

Harbourfront Commission
Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island

Minutes of Twenty-first Meeting

Date : 24 November 2015
Time : 2:30 p.m.
Venue : Conference Room (Room G46) at Upper Ground Floor,
Hong Kong Heritage Discovery Centre, Kowloon Park,
Tsim Sha Tsui

Present

Mr Nicholas BROOKE	Chair
Mrs Margaret BROOKE	Representing Business Environment Council
Mrs Karen BARRETTO	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Freddie HAI	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Evans IU	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Dr Peter Cookson SMITH	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Mr Ivan HO	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Mr Shuki LEUNG	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Mr CHAN Hok-fung	
Miss Lily CHOW	
Mr Eric FOK	
Mr Hans Joachim ISLER	
Mr Vincent NG	
Miss Christine AU	Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Edward LEUNG	Senior Manager (Tourism) 2, Tourism Commission (TC)
Mr CHAN Chung-yuen	Chief Traffic Engineer/Hong Kong, Transport Department (TD)
Mr MAK Chi-biu	Chief Engineer/Hong Kong 1, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Mr David Stanley CHAIONG	Chief Leisure Manager (Hong Kong West), Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Ms Ginger KIANG	District Planning Officer/Hong Kong, Planning Department (PlanD)
Mr Larry CHU	Secretary

In Attendance

Mr Frederick YU	Assistant Secretary (Harbour) Special Duties, DEVB
Miss Ingrid TJENDRO	Assistant Secretary (Harbour) 2, DEVB
Mr Peter MOK	Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB

Absent with Apologies

Mr LEUNG Kong-yui	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Mr NG Cho-nam	Representing Conservancy Association
Sr Emily LI	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Ir Raymond CHAN	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Engineers
Mr Walter CHAN	
Ms Vivian LEE	

For Agenda Item 3

Mr Kelvin IP	Director, Ronald Lu & Partners (Hong Kong) Ltd
Ms Bella FAN	Senior Associate, Ronald Lu & Partners (Hong Kong) Ltd
Miss Camay LAM	Director, AXXA Group Limited

For Agenda Item 4

Mr Patrick FUNG	Senior Town Planner/Studies & Research 5, PlanD
-----------------	---

For Agenda Item 5

Ms Ginger KIANG	District Planning Officer/Hong Kong, PlanD
Mr Derek TSE	Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong 5, PlanD

Action

Welcoming Message

The Chair welcomed all to the meeting and informed Members that Mr Edward LEUNG, Senior Manager (Tourism) 2 of TC was attending on behalf of Ms Emily MO and Mr David Stanley CHAIONG, Chief Leisure Manager (Hong Kong West) of LCSD was attending on behalf of Mr Richard WONG.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 20th Meeting

1.1 **The Chair** said that the Secretariat circulated the draft minutes

Action

of the last meeting to Members on 11 November 2015, and no comment from Members was received. There being no proposed amendment, the draft minutes were confirmed at the meeting.

Item 2 Matters Arising

A. Greening at the Central and Western District Promenade (Central Section) (paragraph 4.3 of the minutes of the 20th meeting)

2.1 **The Chair** said that in response to Members' comments made at the last meeting, LCSD had submitted a paper on measures to enhance the landscape and greening at the Central and Western District Promenade (Central Section). The paper was circulated to Members on 11 November 2015.

2.2 **Mr David Stanley CHAIONG** informed the meeting that no further comments were received from Members.

B. Inland Lot No. 9027 and Adjoining Government Land at I/O Java Road and Tin Chiu Street, North Point, Hong Kong – Detailed Design of the Western Part of the Site (paragraph 4.5 of the minutes of the 20th meeting)

2.3 **The Chair** informed Members that the proponent would consult Members on the design for the western part of the residential development under Agenda Item 3 of this meeting.

C. Land Use Review on the Western Part of Kennedy Town (paragraph 4.7 of the minutes of the 20th meeting)

2.4 **The Chair** said that PlanD would consult Members on the conceptual design of the waterfront area under Agenda Item 5 of this meeting.

D. Temporary on-street meter parking for coaches at Hoi Yu Street, Quarry Bay, Hong Kong (paragraphs 7.12 and 7.14 of the minutes of the 20th meeting)

2.5 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** queried whether the future development at the ex-North Point Estate site could accommodate all the coaches picking up visitors at Java Road every evening. He added that from his own observation, only a

Action

few coaches have been using the temporary coach parking area at Hoi Yu Street every evening for about 45 minutes. Most coaches has chosen to park at other streets in Quarry Bay and North Point to avoid monitoring of the Police. He opined that the Government should maintain a list of vehicle registrations of coaches picking up visitors at Java Road and their stopover time record for further analysis on whether the provision of coach parking spaces within the future development at ex-North Point Estate site would be sufficient. He objected to using the harbourfront areas for open-air car parking purpose.

- 2.6 **The Chair** said that the Transport and Housing Bureau and TD would be invited to report to the Commission on the latest situation of temporary coach and goods vehicle parking areas within the harbourfront areas in Q1 2016. He added that the Eastern District Office (EDO) should be invited to report to the Task Force on the effectiveness of the temporary coach parking area at Hoi Yu Street in Q1 2016.

TD

EDO

E. *Proposed University of Chicago Center in Hong Kong at the ex-Victoria Road Detention Centre, Victoria Road, Mount Davis (paragraph 4.4 of the minutes of the 20th meeting)*

- 2.7 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** commented that he was concerned about not only the ex-Victoria Road Detention Centre site but the entire Jubilee Battery site. This heritage site should be enhanced holistically without leaving a part dilapidated. The Government should provide resources to revitalise the site, including those areas not included in the University of Chicago's project. Separately, the Government should ensure that the fences to be erected by the University of Chicago Centre would not cut through the existing facilities such as underground tunnels.

- 2.8 **The Chair** asked the Secretariat to liaise with relevant bureaux and departments to provide a written response.

**the
Secretariat**

(Post-meeting note: A written response was circulated to Members on 17 February 2016.)

Item 3 Design of the Western Part of Proposed Comprehensive Development at Inland Lot No. 9027 and Adjoining Government Land at J/O Java Road and Tin Chiu Street, North Point, Hong Kong (Paper No. TFHK/14/2015)

- 3.1 **The Chair** welcomed the project team to the meeting.
- 3.2 In response to the Chair's invitation, **Mr Freddie HAI** declared that his company was involved in the hotel development in the proximity of the Comprehensive Development Area (CDA). **The Chair** decided that Mr HAI could stay but refrain from participate in the discussion of this item.
- 3.3 **Mr Kelvin IP** and **Miss Camay LAM** of the project team presented the design of the western part of the future development at ex-North Point Estate site with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 3.4 **The Chair** commented that restaurant patrons at the podium floor might be affected by traffic noise. Separately, he queried if the design could bring an attractive view for restaurant patrons in the outdoor dining areas.
- 3.5 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** enquired about the followings:
 - (a) the estimated proportion of soft landscaping within the site, as he considered that hard pavement might have occupied a significant portion of the area according to the presented plans;
 - (b) whether the alfresco dining area could be extended into the Emergency Vehicular Access (EVA) as tables and chairs could be moveable and would not block the passage of emergency vehicles;
 - (c) the tree species selected and the estimated proportion of shaded area that visitors could enjoy at the lawn;
 - (d) the alignment of pedestrian routes from the North Point Ferry Piers to transportation nodes such as the North Point MTR station and nearby bus stops and whether the routes were covered;
 - (e) the reason for putting two civic plazas at the locations of

Action

major pedestrian flow; and

- (f) the design of railing and the boundary where the existing railing would be reconstructed.

3.6 **Mr Evans IU** opined that there was no public water feature on ground level. He suggested incorporating water features into the design to serve as focal points for pedestrians.

3.7 **Mr Kelvin IP** made the following responses:-

- (a) certain areas would be opened up for alfresco dining while the major portion of the restaurant would be enclosed within the development. The development would be distant from the Island Eastern Corridor (IEC) and buffered by a large piece of open space. Restaurant patrons at outdoor areas should not be affected by traffic noise;
- (b) the second floor of the building was about one meter lower than the road level of IEC. Restaurant patrons sitting there would not see the running traffic but could still enjoy the view of the open space underneath;
- (c) it was the lease condition to provide a EVA along the waterfront promenade to serve the piers, and another EVA was also required to serve the development itself. To minimise the impact of traffic noise from both IEC and Java Road, the residential towers had to be situated in the middle of the site. Taking into account these constraints and the technical requirements in the building code, the two EVAs could not be combined into one. He added that the EVA serving the development was a few metres away from the proposed outdoor dining area; and
- (d) the project team would further enhance the design by providing street furniture and platforms to differentiate the leisure part from EVA.

3.8 **Miss Camay LAM** supplemented as follows:-

- (a) on soft landscaping, the current design complied with the planning requirement of incorporating 30% of

Action

greenery at ground level. The same requirement was applicable to the open space (POS), the waterfront promenade and private development;

- (b) 30% greenery was provided along the waterfront promenade and POS. Taking into account other public facilities such as pet garden, fitness station and EVAs to be included, there would be little space left for incorporating water features at the ground level;
- (c) the two civic squares would be provided as focal points for POS visitors instead of gathering points; and
- (d) the project team was working with LCSD on the selection of tree species that could provide shades. Around 200 trees, including those to be retained and new trees, would be provided in POS. These trees would be provided at a five-metre interval to allow sufficient space for their growth. The shades to be provided by the trees may not be full in the initial phase but would increase gradually.

3.9 Mr Ivan HO made the following comments:-

- (a) the proponent should provide a holistic urban design plan showing the interfaces with the developments to its east and west;
- (b) the proponent should reconsider incorporating water features into the design as they could help reduce heat radiation in summer and create a comfortable ambiance for POS visitors;
- (c) The proponent should provide the design of railing, signage and street furniture along the waterfront promenade for Members' comments; and
- (d) instead of using the space purely as focal points, the proponent should allow more activities such as events in the civic plazas.

3.10 Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN had some additional comments as follows:

Action

- (a) water features should be incorporated into the design;
- (b) the proponent should provide details on the design of proposed outdoor dining area;
- (c) a plan showing the area of shades to be provided in POS should be provided;
- (d) lighting should be put some distance from the waterfront so that there should be no glare affecting visitors enjoying a clear harbour view along the waterfront;
- (e) the two EVAs could be combined; and
- (f) the function of the civic plazas should be gathering places for POS visitors and commuters.

3.11 **The Chair** asked the proponent to consider Members' views of extending the proposed outdoor dining area onto the EVA.

3.12 In response to Member's enquiry on selection of tree species, **Mr David Stanley CHAIONG** said LCSD was open-minded on the tree species and planting arrangement as long as the trees were salt spray tolerant.

3.13 **The Chair** said that some comments raised by Members were yet to be addressed and asked the proponent to provide a written response after the meeting.

**the Project
Proponent**

(Post-meeting note: A written response provided by the proponent was circulated to Members on 17 February 2016.)

Item 4 The Urban Design Study for the Wan Chai North and North Point Harbourfront Areas: Study Progress - Preliminary Harbourfront Enhancement Proposals (Paper No. TFHK/15/2015)

4.1 **The Chair** welcomed the representative of PlanD to the meeting. **Mr Patrick FUNG** presented Paper No. TFHK/15/2015 to Members.

4.2 **The Chair** asked PlanD to present the revised harbourfront enhancement proposals at the next meeting of the Working

Action

Group on the Urban Design Study for the Wan Chai North and North Point Harbourfront Areas (WGUDS). He further enquired about the reason for excluding the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter and some other waterfront areas from the scope of the Design Ideas Competition.

- 4.3 **Mr Patrick FUNG** responded that taking into account the resources and efforts participants might need to put into, PlanD would like participants to focus on three precincts, namely the Celebration Precinct, the Pierside Precinct and the New Water Sports and Recreation Precinct. Having regard to the site constraints of the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter, and that only very limited area would be available for enhancement in the vicinity, it was decided not to include the North Point harbourfront in the competition.
- 4.4 **The Chair** opined that the entire study area should be included in the scope of the competition.
- 4.5 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** suggested the study team to meet with experts of water sports and marine uses such as water sports associations, the Yacht Club and the Sailing Federation to assess the technical feasibility of the harbourfront enhancement proposals to be recommended.
- 4.6 **Mr Patrick FUNG** responded that a meeting with water-related organisations including water sports associations was being arranged. A list of the organisations engaged would be provided to Members. The study team would also meet with the Yacht Club to exchange views.
- 4.7 **The Chair** echoed with the view of Mr Paul ZIMMEMAN that water-related organizations in particular the Yacht Club had hands-on experiences in organising marine related activities which could serve as useful reference for the study team.
- 4.8 **Mr Hans Joachim ISLER** agreed that discussion with water-related organisations such as the Sailing Federation and the Water Sports Council would be useful. He suggested to develop the ex-cargo handling basin into an event centre for water sports. He reminded the study team to scrutinise the technical issues involved before presenting any harbourfront enhancement proposal to the public for comments.

PlanD

- 4.9 **Mr Patrick FUNG** responded that the study team would consider Members' comments and present the revised harbourfront enhancement proposals to Members for further comments.

Item 5 Land Use Review on the Western Part of Kennedy Town - Planning and Design Intent of the Waterfront Area (Paper No. TFHK/16/2015)

- 5.1 **The Chair** welcomed the representatives of PlanD to the meeting. **Mr Derek TSE** presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 5.2 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** commented that roofs should be provided to the small piers to provide cover. He added that if the China Merchant Godown Pier was proposed to become a pier for berthing small cruises, more than one storey of structures should be allowed to provide sufficient space for supporting facilities and dining services. Separately, he enquired if the future open space would provide a circular pedestrian route.
- 5.3 **Mr CHAN Hok-fung** said that as the subject District Councillor of the area concerned, he had organized a few sessions with local residents and would like to share their views as follows:-
- (a) dining facilities along the waterfront promenade might not be preferred as there were sufficient dining choices in Kennedy Town. Separately, lack of parking space within the area would further worsen the existing illegal parking problem in Kennedy Town. Provision of underground parking spaces underneath the waterfront promenade should be explored;
 - (b) simple greenery and lawn were preferred in the promenade;
 - (c) to provide a footbridge connecting the waterfront promenade with the adjacent China Merchant Godown Pier area to enhance pedestrian connectivity;
 - (d) to open up the basketball court in the proposed primary school to the public after school hours;

Action

- (e) the two small piers might not be suitable for berthing vessels due to strong wave; and
- (f) the pedestrian connectivity between Kennedy Town and Sheung Wan should be further enhanced.

5.4 **Mr Ivan HO** expressed the following views:-

- (a) the east-west pedestrian connectivity in the area should be enhanced;
- (b) a three dimensional diagram showing pedestrian routes at different levels should be presented in future studies;
- (c) more flexibility should be allowed for future use of the two small piers at the waterfront promenade as they might not be suitable for water transport due to wave conditions;
- (d) at least a two-storey structure should be allowed at the China Merchant Godown Pier to provide necessary space for supporting facilities of dining services such as kitchen and garbage storage;
- (e) ancillary facilities for parents such as shaded seats should be provided near the children's playground; and
- (f) there might be no need to specify leisure and tourism use for the China Merchant Godown area as the entire area should be attractive to both local residents and visitors.

5.5 **Mr Freddie HAI** commented that parking facilities in Kennedy Town were not sufficient. If the China Merchant Godown Pier would be used for berthing ferries and boats travelling to other places, more parking space should be provided near the site concerned. He added that the waterfront promenade should be designed in an innovative way.

5.6 **Ms Ginger KIANG** responded that:-

- (a) proposed amendments to the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) were being prepared to indicate the planning intention of

Action

different parts of the area. There would not be detailed design requirements but rather land use zoning with appropriate development parameters to guide the future developments. The conceptual plans for the waterfront area were intended to illustrate how the planning intentions could be materialised in accordance with the Harbour Planning Principles. The sites concerned would be implemented only after the approval of the OZP amendments. Detailed design of individual sites could be further contemplated by the future implementation agents; and

- (b) PlanD would consider incorporating public car parking facilities into the waterfront promenade. Subject to a separate study on its technical feasibility, flexibility would be allowed for the implementation agent to provide an underground car park.

5.7 **The Chair** asked PlanD to be flexible when drawing up broad planning intentions at this stage.

5.8 **Ms Ginger KIANG** responded that PlanD intended to allow as much flexibility as possible for the future implementation agents taking into account public comments and actual circumstances of the sites concerned. The current proposal of allowing low-rise structure of 10mPD at the China Merchant Godown Pier had taken into the general principle that tall buildings were not desirable at the waterfront.

5.9 **Mr Freddie HAI** said that as the buildings behind were tall, it might not be a concern if the structure on the pier would be a two-storey structure as there would still be a stepped profile towards the waterfront.

5.10 **Mr Vincent NG** opined that a stepped down building height profile towards the waterfront should be the most desirable. On the other hand, future land use and the width of the waterfront were also relevant considerations. A more stringent building height requirement would be applicable for open space and if the waterfront was narrow.

5.11 **Mr Ivan HO** reiterated that a one-storey structure on the pier might not be practical if alfresco dining was to be allowed.

Action

5.12 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** echoed that a two-storey structure should be allowed on the pier if food and beverage services would be provided. He enquired if the trees in the Cadogan Street Temporary Garden would be removed for converting the area into a residential site. He also enquired about the future parking provision within the area.

5.13 **Ms Ginger KIANG** made the following responses:-

- (a) building height for the China Merchant Godown Pier would be further reviewed; and
- (b) the Cadogan Street Temporary Garden was included in the ground decontamination works to be implemented by CEDD.

5.14 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** opined that the Cadogan Street Temporary Garden should be retained. According to his observation, the trees were healthy and not contaminated.

5.15 **Mr MAK Chi-biu** responded that CEDD had conducted an environmental impact assessment (EIA) and proposed to decontaminate the entire area including the Cadogan Street Temporary Garden based on the findings of the EIA.

5.16 **The Chair** asked the Secretariat to recirculate the paper on “Ground Decontamination Works at the Site of the Ex-Kennedy Town Incineration Plant/Abattoir and Adjoining Area” provided by CEDD to Members for reference. Separately, he asked PlanD to take into account Members’ comments when proposing amendments to the OZP.

**the
Secretariat**

(Post-meeting note: CEDD’s paper on “Ground Decontamination Works at the Site of the Ex-Kennedy Town Incineration Plant/Abattoir and Adjoining Area” was re-circulated to Members on 25 November and 22 December 2015. To address Members’ comments on the paper, CEDD further submitted a paper on the contamination level of Cadogan Street Temporary Garden and the need to remove all the trees. The paper was circulated for Members’ information on 13 January 2016. Members’ further comments were conveyed to CEDD.)

Item 6 Any Other Business

A. Action Areas

- 6.1 In response to the Chair's invitation, **Miss Christine AU** briefed Members on the short-term uses and the tentative site availability schedule for long-term development of the new Central harbourfront sites with the aid of the PowerPoint.
- 6.2 **The Chair** commented that the condition of works areas within Site 3 should be improved by relocating existing works equipment and removing perimeter fences. The Government should also consider releasing the vacant works areas for public use.
- 6.3 **Miss Christine AU** responded that the condition of the works areas would be improved after the completion of all the works within 2016. It was expected that Site 3 could be made available for permanent development in the next two or three years. There was no plan to put the areas within the site for long-term temporary uses at the moment.
- 6.4 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** made the following comments:-
- (a) to remove the concrete barriers and add planters along Lung Wo Road through the ongoing road works for the Formula E race;
 - (b) to provide shades through planting trees along the waterfront promenade even if it was temporary in nature; and
 - (c) to provide a three-dimensional diagram to illustrate the future design when the Queen's Pier (QP) was reassembled.

He further enquired about the schedule of opening the pedestrian crossing across Lung Wo Road near Star Ferry multi-storey Car Park and the implementation time table of North Island Line (NIL).

**Highways
Department
(HyD)**

(Post-meeting note: A written response on the implementation time table of NIL provided by HyD was circulated to Members on 17 February 2016.)

Action

6.5 **Mr MAK Chi-biu** responded that the pedestrian crossing would be opened in a few months.

6.6 **Miss Christine AU** responded that the works for the Formula E race track was ongoing, HyD was considering Members' suggestions such as removing concrete barriers and enhancing the greening along the road. They would provide a written response when ready.

HyD

(Post-meeting note: A written response provided by HyD was circulated to Members on 17 February 2016.)

6.7 **Mr Paul ZIMMEMAN** expressed that as there would be special race barriers added by the organizer, the concrete barriers could be removed without affecting the Formula E race.

6.8 On the reassembly of the QP, **Miss Christine AU** said that CEDD had commissioned a study to carefully examine the technical feasibility of the reassembly works and the future design of QP. The department would consult Members as well as other stakeholders on the design within 2016.

6.9 On NIL, **Miss Christine AU** said that the Government was committed to take forward the permanent development of the new Central harbourfront sites and would look into the interfaces with NIL.

6.10 On enhancement of the Central and Western District Promenade (Central Section), **Miss Christine AU** said despite the promenade was of temporary nature, further enhancement would be implemented. LCSD had submitted a paper to enhance landscape and greening at the promenade and proposed to add landscape features and arbours along the promenade.

6.11 **The Chair** referred Members to LCSD's paper on proposed landscape beautification project for the promenade (Central section), which was circulated to Members on 11 November 2015. If Members have any further comments, they could convey them to the Secretariat for the information of LCSD.

6.12 **Mr Vincent NG** said that the reassembly of QP, which was now expected to complete in 2019, had been delayed for six years

Action

than it was originally promised. The implementation progress was slow since the old QP was demolished in 2007. Separately, the establishment of the proposed Harbourfront Authority (HFA) also took a longer time than expected. There would be a time gap between the availability of the new Central harbourfront sites and the establishment of HFA. He opined that it would be the task of the Commission as well as the Harbour Unit to oversee the implementation of permanent development of the new Central harbourfront which would be a showcase of Hong Kong.

- 6.13 **Miss Christine AU** responded that the Harbour Unit was trying its best to complete the financial consultancy study for discussion by the Commission at its upcoming meeting on 21 December 2015. The Commission would also submit its final report on the proposed establishment of the HFA to the Chief Executive. She said that the Commission and the Harbour Unit were mindful of the interfacing between the establishment of the HFA and permanent development of some new Central harbourfront sites and would next focus efforts on this front.
- 6.14 **Mr Ivan Ho** believed that the walking experience on the temporary footbridge from Central Piers to the General Post Office was unpleasant as pedestrians could only see works areas in the neighborhood. He commented that as the area would continue to be works area when permanent development of Site 3 commenced, a better and pleasant pedestrian route should be provided.
- 6.15 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that the Government should consider finishing the works within Sites 1 and 2 as soon as possible in order to provide a pleasant alternative pedestrian route for the public.
- 6.16 **The Chair** asked Harbour Unit to follow up the comments raised by Members.

**Harbour
Unit**

B. Eastern Street Temporary Car Park

- 6.17 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** requested the provision of additional greening at the Eastern Street Temporary Car Park.

**Lands
Department
(LandsD)**

(Post-meeting note: A written response provided by LandsD was circulated to Members on 17 February 2016.)

Action

C. Temporary Bus Terminus in Wan Chai

6.18 **The Chair** opined that a temporary bus terminus was opened at the Wan Chai waterfront and pedestrians were no longer able to have access to the waterfront. He requested to explore reserving the waterfront portion to pedestrians.

CEDD

(Post-meeting note: A written response provided by CEDD was circulated to Members on 17 February 2016.)

6.19 There being no other business, the meeting ended at 5:00 p.m.

Secretariat

**Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island
February 2016**