

Harbourfront Commission
Task Force on Harbourfront Developments
on Hong Kong Island

Minutes of Twenty-seventh Meeting

Date : 29 May 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
Mr LEUNG Kong-yui	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Dr NG Cho-nam	Representing Conservancy Association
Mrs Karen BARRETTO	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Anthony CHEUNG	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Evans IU	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Mr Ivan HO	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 Hans Joachim ISLER	
Mr Thomas CHAN	Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands) ¹ , Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Edward LEUNG	Senior Manager (Tourism) 21, Tourism Commission (TC)
Mr Peter MAK	Chief Traffic Engineer/ Hong Kong, 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)
Ms Jenny WONG	Secretary

In Attendance

Miss Christine AU	Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Peter MOK	Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB

Absent with Apologies

Dr Peter Cookson SMITH	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Sr Emily LI	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr Walter CHAN	
Ms Vivian LEE	
Mr Vincent NG	
Mr NGAN Man-yu	
Mr Henry CHAN	
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
Ms Cathy LAM	Engineer 23 (HK Island Division)1, CEDD
Mr NG Shiu-yan	Divisional Officer (Planning Group)1, Fire Services Department (FSD)
Mr KWOK Wai-shun	Station Commander North Point Fire Station, FSD
Mr NG Wah-sum	Assistant Divisional Officer (Marine), FSD
Mr Charles LUK	Executive Director, AECOM
Mr Jimmy LAU	Technical Director, AECOM

For Agenda Item 3

Ms Amy CHEUNG	Assistant Director/Territorial, PlanD
Ms April KUN	Chief Town Planner/Studies and Research, PlanD

Mr Patrick FUNG	Senior Town Planner/ Studies and Research 5, PlanD
Mr Kenny CHAN	Associate Director, AECOM
Mr Avery WAI	Assistant Urban Planner, AECOM

For Agenda Items 4 and 5

Mrs Susanne WONG	District Officer (Central and Western), Home Affairs Department (HAD)
Mr Jiv MOK	Senior Executive Officer (District Management), HAD
Mr Eric MAN	Executive Officer (District Management), HAD
Miss K C CHAN	Executive Assistant, Central and Western District Office, HAD
Ms Maggie MAK	Senior Engineer/ Central and Western, TD
Mr Joe HUI	Senior Engineer/ Gas Standards A2, Electrical and Mechanical Services Department (EMSD)
Mr Gary YIU	Estate Surveyor/ Central and Harbourfront, Lands Department (LandsD)

Action

Welcoming Message

The Chair welcomed all to the meeting. He informed Members that Mr Edward LEUNG, Senior Manager of TC, attended the meeting on behalf of Ms Emily MO.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 26th Meeting

1.1 **The Chair** said the draft minutes of the last meeting were circulated to Members on 22 May 2017. The revised draft minutes with Members' comments incorporated were circulated on 26 May 2017. There being no other proposed amendment, the minutes were confirmed at the meeting.

Item 2 Matters Arising

A. Proposed Boardwalk underneath the Island Eastern Corridor – Stage

2 Community Engagement (paragraph 2.5 of the minutes of the 26th meeting)

- 2.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives of the project team to the meeting. **Mr Alfred WONG** said that the project team had revised the scheme for the proposed boardwalk underneath the Island Eastern Corridor (IEC) after taking into account Members' comments and public opinions collected during Stage 2 Community Engagement (CE2). Under the revised scheme, both eastern and western sections of the boardwalk were placed under IEC as far as technically feasible.
- 2.2 **Mr LAM Chun-tak** presented the revised scheme with the aid of a PowerPoint. Under the revised scheme, the boardwalk would occasionally embrace existing columns of IEC in order to utilize the space underneath the IEC. Majority of the boardwalk would maintain a minimum overall clear width of 7.5m and would largely be placed underneath the IEC footprint. He said that CEDD would conduct a 2-month public consultation to collect public views on the revised scheme in Q3/Q4 2017 tentatively.
- 2.3 **The Chair** supported the revised scheme. He requested the Fire Services Department (FSD) to allow the North Point FSD Pier (the FSD pier) to be used as a landing for the boardwalk with the aim of minimizing the level change along the alignment of the boardwalk. He opined that such a proposal should not hinder the work of FSD, given that the area was observed to be serving as a carpark most of the time now.
- 2.4 **Mr KWOK Wai-shun** responded that only temporary parking was allowed at the FSD pier.
- 2.5 **Mr NG Wah-sum** supplemented that the FSD pier was operational to save and rescue people's lives from fire and other calamities in the sea. In the unfortunate circumstance with the happening of serious incidents involving a large number of casualties, FSD would need to occupy the whole pier to arrange transportation of casualties to hospitals.

Passageway to the pier must be kept clear during operations. In this connection, shared use of the pier was considered not practicable from FSD's operational perspective.

- 2.6 **The Chair** opined that the passageway could be kept clear during operations by simply installing a foldable gate.
- 2.7 **Mr NG Wah-sum** responded that it might be unacceptable to the public if the pier cum part of the boardwalk was closed off for a few hours during operations. FSD would take on board Members' comments and consider if there was any feasible way to share the use of FSD Pier with boardwalk users.
- 2.8 **Ir Raymond CHAN** supported the revised scheme but said that the rising gradient, even not very steep, would cause inconvenience to users in wheelchairs as well as cyclists. If the FSD pier could be shared with boardwalk users, FSD could flexibly use part of the boardwalk to carry out rescue work when needed.
- 2.9 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** supported the revised scheme and echoed Members' comments on shared use of the FSD Pier. He was confident that members of the public would give way to FSD under emergency situations.
- 2.10 **Mr Ivan HO** welcomed the proposed alignment which would provide design flexibility to make it more interesting and vibrant. He opined that the overall design for the activity nodes should be consistent. He concurred with other Members that cordoning off the FSD pier during emergency would be a sensible option.
- 2.11 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** supported the revised scheme. She suggested that the rationale behind the design should be provided to the public during the upcoming public consultation.
- 2.12 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** appreciated the efforts that the project team had made in minimizing the impact on the

harbour and providing a sheltered boardwalk for public enjoyment. He said additional connections should be provided in the western section to better connect the hinterland with the boardwalk. On shared use of the FSD pier, the general public would certainly give way to rescue operations. The arrangement was similar to the shared use of public road outside fire stations/ambulance depots. He observed that the FSD pier was used as a temporary carpark from time to time.

2.13 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** supported the revised scheme and echoed that a winding boardwalk could be more interesting from design perspective. He opined that the project team might provide more gathering points for various activities. He also concurred with other Members on the shared use of the FSD pier.

2.14 **Mr LAM Chun-tak** made the following responses-

- (a) despite geographical constraints under IEC, the western section of the boardwalk would be as flat as possible, i.e. at a level of around +5.5 mPD and the gradient for the eastern section was in general less than 4%. Only a 70m-long section outside K. Wah Centre would have a gradient of about 4.7%, which should be acceptable for the aged and disabled;
- (b) majority of the boardwalk would maintain a minimum overall clear width of 7.5m and largely be placed underneath the IEC footprint under the revised scheme;
- (c) the four activity nodes at Oil Street, Tong Shui Road, North Point Vehicular Ferry Pier and the area next to Hoi Yu Street as elaborated in CE2 would remain unchanged; and
- (d) the project team was liaising with the Highways Department and PlanD on providing additional connections near Oil Street and City Garden at the western section.

- 2.15 **Mr KWOK Wai-shun** supplemented that FSD would prohibit cars from parking at the FSD pier in the medium to long run.
- 2.16 **Mr NG Wah-sum** added that while pedestrians would only be restricted from using the roads outside fire stations/ ambulance depots for a short period of time under normal circumstances, FSD would need to close off the FSD pier for hours during rescue operations. The level of inconvenience to the public would be much higher in the latter case.
- 2.17 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** opined that after weighing the pros and cons, he believed that the community would accept the FSD pier to be closed off under the few emergency circumstances rather than accepting the rising gradient which would be permanent in nature.
- 2.18 As a way out, **Mr NG Shiu-yan** suggested having an alternative route above the FSD pier for public use during above-mentioned operations.
- 2.19 **The Chair** said the above suggestion would involve additional project cost.
- 2.20 **Ir Raymond CHAN** said that the alternative route, if any, could be much narrower as compared to the rest of the boardwalk.
- 2.21 **The Chair** thanked the project team and FSD for attending the meeting and asked them to consider Members' comments. He said that in the upcoming consultation, it should be made clear that the public was not invited to suggest further options on the alignment all over again but they could give views on the revised one.
- 2.22 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** said that the Commission could play a more active role in assisting the Government to explain the revised scheme to the public.

CEDD

Item 3 Urban Design Study for the Wan Chai North and North Point Harbourfront Areas - Proposed Major Refinements to the Harbourfront Enhancement Proposals (Paper No. TFHK/02/2017)

3.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives from the study team to the meeting. **Ms Amy CHEUNG** informed Members that after taking into account public views and comments received during and after the Stage 2 Public Engagement (PE2) and subsequent meetings with relevant stakeholders and Members, the study team had proposed refinements to the Harbourfront Enhancement Proposals (HEPs) for the Urban Design Study for the Wan Chai North and North Point Harbourfront Areas (UDS). **Mr Kenny CHAN** briefed Members on the current progress and the proposed refinements with the aid of a PowerPoint.

3.2 **Mr Hans Joachim ISLER** made the comments below-

- (a) as a member of the Hong Kong Water Sports Council and the Hong Kong Sailing Federation, he had attended a meeting with the study team on 9 May 2017. He appreciated the study team's effort in seeking water sports communities' further comments and views. In general, he agreed that the Wan Chai basin was an ideal location for developing into a water sports centre and holding international water sports events;
- (b) he recognized that both permanent and temporary wave-brakes might not be able to satisfy the requirements under the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (PHO);
- (c) relocation of Noonday Gun might be a possible way to maintain a wide and continuous boardwalk;
- (d) on the Water Sports and Recreation Precinct, sufficient

facilities should be provided for organising both local and international water sports competitions or events; and

- (e) he supported the proposed traffic arrangement as it could provide more open space at the waterfront.

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

- (a) he suggested exploring a double deck concept along the waterfront to provide additional space for both pedestrians and cyclists;
- (b) the water quality problem had yet to be resolved as he could not see drainage facilities such as dry weather flow interceptors be incorporated in the refined HEPs;
- (c) wave attenuation at the Water Sports and Recreation Precinct had not been resolved and the proposed wave-brake would not only give rise to maintenance and management complications while requiring the same requirements under the PHO as a fixed breakwater;
- (d) he objected to the proposed floating swimming pool in the Water Sports and Recreation Precinct;
- (e) he stressed the importance to allow basic infrastructure including waste, sewerage, electricity and water supply etc. to be provided along the waterfront to facilitate marine users and the organising of various events and activities;
- (f) pedestrian connectivity to the waterfront should be improved and additional space for activity or public viewing should be provided; and
- (g) ancillary facilities such as bollards and public viewing deck should be provided to facilitate the organising of dragon boat race, sea canoeing and other water sports

activities near the East Coast Park Precinct.

- 3.4 **The Chair** enquired if it would be feasible to build a cantilevered walkway without supporting structures on the seabed.
- 3.5 **Mr Kenny CHAN** made the following responses -
- (a) the proposed wavebrake had been proved to be an effective wave attenuation measure, and its impact on PHO was relatively small when compared with other types of permanent measures. Further study on this particular issue might need to be conducted at the implementation stage when more details of the water events were available;
 - (b) the study team would further look into the appropriate traffic circulation arrangements in planning and design of the Water Sports and Recreation Precinct;
 - (c) the Environmental Protection Department had commissioned a study to improve near shore water quality and the study team would make reference to the findings of the study when making recommendations on the way forward;
 - (d) there was an existing water selling kiosk in CWBTS to support existing vessels within the typhoon shelter. Consideration might be given to upgrade the existing facility if needed;
 - (e) the potential PHO implications of the proposed additional connection to the proposed boardwalk underneath IEC outside City Garden would be assessed in the project implementation stage;
 - (f) whether dragon boat race and other water sports events could be held near the Pierside Precinct and the East Coast Park Precinct would be subject to further investigation on wave attenuation. Various supporting

facilities including bollards had been included in HEPs;
and

- (g) cantilevered boardwalk in the eastern section of CWBTS was included as an option in order to maintain a continuous pedestrian connection along the waterfront while keeping the implications in relation to PHO to the minimum.

3.6 **The Chair** requested and **Ms Amy CHEUNG** agreed to further discuss with Members on the implementation of the final recommendations of the UDS. She said the study team aimed at substantially completing the UDS by end 2017 and taking forward some “quick-win” initiatives subject to site availability.

PlanD

[Post-meeting note: The study team attended the meeting of the Working Group on the UDS (WGUDS) on 12 September 2017 and discussed with Members regarding the implementation arrangement.]

3.7 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** reiterated his concern over water quality and provision of sufficient facilities along the harbourfront for marine uses.

3.8 In response, **Ms Amy CHEUNG** said that the study team was proposing water sports activities in an area that water quality would be acceptable and would consult other relevant bureaux and departments on future measures to improve water quality in the study area.

3.9 **Miss Christine AU** supplemented the following -

- (a) the study team was engaged in 2015 to develop the Wan Chai North and North Point harbourfront areas in an innovative and creative manner. After conducting PE1 and PE2 and taking into account comments from the Commission, Members might appreciate that some innovative HEPs were proposed based on public aspirations and comments. Although some of them

might be difficult to implement under the current set-up, they might be taken forward gradually in parallel with the evolution of development and management model of harbourfront areas. The study team was finalising HEPs and would formulate an implementation strategy; and

- (b) a working group on PHO under the Commission had been examining the issue about the implications of the law separately. In any case, Members might not have preferred the team to have simply discarded all proposals that might have PHO implications. The PHO requirements might still be satisfied if there were overriding public needs.

3.10 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** opined that the study team should allow flexibility when considering whether to include the cantilevered boardwalk proposal so that such proposal might be implemented in future when there were public needs.

3.11 **Mr Hans Joachim ISLER** concurred with the Chair and requested the team to provide a time table for implementing various HEPs so that the Commission could deliberate on the priorities. For example, the proposed public viewing deck on the existing breakwater that may not involve reclamation might be implemented first. He further enquired if the provision of dry weather flow interceptor at CWBTS would have any PHO implications.

3.12 **Ms Amy CHEUNG** responded that the study team had proposed three options for the cantilevered boardwalk along CWBTS promenade. They were not mutually exclusive with a view to providing flexibility for implementation. The timing for implementation of the public viewing deck on the breakwater would be considered when formulating the overall implementation strategy.

- 3.13 On the cantilevered boardwalk at the eastern end of CWBTS, **Ir Raymond CHAN** commented that the study team might consider making use of the foundation structures of IEC to accommodate the boardwalk as an alternative route to minimise the space required for potential reclamation.
- 3.14 **Mr Kenny CHAN** responded that hanging boardwalk structure along that section of the IEC had been considered, but was not recommended as it would cast extra shadow on the waters. In addition, to allow sufficient headroom for pedestrians, such an alignment would completely block marine access to that area at the south eastern corner of CWBTS.
- 3.15 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** requested the study team to bring in more activities in the proposed open space, rearrange the building form of structures, and provide more parking spaces in the Pierside Precinct; devise direct pedestrian connections from the hinterland to the Water Sports and Recreation Precinct; include more features that could provide shades in the Celebration Precinct, and adopt the shared use concept along the entire stretch of the waterfront.
- 3.16 **Mr Kenny CHAN** made the following responses-
- (a) building form of structures in the Pierside Precinct was determined by several constraints, including loading allowance of the site and alignment of the existing drainage reserve;
 - (b) additional parking spaces would not be necessary in the Pierside Precinct because the area would be supported by efficient public transport system;
 - (c) having regard to the limited space available for footing and estimated loading requirements, it would be difficult to construct a direct pedestrian footbridge spanning across from the hinterland to the Water Sports

and Recreation Precinct; and

- (d) the rooftops and balconies of both the Harbour Recreation Annex and the Harbour Education Annex in the Water Sports and Recreation Precinct could be used for public viewing purpose.

3.17 **Ms Amy CHEUNG** supplemented that HEPs indeed were refined with the comments from Members as expressed in previous WGUDS and Task Force meetings, e.g. users of the waterfront should be encouraged to use public transport instead of private cars, waterfront spaces should be designed with flexibility for different activities and events etc.

3.18 **Mr Anthony CHEUNG** commented that the study team should incorporate more elements such as an aquarium or children's playground in the proposed open space in the Pierside Precinct. He also noticed that there was no activity node proposed at the Revitalised Typhoon Shelter Precinct. Besides, he enquired if public viewing stands would be provided for water sports events in the Water Sports and Recreation Precinct.

3.19 **Mr Ivan HO** said that the Pierside Precinct had only provided a large piece of passive open space with some buildings. Buildings with distinguished design features that could provide attractive activities should be provided along the waterfront from urban design perspective. Besides, an implementation time table for HEPs should be provided for Members' comments.

3.20 **Mr Hans Joachim ISLER** added that it might not be desirable to build many structures in the Water Sports and Recreation Precinct as these structures might reduce flexibility for organising different types of water sports events. He supported the current simple and flexible layout.

3.21 **Mr Peter MAK** said that any assumption that provision of

public parking spaces, especially for goods vehicles, in the vicinity of the Water Sports and Recreation Precinct had been adequate was unrealistic based on parking surveys and the public's aspiration.

3.22 Miss Christine AU made the following responses-

- (a) Members might be aware that various activities were proposed for the study area in Paper No. TFHK/02/2017. For example, a sun bathing area and floating pool were proposed in the Water Sports and Recreation Precinct and berthing facilities were included in the Revitalised Typhoon Shelter Precinct. These proposals had been retained in the latest submission. The study team had only made some refinements to the HEPs in response to public comments received in PE2 and comments raised by Members at previous WGUDS and Task Force meetings; and
- (b) Members supported that no on-street parking spaces should be provided along Hung Hing Road at the last meeting of WGUDS on 22 March 2017. To enhance the harbourfront for public enjoyment, patrons going to the subject area would be encouraged to use public transport.

3.23 The Chair thanked the study team for the presentation and asked them to take on board Members' comments when finalising the HEPs.

Item 4 Proposed Setback of the Eastern Street North Parking Site from Seawall for Provision of Public Open Space Connecting the Fung Mat Road Waterfront Site and Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park (Paper No. TFHK/03/2017)

Item 5 Open Space Development at Fung Mat Road Waterfront Site (Paper No. TFHK/04/2017)

- 4.1 **The Chair** welcomed representatives from the Central and Western District Office (C&WDO) of HAD, LandsD, EMSD and TD to the meeting. He informed Members that as items 4 and 5 were interrelated, discussion of the two items would be combined.
- 4.2 **Mrs Susanne WONG** presented the proposal to set back the existing short-term tenancy (STT) carpark at Eastern Street North and the design of the temporary open space at the Fung Mat Road site with the aid of a PowerPoint.
- 4.3 **Mrs Susanne WONG** further informed Members of the followings-
- (a) C&WDO would be responsible for managing the sites concerned after completion of works until the sites were taken up by LCSD for long term development;
 - (b) construction and installation works for the project “Harbourfront Enhancement and Revitalisation at the Western Wholesale Food Market (WWFM)” under the Signature Project Scheme (SPS) would be completed by end 2017 as originally scheduled;
 - (c) the promenade at WWFM, the Fung Mat Road site and the strip of land to be set back from the Eastern Street North STT carpark (the STT carpark) were expected to be ready for public access in Q1, Q2 and Q3 in 2018 respectively;
 - (d) the STT carpark would be fenced off due to public safety considerations;
 - (e) the enhancement of the STT carpark and the Fung Mat Road site would cost around \$10 million and \$8 million respectively;
 - (f) facilities for the above projects were basic and flexible so they could be easily incorporated into the future design

of the long-term waterfront development;

- (g) C&WDO would coordinate with relevant government departments to keep exploring alternatives to address the parking demand in the district with a view to releasing the STT carpark for public enjoyment; and
- (h) relevant Government departments would ask the current operator to set back the subject carpark as soon as practicable.

4.4 **The Chair** welcomed setting back the STT carpark. He enquired if re-tendering of the site would be required by end 2017.

4.5 **Mrs Susanne WONG** responded that no re-tendering would be required. The existing STT could be terminated by either LandsD or the operator by serving a notice of not less than six calendar months.

4.6 **Ir Raymond CHAN** supported setting-back the STT carpark and agreed to extending the STT for car parking purpose until end 2018 but not further. He suggested using transparent materials to fence off the STT carpark so that patrons on the waterfront passageway would be aware should any accident happen in the carpark.

4.7 In response, **Mrs Susanne WONG** said that relevant Government departments would ensure all safety requirements for parking Liquefied Petroleum Gas cylinder wagons would be strictly complied with.

4.8 **Mr Ivan HO** welcomed setting-back the STT carpark but opined that the STT should not go beyond end 2018.

4.9 **The Chair** concluded that Members in general agreed to extend the STT carpark concerned until end 2018. He invited and C&WDO agreed to consult the Task Force again should any further extension be required.

Item 6 Any Other Business

A. New STT of the Hong Kong Observation Wheel Site at the New Central Harbourfront

- 6.1 **Miss Christine AU** informed Members that after obtaining support from the Task Force and the Central and Western District Council in 2016 to continue the existing short-term use through an open tender, LandsD invited an open tender with a term of three years on 11 November 2016 for seven weeks. Similar to the previous STT, a two-envelope approach was adopted for the tender exercise. The assessment criteria on technical submission included overall site design; plans for daily operation; management and promotion; ticket prices for adults, the elderly, persons with disabilities and children; and the community engagement programme. The tender was closed on 30 December 2016 and LandsD announced the tender result on 23 May 2017. A new bidder received the highest score in both rental and technical assessments and has hence won the tender. LandsD would terminate the current STT in accordance with the terms in the tenancy agreement and it was expected that the site could be handed over to the new operator as early as in September 2017.
- 6.2 **The Chair** enquired whether the existing wheel would be dismantled.
- 6.3 **Miss Christine AU** responded that it had been included in the tenancy agreement of the new STT that the tenant might use the existing wheel, provided that a commercial deal could be reached between the existing operator and the new tenant. Failing that, demolition of the existing wheel would be needed and it might take around one year for the new tenant to install a new wheel and then to obtain all necessary

licences before commencing operation. Despite that there was a possibility of the wheel operation to be suspended for a period of time, **Miss Christine AU** said that there was some area within the site for the new tenant to organise events for earlier public enjoyment. The Government was given to understand that the new tenant would announce its operational details in due course.

6.4 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** was concerned about that tonnes of construction waste would be generated from disposal of the existing wheel and its concrete base.

6.5 **Miss Christine AU** responded that the existing tenant was required to comply with relevant environmental protection regulations as stipulated in the tenancy agreement when taking down the existing wheel. While noting that there might be the possibility of having the current wheel dismantled, the Government considered that open tender was the most transparent and fairest way to let out Government land for commercial use.

B. Site 3 on the New Central Harbourfront

6.6 **Miss Christine AU** informed Members that the planning brief for the “Comprehensive Development Area” Zone at Site 3 of the new Central harbourfront was endorsed by the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) of the Town Planning Board on 23 December 2016. Members’ comments were recorded and responded by PlanD in the MPC paper No.19/16, which was tabled for Members’ reference. Members would be briefed on the progress of the development in due course.

6.7 **The Chair** said Site 3 was an iconic site on the harbourfront and urged the Government to handle the land disposal matter prudently.

6.8 **Mrs Margaret BROOK** said that the public was concerned about the demolition of the General Post Office building

under the endorsed planning brief.

- 6.9 There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 5:30 pm.

Secretariat

Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island

Harbourfront Commission

September 2017