

Harbourfront Commission
Task Force on Harbourfront Developments
on Hong Kong Island

Minutes of Twenty-sixth Meeting

Date : 10 March 2017
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, Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island
Mrs Margaret BROOKE	Representing Business Environment Council
Dr Vivian WONG	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Anthony CHEUNG	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Dr Peter Cookson SMITH	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Mr TAM Po-yiu	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Ir Raymond CHAN	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Shuki LEUNG	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Mr Walter CHAN	
Mr Vincent NG	
Mr Henry CHAN	
Mr Thomas CHAN	Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands) ¹ , Development Bureau (DEVB)
Ms Carmen YU	Senior Assistant Secretary (Tourism) ² , Tourism Commission (TC)
Ms Maggie MAK	Chief Traffic Engineer/ Hong Kong (Atg.), Transport Department (TD)
Mr Alfred WONG	Chief Engineer/ Hong Kong 1, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Mr Richard WONG	Assistant Director (Leisure Services) ² , Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)

Mr Louis KAU District Planning Officer/ Hong Kong, Planning
Department (PlanD)
Mr Larry CHU Secretary

In Attendance

Miss Christine AU Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
Ms Jenny WONG Assistant Secretary (Harbour) Special Duties,
DEVB
Miss Emily SOM Assistant Secretary (Harbour)2, DEVB

Absent with Apologies

Mr LEUNG Kong-yui Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and
Transport in Hong Kong
Mr SO Kwok-yin Representing the Conservancy Association
Mr Evans IU Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape
Architects
Sr Emily LI Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Ms Vivian LEE
Mr NGAN Man-yu
Ms Rosanna CHOI
Ms Jacqueline CHUNG
Mr Stanley HO
Mr David PONG
Mr YEUNG Hoi-wing
Mr Alvin YIP

For Matters Arising

Mr Alfred WONG Chief Engineer/ Hong Kong 1, CEDD
Mr LAM Chun-tak Senior Engineer2 (HK Island Division)1, CEDD
Mr Charles LUK Executive Director, AECOM
Mr Jimmy LAU Technical Director, AECOM

For Agenda Item 3

Mr Mike HILL CEO, Magnetic Asia Ltd.
Ms Kinny BARLOW Head of Partnership, Magnetic Asia Ltd.

For Agenda Item 4

Ms Maureen EARLS Managing Director, Central Venue Management
Mr John BINKS Strategy Director, Central Venue Management
Ms Fiona LIU Account Manager, Central Venue Management

For Agenda Item 5

Mr C K LAM

Chief Engineer/Hong Kong2, CEDD

Mr Franklin TSE

Senior Engineer 5 (HK Island Division 2) , CEDD

Action

Welcoming Message

The Chair welcomed all to the meeting. He informed Members that Ms Carmen YU, Senior Administrative Officer of TC, attended the meeting on behalf of Ms Emily MO; and Ms Maggie MAK, Chief Traffic Engineer (Acting) of TD, attended on behalf of Mr Peter MAK.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 25th Meeting

1.1 **The Chair** said the draft minutes of the last meeting were circulated to Members on 28 February 2017. No comments were received from Members. There being no proposed amendment, the minutes were confirmed at the meeting.

Item 2 Matters Arising

A. *Proposed Temporary Use at the Three Berths Released from Western District Public Cargo Working Area in Kennedy Town (paragraph 3.2 of the minutes of the 25th meeting)*

2.1 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that the local community was unaware of the initiative. As some members of the public had been using the site for diversified activities such as jogging, cycling, kite flying and dog walking for years, he was concerned that the community farm might affect existing users. He requested the Government to engage the users and the community on the initiative.

2.2 **Miss Christine AU** responded that the tenancy agreement governing the short-term tenancy on community farming

would mandate public access to the waterfront including the open space adjacent to the community farm. The Government would welcome views from the local community and incorporate them as the tender requirements as appropriate.

B. Enhancement Works of Leisure Angling Ancillary Facilities in Central and Western District Promenade (Central Section)
(paragraph 2.30 of the minutes of the 25th meeting)

2.3 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** commented that most anglers preferred fishing at the Central Piers rather than along the Central and Western District Promenade as the latter was exposed to strong sunlight. He asked the Government to consider providing angling ancillary facilities including fishing rod holders at the Central Piers.

2.4 **The Chair** said LCSD would be invited to report back to the Task Force on the effectiveness of the trial scheme after it had been implemented for one year. The issue could be considered during the review.

C. Proposed Boardwalk underneath the Island Eastern Corridor – Stage 2 Community Engagement (paragraph 2.18 of the minutes of the 25th meeting)

2.5 **The Chair** welcomed representatives of the project team to the meeting. **Mr LAM Chun-tak** briefed Members on the preliminary findings of Stage 2 Community Engagement (CE2) of the proposed Boardwalk underneath the Island Eastern Corridor (IEC) and the major development gone through in the design and alignment of the boardwalk with the aid of a PowerPoint.

2.6 **The Chair** thanked the project team for the preliminary report on CE2 and enquired when the final report would be available.

2.7 **Mr LAM Chun-tak** responded that the project team was working on the final report of CE2 with a view to publishing

it in a couple of months.

- 2.8 **Mr Raymond CHAN** enquired if the project team had received public comments concerning Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (PHO).
- 2.9 **Mr LAM Chun-tak** said the public generally welcomed the boardwalk scheme with a width of 10m. While some of them had raised questions about compliance with PHO, they did not object to the proposed scheme. Comments concerning the extent of reclamation were mainly expressed by the Society for Protection of the Harbour (SPH) and Task Force members. The project team would prepare cogent and convincing materials to demonstrate that the proposed scheme would satisfy the overriding public need test as required under PHO.
- 2.10 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** said that the Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design (HKIUD) had made comments on the proposed scheme which were available for viewing at the Institute's website. Some members of HKIUD did express concern about the PHO.
- 2.11 **The Chair** invited the project team to continue their presentation and **Mr LAM Chun Tak** briefed Members on the major developments in the design and alignment of the IEC boardwalk with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 2.12 **The Chair** remarked that Members had requested the project team to place the boardwalk underneath the IEC as originally designed at the informal session on 27 February 2017. He invited response from the team on Members' request.
- 2.13 **Mr Alfred WONG** responded that the project team was carefully exploring other possible schemes with DEVB and would consult the Task Force when ready.
- 2.14 **Miss Christine AU** supplemented that the Government had received a variety of views from the community and the Task

Force on the design, alignment, height of various sections as well as other requirements of the boardwalk over the years since inception of the project. While some appreciated better utilization of space for multiple uses, others were mindful of the footprint and additional width; while many supported a cycle track, others preferred a simplistic walkway. The project team had been striking a balance among different views, of which some were conflicting. As members of the Task Force also held different views on some aspects of the boardwalk, the team would appreciate some general pointers and principles from the Task Force on how the boardwalk scheme should be designed.

2.15 **Mr Vincent NG** made the following comments-

- (a) the boardwalk was an important project as part of the long-anticipated continuous promenade along the harbourfront on Hong Kong Island and there should be expedited implementation;
- (b) the views expressed by the community on various requirements of the boardwalk during the public engagement exercises might be conflicting as the community did not understand the technical aspects of the scheme fully and might not be aware of the PHO implications;
- (c) the Government might be over-generous to incorporate all public views which had resulted in a wider and wider boardwalk. He questioned whether the proposed 10m width scheme would only involve minimum reclamation;
- (d) the original scheme underneath the IEC, though might not be wide enough to accommodate multiple uses, would be more acceptable in terms of compliance with the PHO as it would not take away further water space; and
- (e) the project team should demonstrate that they had

tried their best to put the boardwalk underneath the IEC. Only failing that should the boardwalk be diverted outside the footprint of IEC. To this end, the Government could convince the Court and the society that only minimum reclamation had been carried out.

2.16 **The Chair** echoed with Mr Vincent NG's view that the Government should provide a time sensitive solution to take forward the boardwalk initiative. The boardwalk should be put underneath the IEC with shared use design as far as practicable.

2.17 **Mr Raymond CHAN** made the following comments-

- (a) he had all along been envisioning a simplistic boardwalk underneath the IEC;
- (b) to accommodate a walkway and a cycle track on a 5m-wide boardwalk, the Government might consider the time sharing principle. For instance, the boardwalk could be used exclusively for large-scale cycling competitions a few times every year; and
- (c) the project team should explore technical solutions to minimize the changes in elevation along the boardwalk.

2.18 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** opined that the chance of satisfying the overriding public needs test with the present scheme was slim as there were other reasonable alternative designs. He was worried that this would defer the implementation of the project.

2.19 **Mr Thomas CHAN** made the following responses-

- (a) the Government would appreciate the Task Force's indication of the preferred boardwalk design;
- (b) as for the time required for taking forward the project, the Government would need to go through the

consultancy process which would include the compilation of the cogent and convincing materials for satisfying the overriding public needs test;

- (c) the original public need to be satisfied by the proposed project was to establish accessibility to the waterfront for public enjoyment instead of merely providing a pedestrian walkway. Hence, weight should be given to how the boardwalk could be designed to satisfy the need of public enjoyment; and
- (d) if the consultant would come up with a technically feasible plan to put the boardwalk underneath the IEC and make use of the area under IEC, would it be acceptable to provide more space on the boardwalk given that the boardwalk would likely run into or embrace columns of the IEC?

2.20 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** considered that the present scheme was not one with minimum reclamation. He suggested that the respondents in the CE exercises could not represent all residents living at that area and their views would not be sufficient to override the requirement of PHO.

2.21 **Dr Vivian WONG** said it would be worthwhile to put a design which fulfilled the aspiration of the public to the test of the PHO. Besides, she opined that it would be feasible and easy to place the boardwalk with a cycle track underneath the IEC and referred to a recently built cycle lane underneath a highway in Fujian as an example.

2.22 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said there was no need to challenge the law. The Victoria Harbour was a natural heritage of Hong Kong that needed to be preserved against reclamation. Having regard that one could not enjoy the harbour if there was no access, he had always been supportive to the boardwalk initiative provided that it was put underneath the IEC. Alteration in alignment of the boardwalk outside the IEC footprint could not be justified. Besides, a boardwalk under the shelter and shade of the IEC could also maximise

public enjoyment.

- 2.23 **Mr Walter CHAN** opined that there might be a real risk for the proposed design to face legal challenges as the court had set a very high threshold for the overriding public need. He enquired if advice of the Department of Justice had been sought on whether the cogent and convincing materials in hand were sufficient for satisfying the PHO's requirement.
- 2.24 **The Chair** responded that the Task Force was aware of the risk of legal challenge for this scheme.
- 2.25 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** said that the need to be satisfied was a need for access to and enjoyment of the harbour. It was believed that maximising the area of the boardwalk underneath the IEC could meet the requirements of the PHO. Any additional facilities should be provided on the boardwalk only if the PHO's requirement was met.
- 2.26 **Mr Raymond CHAN** advised the Government to go for an alignment with the minimum permissible width first with a possibility for future expansion.
- 2.27 **Miss Christine AU** made the following responses-
- (a) it was the vision of the Commission to build a 73km long continuous promenade with high quality open spaces for diversified uses and public enjoyment along our harbourfront. From the public engagement exercises, public aspiration of a shared use boardwalk with diversified activities was identified;
 - (b) as for the compliance with PHO, the Government would adhere to the concerned technical circular on carrying out all harbourfront projects involving reclamations. Separately, a working group had been set up under HC to examine the PHO;
 - (c) information relevant to reclamations including reclamation area, decked area above the sea had all

been made available to the public through the digests of CE1 and CE2; and

- (d) the project team would take into account views collected from CE1 and CE2 as well as Members from various meetings and briefings and devise an alternative which sought to minimise reclamation and maximise public enjoyment as far as technically feasible.

2.28 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** considered that the IEC boardwalk presented an opportunity for an innovative and unique design that could add diversity to the waterfront of the Victoria Harbour.

2.29 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** underscored that putting the boardwalk directly underneath the IEC within the existing footprint would not have any impact on the existing use of the harbour. The design could make use of the water body to the south of the IEC.

2.30 **The Chair** concluded that the Task Force's general principles on the design of the boardwalk were that the boardwalk should be underneath the IEC; the design should strike a balance between minimising reclamation and maximising public enjoyment; shared-use including time-sharing should be encouraged; and there should be minimum change in elevation. He asked the project team to provide an alternative option with architectural inputs to the Task Force within three months.

CEDD

2.31 **Miss Christine AU** responded that the project team would report to the Task Force at the next meeting.

Item 3 Clockenflap Hong Kong's Music & Arts Festival

3.1 **The Chair** welcomed the representatives from the organiser of the Clokenflap Hong Kong's Music & Arts Festival

(Clockenflap) to the meeting. **Mr Mike HILL** shared with Members their experience of organising the event Clockenflap in 2016 with the aid of a PowerPoint.

- 3.2 **Dr Vivian WONG** supported the idea of organising more diversified and large scale activities at the harbourfront to attract both local residents and overseas tourists. She said that the Government should strengthen its support to the organisers through providing the required facilities within the site concerned.
- 3.3 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** commented that if the Commission considered space should be provided for organising events at the harbourfront on a long-term basis, the Central Harbourfront Event Space (CHES) could be considered as a permanent site for holding events.
- 3.4 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** asked about the use of CHES on days without event and whether public access along the waterfront would be restricted during events.
- 3.5 **Mr Mike HILL** responded that the shared use of venue parks was popular in the overseas lately and welcomed by the general public. If a venue park could be developed at the harbourfront, the general public could still visit the site for leisure purpose even during the peak season for event organisation (which is from mid-November to February) as most events would only occupy part of the site at weekends. For organisers, the new Central harbourfront would be the most desirable location for organising events.
- 3.6 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** said that he supported the idea of converting CHES into a permanent event venue. With reference to the waterfront development in Singapore, he urged the Government to develop the new Central harbourfront into a diversified venue for different activities.
- 3.7 **Dr Peter Cookson SMITH** requested a list of events held at the CHES in the past 12 months.

- 3.8 **The Chair** responded that the information could be provided by the tenant of CHES, who would brief Members under the next item.
- 3.9 **Mr Henry CHAN** opined that the new Central harbourfront was the most attractive harbourfront location for events. He supported organising diversified events in particular arts and cultural events at the harbourfront.
- 3.10 **The Chair** said the Government should take into account Members' comments and explore adopting the venue park concept along the harbourfront, not limiting to the new Central harbourfront.
- 3.11 **Miss Christine AU** made the following responses-
- (a) a new three-year tenancy of CHES had just been awarded to the incumbent tenant until mid-2020. As the site was part of Sites 4 and 7 of the new Central harbourfront, the Government would discuss with the Commission on its long-term development in due course;
 - (b) to develop harbourfront sites holistically, the Government would aim to create unique characters for different sites, and consider other relevant factors such as its surrounding land uses and possible nuisance caused to nearby residents; and
 - (c) the Government had always been supportive to providing more space along the harbourfront for diversified events. For instance, the Lands Department recently proposed to let out a site at the former Kai Tak Runway through short-term tenancy for organizing and managing events and activities.
- 3.12 On the short-term tenancy at the former Kai Tak Runway, **the Chair** opined that the one-year fixed term would to be

too short for the future tenant to invest on infrastructure improvements.

- 3.13 **Dr Vivian WONG** said that most of the events held at CHES were related to arts, so there should not be much concern on the noise impact. She concurred with the Chair that the Government should explore suitable event venues along the entire harbour.
- 3.14 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said the Government need to explore provision of temporary and permanent event venue as well as a set of event management practice for adoption at the harbourfront.
- 3.15 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** asked the Government to take into account circumstances of individual sites when considering converting them into event venue.
- 3.16 **The Chair** thanked the organiser for the presentation.

Item 4 Operation and Planning for the Central Harbourfront Event Space

- 4.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives from Central Venue Management (CVM) to the meeting. **Ms Maureen EARLS** shared with Members their experiences in operating CHES in the past three years and their planning for the new term of tenancy with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 4.2 **The Chair** enquired if there was a code of practice developed by CVM for organising outdoor events and whether it would be supported by the industry. He added that adequate infrastructure invested by CVM at CHES would facilitate organising events of different scales. He noted the challenges met by CVM and organisers in erecting temporary structures for events.

4.3 **Mr Walter CHAN** enquired if CVM had collected feedback from visitors in the past three years through survey.

4.4 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** made the following comments-

- (a) improvement of infrastructure including drainage system and toilet facility should continue to be made at CHES in the new term of tenancy;
- (b) fences along the perimeter should be removed so that CHES could better integrate with the surrounding waterfront;
- (c) the approach for CVM to determine rental fee for the site;
- (d) the substantial amount of waste produced by events including the Hong Kong Wine and Dine Festival organised by the Hong Kong Tourism Board was a serious environmental concern. He requested CVM and the Government to actively address the issue; and
- (e) if there was any specific reason for putting food trucks within CHES rather than on the promenade managed by LCSD.

4.5 **Ms Maureen EARLS** made the following responses -

- (a) CVM had provided suggestions to other event organisers with a view to developing a comprehensive code of practice to be adopted at event space including the site. In the meantime, the event organisers were required to follow specific venue rules set by CVM;
- (b) on infrastructure, power and water supply were available at CHES for toilet facilities, food booths and other uses. If such utility provisions were fixed at designated points, there would not be sufficient

flexibility to allow innovative and custom-made designs for individual outdoor events;

- (c) it would be cost-effective to invest more if CHES could become a permanent event venue rather than a temporary site with a three-year tenancy;
- (d) fences were required for security purpose in particular after the events were closed at night. CVM would consider if movable fences could be used to facilitate removing them during daytime;
- (e) puddles were found on the ground and corresponding measures had been taken to avoid flooding during rainy days. For instance, CVM would help drain away the water and event organisers would use water vacuum to dry the land;
- (f) event organisers were exploring using inflatable structures at the site so that it would be easier in meeting the requirements of the Buildings Department;
- (g) some event organisers had conducted surveys to collect feedback from participants and these comments would be taken into account when reviewing future event arrangement;
- (h) a fixed rental rate was adopted throughout the first three-year tenancy. After review, CVM would adopt flexible rates for different seasons during the new tenancy to attract event organisers to provide more events in the low season such as summer holidays;
- (i) CVM would share their experience on organising events at CHES with event organisers and provide specific comments on their proposals with a view to making the events successful; and
- (j) CVM was aware of the waste problem and it would be handled seriously. Event organisers would be

reminded to observe some sustainability requirements to minimise the amount of materials used and recycling those materials as far as possible.

- 4.6 In response to the waste produced by the Hong Kong Wine and Dine Festival, **Ms Carmen YU** said that she would convey Members' comments to the Hong Kong Tourism Board for improvement in the future. For other tourism events organised by private organisers which had established contact with the Tourism Commission (TC), the TC would remind them to minimise waste production.
- 4.7 In response to the location of food trucks, **Mr Richard WONG** said that the waterfront promenade was also serving as an emergency vehicular access (EVA), and putting food trucks on the promenade would reduce the width of the EVA and could not meet the minimum width requirement, which would not be permitted under the relevant fire safety code.
- 4.8 **Ms Maureen EARLS** supplemented that CVM was informed that it would be easier to provide electricity to food trucks if they were operated within CHES.
- 4.9 **The Chair** thanked CVM for the presentation and advised them to take into account Members' comments when managing the site during the new tenancy.

Item 5 Any Other Business

A. The Large Metal Object found during Works of Wan Chai Development Phase II (WDII)

- 5.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives from CEDD to the meeting. **Mr C K LAM** updated Members on the progress of handling the large metal object found during the works of WDII with the aid of a PowerPoint.

- 5.2 **The Chair** enquired about the time required for completing the marine archaeological investigation through a consultancy.
- 5.3 **Mr C K LAM** responded that CEDD planned to start the consultancy in Q2 of 2017 for completion in Q1 of 2018.
- 5.4 **Mr Vincent NG** enquired if the issue would have any impact on harbourfront initiatives or constitute as reclamation.
- 5.5 **Mr C K LAM** responded that the metal object had been relocated under water to a nearby area outside the WDII reclamation area and the reclamation works had resumed. There would be no further impact on the WDII project.
- 5.6 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** commented that since HMS Tamar would form part of the history of Victoria Harbour, it would be relevant for the Task Force to be updated on the progress of the issue. He urged the Government to expedite the marine archaeological investigation. He opined that it was almost certain that the metal object was the remains of HMS Tamar. He suggested putting it at a prominent location on the future Wan Chai waterfront to pay tribute to its historical significance.
- 5.7 **Mr C K LAM** responded that the Government had to take a prudent approach in ascertaining the nature of the metal object. As stated in the final report of the Preliminary Archaeological Impact Assessment for WDII, although the various strands of evidence did point towards HMS Tamar, without the ships' bell, nameplate or other unique identifier, definitive identification might have to wait until the distinctive keel construction shown in the Tamar's design 'blueprints' could be compared with the remains on the seabed.
- 5.8 **The Chair** shared Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN's view that the object, if confirmed to be the remains of HMS Tamar, should

be displayed at the waterfront.

5.9 **Mr C K LAM** responded that subject to the findings of the consultancy, the Government would consult the Antiquities Advisory Board and the Harbourfront Commission on the way forward.

5.10 **The Chair** thanked the project team for briefing Members and asked them to keep the Task Force updated on the matter.

B. Harbourfront Enhancement on Hong Kong Island

5.11 **The Chair** said that the establishment of a HFA could be further deliberated in the future. While the dedicated funding of \$500 million could be used for taking forward some harbourfront enhancement initiatives first, he asked if the proposed projects could be deliberated later in tandem with HFA.

5.12 **Mr Vincent NG** said that he echoed with the Chair's view and was aware that the establishment of a HFA was supported by one of the candidates of the Chief Executive election.

5.13 **Miss Christine AU** responded that since the current term of Administration had announced to earmark a dedicated funding of \$500 million for taking forward harbourfront development, and further deliberation on the establishment of HFA would take time, she would like to take the opportunity to brief Members on projects proposed for Hong Kong Island that could be taken forward first by using the dedicated funding.

5.14 **Mr Thomas CHAN** said that regardless of the future deliberations on the establishment of HFA, the Government would still like to seek Members' view on whether the two

harbourfront projects proposed for Hong Kong Island could be funded by the dedicated funding so that necessary preparation could be made accordingly.

- 5.15 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** requested information on site availability, land uses and possible proponent to implement the proposed projects before providing further comments. He said that an overview of land status along the entire harbourfront should be made available to Members.
- 5.16 **Miss Christine AU** responded that an action area table setting out the progress of implementing various harbourfront enhancement initiatives on Hong Kong Island had been circulated to Members regularly. On the two projects proposed for Hong Kong Island, the land was immediately available. She presented details of the proposals to Members with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 5.17 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** suggested to arrange a workshop for Members of the Commission and the Task Forces to discuss potential harbourfront projects further. A list of harbourfront sites with their existing land use and availability should be provided to Members for information.
- 5.18 **Mr Raymond CHAN** suggested the Harbour Unit to lay down the guiding principles of selecting proposed projects at the workshop for Members' reference.

[Post-meeting note: A workshop for Members to discuss harbourfront enhancement proposals to be funded by the dedicated funding was held on 18 April 2017.]

C. Site 3 on the New Central Harbourfront

- 5.19 On behalf of Dr Peter Cookson SMITH, **the Chair** asked about the progress for the long-term development of Site 3 on the new Central Harbourfront.

5.20 **Miss Christine AU** responded that the Government was exploring the best way to dispose Site 3. As the matter involved complicated issues, the Government would need more time before updating Members.

**Harbour
Unit**

5.21 There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 6:05 pm.

Secretariat

Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island

Harbourfront Commission

May 2017