hour cited by the Administration was for both east-bound and west-bound traffic.</p> <p>SOS pointed out that the survey conducted by the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee showed that 70% of the respondents either supported ERP or were neutral on the issue, but the report of the Expert Panel stated that social acceptance was uncertain. SOS tended to believe in the former because polling had not been conducted by the latter.</p> <p>The Administration responded that --</p> <p>(a) it would provide updated GFAs for the proposed developments;</p> <p>(b) the figure of some 3 000 pcu per hour covered both directions; and</p> <p>(c) in interpreting public opinion on ERP, it was important to take into consideration whether the public knew all the costs and benefits involved.</p>	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
025338 - 025602	Dr KWOK Ka-ki Mr Albert CHAN Chairman Administration	<p>Dr KWOK Ka-ki suggested that the subject should be discussed again in September 2007.</p> <p>The Administration responded that whether September 2007 was the appropriate timing would depend on the progress of the Consultants in processing the views received during Stage 1 Public Engagement and formulating the urban design proposals for the Stage 2 Public Engagement. If the Consultants had not yet completed their work by September 2007, then October 2007 might be a more appropriate timing.</p> <p>The Chairman advised that the Clerk would liaise with the Administration on the matter.</p> <p>Mr Albert CHAN suggested that the Chairman should convey in writing to the Chief Executive of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region the suggestion of organizing an international design competition for the Central harbourfront. Other members agreed.</p>	
025603 - 025631	Chairman	Any other business	