

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)985/06-07
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/PL/PLW/1

Panel on Planning, Lands and Works

**Minutes of special meeting
held on Thursday, 14 December 2006 at 4:30 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 Miriam LAU Kin-yee, GBS, JP
Hon CHOY So-yuk, 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

Members attending : Hon LEE Cheuk-yan
Hon CHEUNG Man-kwong
Dr Hon YEUNG Sum
Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP
Hon WONG Kwok-hing, MH
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung
Hon TAM Heung-man

Members absent : Dr Hon LUI Ming-wah, SBS, JP
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP
Hon Mrs Sophie LEUNG LAU Yau-fun, SBS, JP
Hon WONG Yung-kan, JP
Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, GBS, JP
Hon Vincent FANG Kang, JP
Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming, SBS, JP

Public officers attending : **Agenda item I**

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

Mrs Rita LAU, JP
Permanent Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands
(Planning & Lands)

Mrs Ava NG TSE Suk-ying, JP
Director of Planning

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

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

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

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 Planning issues relating to the reprovisioning of the Star Ferry Pier in Central including the proposed preservation of the building structure and clock tower of the old Star Ferry Pier

(LC Paper No. CB(1)511/06-07(01) -- Letter dated 13 December 2006 from Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki

LC Paper No. CB(1)511/06-07(02) -- A Survey Report of Historical Buildings and Structures within the Project Area of the Central Reclamation Phase III

LC Paper No. CB(1)511/06-07(03) -- Press release dated 12 December 2006 on "AAB reaffirms no objection raised to Star Ferry Pier demolition plan in 2002" issued by the Administration

LC Paper No. CB(1)2208/05-06(02) -- Information paper on "Reprovisioning of Star Ferry Pier in Central" provided by the Administration

LC Paper No. CB(1)2240/05-06 -- Terms of the motion passed by the Panel at the special meeting on 20 September 2006

LC Paper No. CB(1)46/06-07(01) -- Administration's written response to the motion passed at the special meeting on 20 September 2006

LC Paper No. CB(1)414/06-07 -- Minutes of special meeting on 20 September 2006)

The Chairman said that the special meeting was convened at the request of Dr KWOK Ka-ki and in view of the public's deep concern about the demolition of the old Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower, and the fact that Members were not aware of a survey report of a heritage consultant completed in 2001 when the Panel discussed the issue at its two previous meetings on 20 September and 14 November 2006. The Chairman said that some members had suggested inviting the parties concerned to attend this Panel meeting to express their views. However, in view of the short notice of this meeting, there was not sufficient time to invite all the deputations who had previously given views on the subject to this meeting. He suggested that should members consider it necessary, the Panel hold another meeting to receive deputations' views on the subject.

2. After discussion, it was agreed that the Panel would hold a special meeting on 18 December 2006 to further discuss the subject. Relevant experts in the community and interested groups would be invited to give advice and views on whether and how the old Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower should be preserved.

3. With reference to the motion passed by the Panel at its meeting on 20 September 2006, the Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (SHPL) said that the Administration had issued a written response on 11 October 2006 explaining that the Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower had to be demolished owing to the planned public works projects in the area. However, the Administration would consider, from a urban design point of view, how to incorporate some special features of the old Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower in the new Central harbourfront under the study on the "Refinement of the Urban Design Framework for the Central Reclamation and Preparation of Planning/Design Briefs for Key Development Sites" (Central Reclamation Urban Design Study). At the Panel meeting on 14 November 2006, he had reiterated that the old Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower had to be demolished, and the clock tower would be reconstructed at an appropriate site in the future Central harbourfront promenade. In relation to the suggestion of Prof Patrick LAU made at that meeting, the Government had recorded the features of the old Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower through an advanced laser scanning technology. The issue had been discussed again at the adjournment debate of the Legislative Council (LegCo) on 13 December 2006 and he had spelt out the Government's stance in an article published in the local press on the day of this meeting. SHPL stressed that the Government respected the public's aspirations and would reconstruct the clock tower at a suitable site of the future Central harbourfront.

4. Ir Dr Raymond HO said that it was always difficult to strike a balance between the conservation of heritage buildings and urban development in a modern city. The old Star Ferry Pier clock tower should be retained and modern technology should be able to preserve the tower intact so that it would reappear in the Central harbourfront in future. The Government should take this opportunity to better plan the conservation of built heritage in the territory.

5. Mr WONG Kwok-hing sought clarification on whether the clock tower of the old Star Ferry Pier would be "relocated" or "reconstructed" and whether the rhythmic sound of the clock could be retained as it was a part of the fond "collective memory" of Hong Kong people. He hoped that the clock tower could be "relocated" like the Murray House, and he gathered that it was technically feasible to relocate the clock tower.

6. SHPL said that the clock tower would be "reconstructed" in the future Central harbourfront. It was impracticable and infeasible to retain the parts of the pier building and the clock tower and then relocate them in their holistic form somewhere in the future Central harbourfront or in another place. He was not sure whether the sound of the clock could be revived. He stressed that the clock was the property of the "Star" Ferry Company, Limited.

7. Dr KWOK Ka-ki said that on 13 December 2006, he and nine LegCo Members had met SHPL and made three modest requests, namely a meeting should be held to discuss the issue; experts and scholars should be invited to study the ways to preserve the old Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower, and demolition of

the Pier and the clock tower should be deferred until after the meeting and the experts had given their advice. However, when Members were debating the issue at the Council meeting later on the same day, demolition works at the old Star Ferry Pier had been in progress. Dr KWOK pointed out that the heritage consultant's report in February 2001 had suggested that ways should be found to preserve and relocate the Star Ferry clock tower and demolition was not a desirable option. The Administration had not disclosed the report to LegCo Members in 2002 when CRIII was considered. The credibility of the Government and whether the public had been misled were serious questions at issue. Many people had not been aware that the relocation of the Star Ferry Pier meant the demolition of the old pier and its clock tower. Dr KWOK further expressed disappointment that the Administration had not arranged a meeting between experts from the Government and those from the community to discuss ways to preserve the old Star Ferry Pier. He said that some engineers had pointed out that the construction plans of Road P2 and the underground infrastructure facilities at CRIII could in fact be altered to enable the retention of the old Star Ferry Pier in-situ. He said that when the bulldozers pulled down the old Star Ferry Pier, the Government had destroyed the confidence of the public in it and hurt the feelings of Hong Kong people.

8. SHPL responded that the Government's stance had been spelt out clearly at previous meetings of the Panel and had not changed. Since the decision had been made on the CRIII project and the associated reprovisioning plans, relevant contracts had been awarded and the works had proceeded as planned. The Permanent Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (PSPL) explained that when the draft Central District (Extension) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) covering the CRIII was exhibited for public inspection in 1999, only one objection was concerned with the relocation of the Star Ferry Pier. In considering the objection, the Town Planning Board (TPB) recognized the historical significance and importance of the "Star Ferry" icon as one of the landmarks and major tourist attractions in Hong Kong and agreed that its identity should be recreated in the new Central waterfront. Thereafter, after a continuous dialogue with the ferry company, it was agreed that the design of the new Star Ferry Pier should be modeled on the pier building in 1912. When the draft Central District (Extension) OZP was gazetted again in 2002, no more objections concerning the relocation of the Star Ferry Pier had been received. When the Administration applied for funding for the CRIII project in 2002, the Administration had explained in detail to Members the reprovisioning arrangements of the Star Ferry Pier and the infeasibility of retaining the Pier at the original site.

9. Mr LEE Wing-tat said that it was regretful for the matter to have developed to such a state. When Members were debating the demolition of the Star Ferry Pier at the Council meeting on 13 December 2006, the Police cleared protestors from the pier site for continuation of the demolition works. It was not a good example of maintaining a good relationship between the executive and the legislature. He said that at the meeting with SHPL on that day, he had pointed out that unless the public could see that the Government had attempted and exhausted all means to preserve the old Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower, and yet found it

necessary to demolish the building, the public would not be satisfied. Mr LEE said that he was very disappointed that SHPL had refused to convene a meeting of experts from the Government and from the community to discuss ways to preserve the old Star Ferry Pier. Mr LEE requested that the Government experts concerned should be present at the special meeting of the Panel on Monday, 18 December 2006 when experts from the community would be invited to discuss ways to preserve the old Star Ferry Pier. Meanwhile, the Government should suspend the demolition works. He pointed out that the public's aspiration regarding the preservation of heritage buildings had changed since 2000 and the Government should respond in time to such changes.

10. SHPL said that a balance had to be struck between development of a city and the preservation of heritage buildings and sites. He pointed out that every component of the whole CR III project had undergone detailed consideration and statutory consultation procedures, and contracts had already been awarded. Any major or fundamental changes to the plan would be impracticable at this advanced stage of work. He stressed that it would be impracticable not to demolish the old Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower at this stage, and reiterated that the special features of the old Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower would be incorporated into the design of the new Central harbourfront and the details would be worked out under the Central Reclamation Urban Design Study.

11. Dr YEUNG Sum said that the Government had always accorded priority to property development and viewed the conservation of heritage buildings/sites as a subsidiary consideration. The Government should review its town planning policy by according priority to the conservation of heritage buildings/sites. He suggested that the Government should set up a statutory body, vested with the authority to compensate the affected parties, to oversee the conservation of heritage buildings/sites. Referring to the "Survey Report of Historical Buildings and Structures within the Project Area of the Central Reclamation Phase III" (Survey Report), Dr YEUNG pointed out that the heritage consultant had clearly stated that the old Star Ferry Pier, especially its clock tower, formed an eye-catching icon for both locals and tourists, and it should be relocated despite that its age did not meet the minimum requirement of historical buildings.

12. SHPL stressed that high-rise buildings would not be built in the new Central and Wan Chai reclamation areas, a large area of which would mainly be used as amenity areas for the public. As regards the suggestion of setting up a statutory body to oversee the conservation of heritage buildings/sites, he pointed out that the subject fell outside the purview of this Panel and his Bureau, and he would relay the suggestion to the Home Affairs Bureau.

13. Mr Albert CHAN opined that it was a serious failure of duty on the part of the Administration in withholding the Survey Report, which had made very constructive proposals. The Administration should be reprimanded for this. He further said that the Administration should provide detailed information to substantiate its claim that the various relevant statutory and advisory bodies and

other organizations had supported the demolition of the old Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower. Mr CHAN stressed that in the deliberation of the proposals related to CRIII, members had mainly focused on the wider issues such as land use, and the Administration had distorted the views of members in claiming that members did not object to the demolition of the old Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower. He said that to be fair to the LegCo, the Administration should provide evidence as to when, where and at which meetings Members had supported the demolition arrangements.

14. SHPL responded that in most circumstances, it was impossible to maintain records specifically on who had agreed or disagreed to a particular proposal, nor was it practical to require every member of a committee to sign on record to signify agreement to a proposal. He further said that the Survey Report had all along been available for public scrutiny. Since some people had indicated in the previous week that they could not download the Report from the Internet, the relevant department had immediately rectified the technical problem. He stressed that the Antiquities Advisory Board (AAB) had discussed the Survey Report. The Assistant Director of Leisure and Cultural Services (Heritage & Museums) (AD/H&M) said that the Survey Report had all along been available at the Environment Protection Department for public scrutiny. The heritage consultant was commissioned by the Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO) of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department to conduct a survey about the impact of the CRIII project on the historical buildings and structures within the project area. Referring to paragraph 6.1.1 of the Survey Report, AD(H&M) pointed out that the consultant had recommended that since the old Star Ferry Pier could not be preserved on its original site, the Government should consider to reconstruct the clock tower. In fact, this was the approach adopted by the Government.

15. Miss TAM Heung-man considered that what the consultant had recommended in 2001 was to preserve the old Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower as far as possible. She asked as to when the Government had conducted public consultation specifically on the issue. She pointed out that at the meeting of the Public Works Subcommittee on 5 June 2002 at which the funding proposal for implementation of CRIII was considered, the Administration did not mention about the Survey Report, and now the Administration claimed that there was no objection from Members at that time to demolish the old Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower. Miss TAM further said that at the special meeting of the Panel on 20 September 2006, many organizations had raised objection to the demolition arrangements and supported the preservation of the old Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower. She stressed that the old Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower was an icon for "collective memory" and the Government should respect the public's aspirations and Members' opinions in the preservation of the Pier and its clock tower. She asked whether the Government would examine the legal and cost implications of canceling or modifying the relevant works contracts so as to enable the preservation of the old Star Ferry Pier.

16. SHPL responded that it was not advisable for the Government to modify the terms of public works contracts lightly after the award of contracts as it would affect Hong Kong's image as an international business centre.

17. With reference to paragraph 6.1.1 of the Survey Report, Dr Fernando CHEUNG pointed out that the consultant had recommended categorically that the clock tower, if not the whole Star Ferry Pier building, should be "relocated", and not "reconstructed", at a new site suitably in harmony with the surroundings. He opined that the Government had misled the public as its proposal was to reconstruct a replica of the clock tower in the future Central harbourfront. Only by relocation of the clock tower would the icon for "collective memory" be restored. Dr CHEUNG pointed out that at the meeting in March 2002, the AAB had not voted on the issue of demolishing the Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower, and it could not be said that AAB did not raise any objection to the demolition of the Pier and its clock tower. In fact, based on AAB's meeting minutes, a member of AAB had expressed grave concern over the demolition of the Pier and its clock tower. He opined that it was too much a co-incidence that the Survey Report had not been accessible on the Internet in previous weeks.

18. SHPL stated that the Government's stance had been clearly made known to the public, i.e. the clock tower would be reconstructed at a new site in the Central harbourfront, and it was regretted that the use of different words in the press releases might have caused some confusion about the situation. AD(H&M) added that the heritage consultant was engaged by the AMO to study the impact of the CR III project on the Star Ferry Pier, the Queen's Pier and the City Hall. The consultant was not an expert on the technical aspects of preservation of historical buildings, which had to be considered by the relevant professionals in the Government. He pointed out that based on the meeting record, AAB members had not expressed particular concern on the demolition of the old Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower when the Government consulted the AAB in 2002 about the implications of the CR III on the historical buildings in the area, though one member had raised concern about the Queen's Pier. During the process, the AAB had expressed opinions on the design of the new Central harbourfront but had not raised any objection to the demolition of the old Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower. AD(H&M) said that at the meeting on 12 December 2006, the AAB had reviewed the discussion paper and minutes of meeting regarding its relevant deliberation of the subject in 2002, which revealed that the AAB did not raise any objection to the plan.

19. Mr LEE Cheuk-yan said that it was an extremely dramatic scene that when, on the previous day, Members were discussing the demolition of the old Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower, the Police were clearing demonstrators from the site of the Pier for the demolition works. He pointed out that strong governance should not mean that public opinions could be ignored. Mr LEE said that if the Government respected the recommendation of the heritage consultant to relocate the clock tower, it should mobilize the technical departments to work out the arrangements for relocating the clock tower. He enquired about the timing of

demolishing the clock tower, as any expert advice to preserve and relocate the clock tower at the special meeting of the Panel on 18 December 2006 would be wasted if the clock tower had been demolished before the meeting.

20. SHPL responded that the Administration had explained the Government's stance to the LegCo on previous occasions, including the Panel meeting on 14 November and the Council meeting on 13 December 2006. He pointed out that the infrastructure project works at CRIII had already commenced and action was in hand to demolish the old Star Ferry Pier. Having regard to the public's aspiration of preserving the old Star Ferry Pier, the Government would consider how to reconstruct the clock tower in the new Central harbourfront. He reiterated that it was impracticable to retain the existing Pier and its clock tower. As to whether this Panel should convene another special meeting to discuss the same subject, it was a matter for Members to decide.

21. Ms Audrey EU said that it would be inconceivable for the United States and British governments to demolish the Bell of Liberty and the Big Ben respectively, and yet the Hong Kong Government decided to demolish the clock tower of the old Star Ferry Pier. Ms EU said that it was not uncommon that public works projects were modified through variation orders, and it would not be infeasible to make modifications to the infrastructure projects at CRIII in order to preserve the old Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower. Ms EU pointed out that whilst the Government had decided to demolish the Pier and clock tower, place the clock in a museum, and rebuild a replica of the clock tower in the future Central harbourfront promenade, the Government should have considered other options for preservation of the Pier and the clock tower. She requested that the Administration should provide detailed information on the time and financial implications of the different options for preservation of the Pier and clock tower, namely the preservation of the whole Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower, the preservation of the horizontal building of the Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower, the preservation of the clock tower only, and the demolition and reconstruction of the clock tower at the original site. She requested that the information should be provided before the Panel's special meeting on 18 December 2006.

22. SHPL pointed out that the existing plans for Road P2, the Extended Overrun Tunnel of the Airport Railway and Man Yiu Street drainage box culvert all ran underneath or beside the old Star Ferry Pier, which therefore had to be demolished. He said that the Administration could provide a written response detailing the reasons for the need to demolish the old Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower. As regards the information requested by Ms EU, SHPL said that given the short notice, the Administration could not provide the information by 18 December 2006.

23. Ms Audrey EU said that if there was a will, there was a way to retain and incorporate the old Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower into the design of the new Central harbourfront; and it was therefore necessary to convene a meeting to seek advice from the experts. She strongly requested that the Administration should hold up the demolition works until after the experts had given advice on the ways to preserve the old Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower.

24. SHPL explained that the OZP covering the CRIII, which had been approved through the statutory procedures, did not include the old Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower. The arrangement to demolish the old Pier and its clock tower had been decided after public consultation and undergoing the proper statutory procedures. The Administration's current proposal had struck the best balance having regard to all relevant considerations.

25. Miss CHOY So-yuk enquired as to the reason for having to demolish the old Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower immediately, and the financial implications for compensating the contractor if the demolition works were deferred for, say one week or one month. She opined that the meeting with the experts should be held even if the clock tower had been demolished before the meeting. Miss CHOY said that the decision of demolishing the old Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower was made before the public had expressed a strong desire to retain the ferry pier and clock tower recently. She asked which officer in the Administration should be held responsible for demolishing the clock tower immediately if the experts advised at the Panel meeting on 18 December 2006 that it would be feasible to retain the old Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower at the original site, or relocate them intact to another site in the new Central harbourfront. She said that the AAB had held a meeting on 12 December 2006 to discuss the preservation of the old Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower, and according to one of the Board members, the upper part of the old Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower could be relocated intact to a new site.

26. SHPL reiterated that in response to the motion passed at the special meeting of the Panel on 20 September 2006, the Administration had given a written response on 11 October 2006 that the old Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower would be demolished, and the Government would consider how to reconstruct the clock tower in the new Central harbourfront. SHPL said that the decision of demolishing the old Pier and its clock tower was collectively made within the Government and the head of the responsible Bureau was himself.

27. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung asked whether SHPL had met the Chief Executive and the Chief Secretary for Administration before meeting Members to discuss the Government's actions in demolishing the old Starr Ferry Pier clock tower on the previous day. He opined that although the Government had consulted various relevant bodies on the issue, it accepted only the advice which supported its decision to demolish the old Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower. In the process, the heritage consultant's recommendation that the old Pier and its clock tower

should be relocated to a new site had been ignored. Mr LEUNG was of the view that the decision to demolish the old Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower was a political one, and not out of technical considerations. He doubted the need to demolish the old Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower immediately as it was not uncommon that a construction project was held up for two to three days owing to inclement weather. He believed that the Government wanted to remove the historical icon, i.e. the clock tower, as soon as possible so that the public could no longer call for the preservation of the old Pier and its clock tower. He said that the Government was losing its credibility in such actions.

28. In response to Miss TAM Heung-man's request for provision of the papers and minutes of the AAB meeting held in 2002 to discuss the arrangements for the old Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower in the Central Reclamation Project, AD(H&M) undertook to liaise with the LegCo Secretariat to arrange for the provision of related documents.

(Post-meeting note: Subsequent to the meeting, the Administration provided a summary of the paper and a summary of the discussion of the AAB meeting on 13 March 2002. The information (LC Paper No. CB(1)575/06-07(01) was issued to members on 21 December 2006.)

29. Mr Alan LEONG said that the crux of the issue was whether the Government was willing to take into consideration the current public aspirations in the formulation of the policy on preservation of historical buildings vis-à-vis urban development projects. He was of the view that the existing public consultation mechanism of the Government had failed to take into account the recent trend of public opinions on preservation of historical buildings, despite that the Government had conducted the so called public consultation exercises in 1999 and 2000. Mr LEONG said that a responsible government would not allow the findings of the public consultation exercises conducted seven years ago to override the current aspirations of the public on preservation of historical buildings, or the harmony of the community would be undermined. The Government should not consider that preservation of historical buildings would hinder the development of the city. In fact, many experts had expressed the view that the old Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower could be retained without adversely affecting the development of the Central harbourfront. Mr LEONG shared members' view that the demolition of the old Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower should be held in abeyance pending the experts' advice on the ways to preserve the historical landmark.

30. SHPL responded that he had heard Mr LEONG's views clearly.

Motion proposed by Dr KWOK Ka-ki

31. Dr KWOK Ka-ki put forward the following motion, which was seconded by Miss CHOY So-yuk, for the Panel's consideration, a copy of which was tabled at the meeting:

"本事務委員會促請政府立即暫停拆卸天星碼頭工程，及盡快召開專家會議，以探討各個保存的方案。"

(Translation)

"That the Panel urges the Government to immediately suspend the demolition works of the Star Ferry Pier and expeditiously convene an experts meeting, so as to examine the various preservation options."

32. The Chairman considered that the proposed motion was directly related to the agenda item under discussion and members agreed to proceed with the motion. Four members voted for and one member voted against the motion. The Chairman declared the motion passed.

33. Prof Patrick LAU said that in his letter to the Chairman, which was tabled at the meeting, he had suggested that the Government should organize an open competition in which the public could participate in the design of the future Central harbourfront promenade.

34. The Director of Planning and PSPL responded that the Planning Department would commission a consultancy study to carry out the Central Reclamation Urban Design Study to refine the existing urban design framework of CRIII and to prepare planning/design briefs or guidelines for key development sites in the subject area. In the course of the study, relevant stakeholders, professional bodies and the public would be consulted. Hence, the study could also achieve the objective of public engagement in the planning process.

35. Prof Patrick LAU was of the view that a public design competition for the development of the Central harbourfront promenade was more preferable.

36. In response to Prof Patrick LAU's enquiry regarding the future of the Queen's Pier, PSPL said that there was a new site in the relevant OZP for reprovisioning of the Queen's Pier and the old pier would be demolished.

II Any other business

Date of next meeting

37. The Chairman said that a special meeting of the Panel would be held on Monday, 18 December 2006 at 5:30 pm to further discuss the planning arrangements regarding the old Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower.

38. SHPL remarked that owing to the short notice, the Administration might not be able to send a representative to attend the special meeting. Dr KWOK Ka-ki said that the Administration should be reprimanded if no Government representative attended the special Panel meeting.

39. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 6:30 pm.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
26 February 2007