

# Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island

## Minutes of Tenth Meeting

Date : 31 July 2012  
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
Mr Lam Kin-lai	Representing the Conservancy Association
Mr Tam Po-yiu	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Dr Peter Cookson Smith	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Ir Dr Chan Fuk-cheung	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Paul Zimmerman	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Mr Chan Hok-fung	
Ms Lily Chow	
Mr Eric Fok	
Mr Vincent Ng	
Ms Gracie Foo	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Ms Stephanie Lai	Senior Manager (Tourism) 2, Tourism Commission
Mr Chan Chung-yuen	Chief Traffic Engineer/Hong Kong, Transport Department
Mr Mak Chi-biu	Chief Engineer/Hong Kong 1, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Miss Olivia Chan	Assistant Director (Leisure Services)2, Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Ms April Kun	District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (Acting), Planning Department (PlanD)
Mr Chris Fung	Secretary

### In Attendance

Mrs Winnie Kang	Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour),
-----------------	--

Mr Frederick Yu	DEVB Assistant Secretary (Harbour) Special Duties, DEVB
Miss Venus Tsoi	Assistant Secretary (Harbour) 2, DEVB

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr Leung Kong-yui	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Dr Frederick Lee	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Andy Leung	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Leslie Chen	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Dr Paul Ho	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr Louis Loong	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Benjamin Cha	
Ms Joanne Chan	
Mr David Chan	
Ms Patricia Or	
Mr Lam Cheuk-yum	

**For Agenda Item 3**

Mr Bosco Chan	Deputy Project Manager (Hong Kong Island and Islands), CEDD
Mr Patrick Keung	Senior Engineer 3 (Hong Kong Island Division 2), CEDD
Mr Silas Liu	Chief Town Planner/Special Duties (Acting), PlanD

**For Agenda Item 4**

Mr Derrick Chow	Assistant Secretary (Adm)1, Chief Secretary for Administration's Office (CSO)
Mr Simon Chan	Senior Project Manager 121, Architectural Services Department (ArchSD)
Mr H M Fung	Project Manager 148, ArchSD
Mr Simon Tsang	Senior Engineer/Hong Kong 1, Highways Department (HyD)
Mr Peter Poon	Engineer/Hong Kong 1-3, HyD

**For Agenda Item 5**

Ms April Kun	District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (Acting), PlanD
--------------	--

Ms Irene Lai Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong 2 (Acting),  
PlanD

**Any Other Business**

Mr Andy Yau Deputy Project Manager/Major Works (2),  
HyD  
Mr Victor Chan Chief Engineer 4/Major Works, HyD  
Mr Conrad Ng Executive Director, AECOM Asia Co Ltd  
Mr Alex Li Principal Engineer, AECOM Asia Co Ltd  
Mr Stephen Cheng Managing Director, Aedas Ltd  
Mr Alex Yan Architect, Aedas Ltd

**Action**

**Welcoming Message**

**The Chair** welcomed all to the meeting. He advised Members that Mr Chan Chung-yuen had taken over the post of Chief Traffic Engineer/Hong Kong of TD from Mr Peter Wong with effect from 3 July 2012. He thanked Mr Wong for his contribution to the work of the Task Force; and welcomed Mr Chan.

**Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 9<sup>th</sup> Meeting**

1.1 **The Chair** said that the Secretariat circulated the draft minutes of the 9<sup>th</sup> meeting to Members on 17 July 2012. After incorporating the proposed amendments received, the revised draft minutes were circulated to Members on 30 July 2012. As no further amendment was proposed at the meeting, the revised draft minutes were confirmed.

**Item 2 Matters Arising**

*Update on Temporary Uses of the New Central Harbourfront Sites*

- 2.1 **The Chair** informed Members that the Harbour Unit of DEVB had briefed the Harbourfront Commission (HC) at its 10<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 4 June 2012 on the proposed temporary uses of the sites.
- 2.2 On the Chair's invitation, **Mrs Winnie Kang** gave Members a brief recapitulation on the proposed temporary uses of the sites, with the aid of a PowerPoint.

**Action**

2.3 **Mrs Winnie Kang** further updated Members that –

- (a) Harbour Unit had presented the proposed temporary uses of the sites to the Central & Western District Council (C&WDC) on 12 July 2012 and obtained its full support to the proposal;
- (b) the tender documents for the short-term tenancy (STT) of Area A were being prepared and could hopefully be issued in September 2012;
- (c) CEDD and ArchSD were working on the design of Areas F and G, which aimed to blend the sites well with the Green Carpet. The design and facilities would be relatively basic due to its temporary nature. The Task Force's views on the design would be sought in due course; and
- (d) Harbour Unit had recently convened an inter-departmental meeting to discuss how to enhance the connectivity and accessibility of the new Central harbourfront. An at-grade crossing from Central Barracks to the new Central harbourfront (across Lung Wo Road) would be opened for public use tentatively in three-month time. Moreover, a pedestrian walkway between Area A and Area D would be opened tentatively in the first quarter of 2013, so that members of the public could have another access road from Central Pier No. 10 to the City Hall (along Road D6 and then across Lung Wo Road).

2.4 **Mrs Winnie Kang** said that Harbour Unit would continue to work on other possible proposals to enhance connectivity and accessibility of the new Central harbourfront; and would update the Task Force on the latest development of the temporary uses on a regular basis.

2.5 In response to the Chair's enquiry, **Mrs Winnie Kang** said that Areas F and G would be ready by the third or fourth quarter of 2013.

2.6 **Mr Chan Hok-fung** said that C&WDC had discussed and supported implementing the proposal as soon as possible. Also, C&WDC suggested providing car parking facilities close to the proposed pet garden at Area G.

**Action**

- 2.7 **Mrs Winnie Kang** responded that Harbour Unit was working with the relevant departments to identify possible temporary parking spaces in the vicinity of the proposed pet garden.
- 2.8 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** asked whether consideration had been given to Members' views raised at the 10<sup>th</sup> HC meeting for opening the STT of Area A to all types of entertainment, not just observation wheel.
- 2.9 **Mrs Winnie Kang** replied that apart from HC, the Government had also sought the views of C&WDC, which supported to have an observation wheel and ancillary facilities at Area A. Bidders could include other entertainment facilities as ancillary facilities in their proposals. Under a two-envelope approach for the open tender of the STT, the tender requirement had to be very specific and needed to be comparing like with like.
- 2.10 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** opined that uses of the site could be open to more opportunities while preferences for the uses might be indicated. He suggested changing the tender requirement to allow "an observation wheel and/or entertainment facilities".
- 2.11 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** commented that the Government should be careful in ensuring the quality of proposals submitted by bidders; and that tall-towered structure should not be allowed in the sites.
- 2.12 In response to the Chair's enquiry, **Mrs Winnie Kang** further explained that with the general support on the proposed use of the site for putting up an observation wheel from the Task Force at its meeting held on 30 August 2011, and subsequently from C&WDC at its meetings, the Government had been working on the STT for some months already and had gone through the necessary process for launching the said STT. The tender exercise for the STT was at an advance stage and planned to be launched in September. She said that while there was little room to further change the primary use of Area A, some flexibility had been built in the tender to allow other ancillary facilities at the site to enhance the vibrancy of the harbourfront.
- 2.13 Regarding other issues raised by Mr Paul Zimmerman on the temporary uses of the new Central harbourfront sites, **the Chair** suggested that the Task Force could have a separate session to

**The  
Secretariat**

**Action**

further discuss the issues comprehensively.

Wan Chai Development Phase II (WDII) (paragraph 2.6 of the confirmed minutes of the 9<sup>th</sup> meeting)

- 2.14 **The Chair** said that CEDD would give a briefing on the planning of WD II area under Agenda Item 3 of this meeting.

Supplementary Information on the "ArtSpace" Project (paragraph 3.13 of the confirmed minutes of the 9<sup>th</sup> meeting)

- 2.15 **The Chair** said that an information note on the purpose and overall layout of the "ArtSpace" project prepared by LCSD was circulated to Members on 17 July 2012. Another supplementary note on the interface between the "ArtSpace" and the proposed public open space (POS) under the "Comprehensive Development Area" (CDA) development at Oil Street was circulated to Members on 30 July 2012, which clarified that LCSD had no intention to fence off the "ArtSpace" from the proposed POS; and that LCSD was open-minded to an integrated design with the proposed POS.

- 2.16 In response to Mr Paul Zimmerman's enquiry, **Miss Olivia Chan** explained that the "red line" shown on the plan circulated to Members on 17 July 2012 was the existing boundary between the "ArtSpace" and the CDA which were now two separate sites at different levels. LCSD would take Members' comments into consideration when further discussing with the developer of the CDA site in the detailed design stage to ensure connectivity and openness between the two sites.

Waterfront Planning in North Point Area (paragraph 3.17 of the confirmed minutes of the 9<sup>th</sup> meeting)

- 2.17 **The Chair** said that PlanD would give a briefing on the planning of North Point area under Agenda Item 5 of this meeting.

Proposed Exterior Designs for the East Ventilation Building (EVB), Administration Building (ADB) and East Vent Shaft (EVS) of the Central - Wan Chai Bypass (CWB) Project

- 2.18 **The Chair** said that HyD would give a briefing on the proposed exterior designs of the buildings under "Any Other Business" of this meeting.

**Item 3 Briefing on the Planning of WD II Project (Paper No. TFHK/9/2012)**

- 3.1 **The Chair** welcomed the presentation team to the meeting. **Mr Bosco Chan** of CEDD presented the paper, with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 3.2 In response to the Chair's enquiry, **Mr Silas Liu** of PlanD said that PlanD would take into account Member's views and other development proposals of the area, including the Royal Hong Kong Yacht Club (RHKYC)'s proposal for the development of Wan Chai Basin, in working out the timing, scope and scale for the study of the new Wan Chai harbourfront. PlanD would report back to the Task Force in due course.
- 3.3 **The Chair** reminded Members that RHKYC had been invited to present their proposal at the next HC meeting which would be held in October 2012. He also opined that temporary access to the waterfront of the area should be provided to the public before the completion of the WDII project in 2017.
- 3.4 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** welcomed a briefing on the planning history of the WDII project. He suggested setting up a dedicated office, like the Energizing Kowloon East Office, as soon as possible to drive the WDII project in an integrated manner as various infrastructure construction contracts within the site were being tendered, including those for the CWB.
- 3.5 **Mr Bosco Chan** said that CEDD would collaborate with PlanD on the engineering aspects to take forward the study of the area holistically.
- 3.6 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** opined that the Wan Chai harbourfront lacked interesting profile; and that the public envisaging process of the study needed careful handling and invigilation. He was of the view that an approach which showed all possibilities to the public should be adopted.
- 3.7 **Mr Vincent Ng** opined that while planning was important, it was also essential to identify implementation and management agents to operate the sites.
- 3.8 Referring to the experience in the "Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront" and exploration of developing

**Action**

Sites 4 & 7 by way of public-private collaboration, **Mrs Margaret Brooke** opined that a holistic, coordinated and integrated approach involving all stakeholders, like planners, engineers, business sector and the HC etc, should be adopted to ensure the practicability of the recommendations formulated by the study. **Mr Tam Po-yiu** shared the same view.

- 3.9 While noting the importance of a holistic and integrated approach, **Ir Dr Chan Fuk-cheung** opined that as the concept plan had been agreed after public envisioning and consultation, the WDII project should proceed to the engineering and implementation stage.
- 3.10 **Mr Bosco Chan** responded that the concept plan which reflected the public's opinion on the development of the waterfront had been agreed by the general public during the "Harbour-front Enhancement Review - Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and the Adjoining Areas" (HER) exercise. The next step was to bring forward the detailed planning. In this regard, PlanD would take the lead to carry out the study and CEDD would closely collaborate with them.
- 3.11 In response to the Chair's enquiry, **Mr Bosco Chan** said that the various land uses within the WDII site had been defined in the concept plan as a result of the HER exercise. PlanD and CEDD were open-minded on how to bring forward the detailed study of the area.
- 3.12 **The Chair** opined that the study should cover the engineering, operation and business feasibility of the sites to ensure their viability in future.
- 3.13 **Ms Gracie Foo** said that the HC would have a closed-door session on 6 August 2012 to further discuss the proposed establishment of a Harbourfront Authority (HA) in Hong Kong. Members might take that opportunity to discuss the identification of implementation agent(s) for the sites and the related issues of establishment of dedicated project team or office etc before the setting up of the proposed HA.
- 3.14 **Mr Vincent Ng** supported conducting the study with the advice of HC while preparing for the establishment of HA.
- 3.15 **Mrs Margaret Brooke** opined that as the concept plan was drawn up six years ago and public aspiration was changing, the



**Action**

outline zoning plan (OZP) should not pose constraints to the detailed study. **Mr Silas Liu** supplemented that OZP of the area was a small scale plan with broad-brush zoning based on the HER study. There was some flexibility within the OZP when working out the details under the study.

3.16 Citing the examples of information technology projects and the concept plan and implementation plan of development projects in Singapore that were reviewed every five years, **Ir Dr Chan Fuk-cheung** opined that the professional departments should be given the required freedom to implement the concept plan of WDII which had obtained public support.

3.17 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** said that there was a difference between strategic planning and local planning. Strategic planning was meant to do longer term planning and projections while changes or updates in local planning could be made in parallel.

3.18 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** requested a detailed plan on the works contracts being carried out in the WDII site. **Mr Bosco Chan** said that he would liaise with Mr Zimmerman and prepare the required information after the meeting.

**CEDD**

3.19 In closing the discussion on this item, **the Chair** concluded that Members were in general supportive of conducting the study, which should cover planning and engineering aspects, as well as the site viability. The Task Force should be updated when the suggested scope of the study and composition of the study team had been worked out.

**PlanD  
& CEDD**

3.20 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** opined that Members should be given the opportunity to examine the scope, timing and mechanism of the study before it was launched.

**Item 4    Extension of CITIC Tower Footbridge to LegCo Complex (LCC) at Tamar (Paper No. TFHK/10/2012)**

4.1 **The Chair** welcomed the project team to the meeting. **Mr Simon Tsang** of HyD presented the paper, with the aid of a PowerPoint.

4.2 Referring to the PowerPoint slides on the three existing pedestrian routes from Admiralty to LCC, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the public access from the Tamar Park to

**Action**

LCC had in fact been closed off by security staff. He opined that a more convenient access to LCC should be provided to the public.

- 4.3 **Mr Simon Chan** of ArchSD responded that one of the reasons to build the footbridge extension was to allow the public and the disabled, not just staff members of LegCo, to have a direct access to LCC from Admiralty Centre through the CITIC Tower footbridge, instead of routing through the Central Government Complex (CGC). A new entrance would be opened on the 1/F level of LCC to receive the public.
- 4.4 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** questioned the necessity to build the footbridge extension as there was already convenient route from Admiralty to LCC and the extension was not included in the original design of LCC; and the design of the extension that followed the existing footbridge across Tim Mei Avenue connecting the CITIC Tower footbridge with the CGC (EW2).
- 4.5 In response, **Mr Derrick Chow** of CSO stated that the Government had been liaising with the LegCo during the construction of the LCC and it was not until June 2011 that the Government noted such request to provide such a direct access to the LCC; LegCo members considered that a direct access route to the LCC would demonstrate its independence and constitutional status.
- 4.6 **Mr Lam Kin-lai** suggested adopting a more transparent design for the footbridge extension, instead of following the design of the existing footbridge. **Mr Paul Zimmerman** also supported adopting a more permeable design by replacing the proposed planters with glass panels.
- 4.7 **Mr Vincent Ng** had no objection to the proposal. He also opined that the design of footbridge extension was a subjective issue. He had no objection to the proposed design so long as it was consistent with the existing environment.
- 4.8 **Mr Simon Tsang** responded that it was the LegCo Secretariat's instruction that the design of footbridge extension should follow that of the EW2 so as to blend well with the existing environment. He added that the proposed design had already been approved by the Advisory Committee on the Appearance of Bridges and Associated Structures. **Mr Derrick Chow** said that the project team would look into the possibilities on how to

**Action**

improve the design, though it might be difficult for substantial alterations as the project was under a very tight project schedule.

- 4.9 **Ms Gracie Foo** suggested that the project team should take Members' comments back, and report to concerned departments, and keep LegCo Secretariat informed as appropriate.
- 4.10 In response to the Chair's enquiry on the present status of the project, **Mr Simon Tsang** said that the design of the footbridge extension was ready and the project would be gazetted in September 2012.
- 4.11 **The Chair** concluded that Members had mixed views on the proposed design. The project team should take into account Members' comments in finalising the design.

*(Post-meeting Note: The Project Team had relayed Members' comments to the LegCo Secretariat and concerned departments after the meeting.)*

**Item 5 Action Areas: Wan Chai East and Island East Action Areas  
- Planning of North Point**

- 5.1 **The Chair** welcomed the presentation team to the meeting. **Ms Irene Lai** of PlanD briefed Members on the waterfront planning of North Point, with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 5.2 **The Chair** remarked that the Task Force had discussed the Oil Street CDA project, the proposed boardwalk under the Island Eastern Corridor (IEC) and the North Point Ferry Piers; and would keep a close eye on the development of the ex-North Point Estate site which had recently been sold.
- 5.3 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that instead of a briefing on the overall planning of North Point waterfront, he was more interested to have an update on the details of the harbourfront enhancement projects, land uses, strategies and progress of issues raised by Members concerning the area. In response, **the Chair** said that the information had been reflected in the Action Areas table.
- 5.4 **The Chair** thanked PlanD's effort and remarked that PlanD's presentation was useful and provided the context of planning

of North Point waterfront.

**Item 6 Any Other Business**

Proposed Exterior Designs for the East Ventilation Building (EVB), Administration Building (ADB) and East Vent Shaft (EVS) of the Central - Wan Chai Bypass (CWB) Project

- 6.1 **The Chair** welcomed the presentation team to the meeting. **Mr Conrad Ng** of AECOM Asia Co Ltd and **Mr Stephen Cheng** of Aedas Ltd presented the proposed exterior designs of the buildings and the connectivity of the future harbourfront area, with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 6.2 **Mr Lam Kin-lai** asked whether the public could access the roof top of the EVB which might be developed as a viewing platform as part of the future public open space.
- 6.3 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** had the following views and enquiries –
- (a) there should be a public access along the breakwater to the EVS;
  - (b) the view and air ventilation corridor through the Oil Street CDA site would be blocked by the ADB;
  - (c) the fence of the ADB should be removed to provide a public access between City Garden and the Oil Street CDA site;
  - (d) whether the roof top of the EVB could be handed over to LCSD for leisure or recreational purposes; and
  - (e) whether there would be activities and landing facilities at the waterfront.
- 6.4 Referring to Annex 7 of Paper No. TFHK/02/2010, **Mr Tam Po-yiu** expressed concern on the visual impact of the structures and enquired whether there would be a large deck in front of the ADB.
- 6.5 In response to Members' comments and enquiries, **Mr Andy Yau** of HyD replied that –

**Action**

- (a) after the completion of construction of the EVS, the breakwater would be handed over to its future management agent. The construction and operation of the EVS would not hinder public access to the breakwater;
- (b) public access to the roof top of EVB should not be allowed due to operational and safety concerns. The bulkiness and appearance of the building would also be affected if extra structures were added to facilitate public access. Members of the public might enjoy the harbour view in the future public open space at the waterfront instead of going to the roof top of the EVB;
- (c) HyD would relay Members' views regarding the design of facilities in the future public open space, including any landing facilities therein, to PlanD for their follow up under the new planning study; **HyD**
- (d) the fence at the southern side of the ADB would be set back to provide a public access between City Garden and the Oil Street CDA site;
- (e) the ADB had been designed to tie in with the ventilation corridors at the two sides of Oil Street CDA site. However, due to site constraints, it could not cater for a ventilation corridor in the middle; and
- (f) HyD would present the design of the landscaped deck in the vicinity to the Task Force later this year. **HyD**

6.6 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** questioned the necessity for the large size of the ADB. He opined that the design of the public open space was not user-friendly; and that the winning entry of the EVS in the design competition organized by the EDC was better than the final enhanced design. He supported concealing the EVB with green landscape.

6.7 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** had the following further enquiries and suggestions -

- (a) whether there would be any fence in the western side of the site facing the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter; and which parties would be responsible for managing the different areas within the site;

**Action**

- (b) where the “non-building” zone around the EVB would be; and what safety concerns for not recommending public access to the roof top of the EVB were;
- (c) what the permitted loading and uses of the landscaped deck would be and which party would be responsible for its future management;
- (d) a footpath or public access should be constructed along the breakwater to the EVS upon reinstatement of works;
- (e) all the fences around the ADB should be removed to enhance permeability and accessibility; and
- (f) a 3-D physical model of the harbourfront area should be provided to facilitate Members’ discussion.

6.8 **Mr Andy Yau** further responded that –

- (a) the area where the basement structures of the EVB and CWB tunnel located was a non-building zone. This, however, would not affect construction of any necessary structures on the sides of the CWB tunnel;
- (b) the paving of the breakwater would be improved to facilitate public access to the EVS upon reinstatement of works;
- (c) the project proponent and management agents of the future public open space had not been identified at this stage;
- (d) the final enhanced design of the EVS had taken into account the public views as expressed in the roving exhibitions and the winning entry in the design competition organised by EDC. The final enhanced design was supported by EDC;
- (e) should public be allowed to access the rooftop of the EVB, there might be chances that some objects would go into the air intake area, which would cause adverse impact to the operation of the EVB. A close proximity between the public area and air intake area might also cause safety concern; and

**Action**

- (f) as some heavy-duty vehicles might need to enter the CWB tunnel from the ADB in case of emergency, it was not recommended for safety reason to allow public access into the ADB by removing the fence. Nevertheless, the design of the fence would be enhanced and the fence at the southern side would be set back to provide a public access between City Garden and the Oil Street CDA site.
- 6.9 **Mr Lam Kin-lai** expressed concern that some of the public open space would be taken up by other facilities, like car parking spaces and administration office of the future management agent. In response, **Mrs Winnie Kang** assured Members that the study to be conducted by PlanD for the new Wan Chai harbourfront would cover this area.
- 6.10 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** reiterated that a dedicated team or office should be set up to lead the development of Wan Chai and North Point harbourfront.
- 6.11 **Mr Andy Yau** said that HyD would follow-up Members' comments on issues under its purview.
- 6.12 **Mr Stephen Cheng** supplemented that the project team had proactively liaised with the Government to extend the green belt of the site in order to put in more greenery.
- 6.13 In closing the discussion on this item, **the Chair** concluded that the project team should take into account Members' comments in enhancing the exterior design of the buildings; and consult the Task Force on the design of the proposed landscaped deck in the vicinity.
- 6.14 **Mr Tam Po-yiu** declared that he was one of the judges in the design competition for the EVS organized by the EDC. Therefore, he had not participated in the discussion on the exterior design of the EVS in the meeting.

Update on Action Areas

- 6.15 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** remarked that some harbourfront enhancement issues previously raised by Members had not been resolved. Regarding the new Central harbourfront, he enquired about the reconfiguration of Lung Wo Road as

**Action**

observed in the Task Force's site visit in January 2012, the position of toilet and kiosks, the boundary of the STT and the fences demarcating the different areas.

- 6.16 **Mr Chris Fung** said that after the site visit to the new Central harbourfront in January 2012, the Secretariat had forwarded Members' comments to the relevant departments and bureaux. After several rounds of discussion, responses from the relevant departments and bureaux had been circulated to Members on 25 July 2012. If Members had any further views, the Secretariat would forward them to the relevant departments and bureaux for further action. Where necessary, outstanding issues could be dealt with in a separate session as proposed by the Chair or when the relevant Action Area was discussed in future Task Force meetings.
- 6.17 **Ms Gracie Foo** responded that the STT boundary of the new Central harbourfront sites had been covered in the presentation on the temporary uses under "Matters Arising" of this meeting. Members were also briefed on the progress of several individual items and the overall context of waterfront planning of North Point. For sites under private developers, the concerned developers would brief Members (essentially on a voluntary basis) when the design was ready. As such, Members would be kept informed of the context, while the deliverables would be reported to Members when they were ready. Detailed suggestions of individual items in the action areas tables might not be covered in the overall action plan but the relevant departments would respond to comments made by Members.
- 6.18 In closing, **the Chair** suggested Mr Zimmerman to send his further comments to the Secretariat. Any outstanding issues relating to temporary uses of the new Central harbourfront sites could be discussed in a separate session.
- 6.19 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

**Secretariat**

**Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island  
October 2012**