

**9<sup>th</sup> Meeting of Harbourfront Commission**  
**held at 2:30 pm on 8 March 2012 at the Conference Room**  
**on Upper Ground Floor, Hong Kong Heritage Discovery Centre,**  
**Kowloon Park, Haiphong Road, Tsim Sha Tsui, Kowloon, Hong Kong**

**Minutes of Meeting**

**Present**

Mr Nicholas Brooke	Chair
Mrs Carrie Lam	Vice-Chair
Mrs Margaret Brooke	Representing Business Environment Council
Prof Becky Loo	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Mr Lam Kin-lai	Representing the Conservancy Association
Prof Carlos Lo	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Andy Leung	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Tam Po-yiu	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Dr Paul Ho	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Dr Peter Cookson Smith	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Mr Shuki Leung	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Winston Chu	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour (SPH)
Ms Lily Chow	
Mr Eric Fok	
Mr Vincent Ng	
Ms Ann So	
Mr Philip Yung	Commissioner for Tourism
Mr To Kam-biu	Assistant Commissioner/Urban, Transport Department
Mrs Sorais Lee	Head (Kai Tak Office), Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Mrs Betty Fung	Director of Leisure and Cultural Services
Mr Francis Liu	Director of Marine
Mr Jimmy Leung	Director of Planning
Mrs Winnie Kang	Secretary

**In Attendance**

Mr Thomas Chow	Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and
----------------	---

Ms Gracie Foo	Lands) Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)1
Mr Ronald Leung	Assistant Secretary (Harbour) 1(Acting), Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Peter Mok	Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB
Ms Jacinta Woo	Chief Town Planner/Studies & Research, Planning Department (PlanD)

For Agenda Item 7

Miss Margrit Li	Assistant Director (Leisure Services) 1, Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
-----------------	--

For Agenda Item 8

Mr Cheung Tak-keung	Commandant (Police Tactical Unit), Hong Kong Police Force (HKPF)
Mr Law Cheuk-hung	Deputy District Commander (Central), HKPF
Mr Chung Sze-pong	Deputy District Commander (Yau Tsim), HKPF

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr Leslie Chen	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Ir Peter Wong	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Benjamin Cha	
Mr Chan Hok-fung	
Ms Dilys Chau	
Mr Clement Kwok	

**Action**

**Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting**

1.1 **The Chair** said that the Secretariat circulated the draft minutes of the 8<sup>th</sup> meeting to Members for comments on 14 February 2012. After incorporating the proposed amendments received, the revised draft minutes were circulated to Members on

29 February 2012. As no further amendment was proposed at the meeting, the revised draft minutes were confirmed.

## **Item 2 Matters Arising**

A. *The Commission's Annual Report (Paragraph 2.4 of the minutes of the 8<sup>th</sup> meeting)*

2.1 **The Chair** said that the annual report was slightly amended having regard to the discussion at the last meeting. Both the English and Chinese versions of the report had been uploaded onto the Commission's website. He encouraged Members and interested parties to read the report which recorded the Commission's first year of work; and identified the various challenges ahead.

B. *Review of Technical Circular No. 1/04 in the light of SPH's proposed Proportionality Principle (Paragraph 2.10 of the minutes of the 8<sup>th</sup> meeting)*

2.2 **The Chair** said that the DEVB issued a written reply on 14 February 2012 to SPH on its paper titled "*Proposed proportionality principle on reclamation of Victoria Harbour*". The reply was circulated to Members for information on 15 February 2012.

C. *Energizing Kowloon East and the Environmentally Friendly Linkage System (EFLS) (Paragraph 7.16 (g) of the minutes of the 8<sup>th</sup> meeting)*

2.3 **The Chair** informed Members that CEDD would brief the Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development on the proposed EFLS at its upcoming meeting on 12 March 2012. All Members were welcomed to attend the meeting, including those not sitting on the Kai Tak Task Force.

D. *Harbourfront Commission Retreat (Paragraph 8.4 of the*

*minutes of the 8<sup>th</sup> meeting)*

2.4 **The Chair** thanked Members for their active participation in the retreat held on 25 February 2012 to discuss the framework for the proposed harbourfront authority. The retreat was productive and clear ideas on the way forward had been developed. He reminded Members that the relevant discussion should be kept in strict confidence and any further discussion on the proposed authority should continue to be held in closed-door sessions.

**Item 3 Progress Report from Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island (Paper No. HC/01/2012)**

3.1 **The Chair**, in his capacity as the Chair of the Hong Kong Task Force, presented the progress report.

3.2 **Mrs Carrie Lam** said that the huge piece of reclaimed land at the new Central harbourfront, which comprised different sites including the Green Carpet Extension in front of Tamar, the advance promenade, Sites 4 and 7 and the open space fronting Central Piers No. 9 and 10, was a valuable piece of public space that should not be left idle. While effort was being made to work out the framework for the proposed harbourfront authority for consideration by the Government of the next term, it would take some time to bring the proposal to fruition even if the next Administration accepted the proposal. To put the sites to good use for public enjoyment in the interim, she would hold a meeting with the relevant departments within the Administration to discuss possible immediate and short-term uses of the sites. We would keep the Commission updated.

**DEVB**

3.3 **Mrs Lam** further said that she would like to seek Members' advice on two other harbourfront projects, namely the new Planning and Infrastructure Gallery to be known as City Gallery at the City Hall and the proposed re-development of

Fenwick Pier. As the Gallery would be open to the public in the middle of the year, Members could make an advance site visit and give the Government suggestions on how the Gallery could be better integrated with the new Central harbourfront. Regarding the proposed re-development of Fenwick Pier, the Development Opportunities Office of DEVB was working closely with the Servicemen's Guides Association on how to enhance and enrich the facilities. The facilities would not only serve visiting navies, but would also be open for public use at other times. As the proposal would be taken to the Land and Development Advisory Committee (LDAC) before the middle of the year, she considered that the LDAC should discuss the proposal with the benefit of the Commission's view on its compatibility with the Central and Wan Chai harbourfront. To facilitate Members' further discussion on the projects, she asked the Secretariat to arrange site visits for Members.

**the Secretariat**

*(Post-meeting note: A site visit to Fenwick Pier was held on 27 April 2012.)*

3.4 **The Chair** said that Members would welcome the visits to the City Gallery and the Fenwick Pier. He was also glad that the short term uses of the Central reclamation site would be discussed and taken forward.

#### **Item 4 Progress Report from Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development (Paper No. HC/02/2012)**

4.1 **Mr Vincent Ng** briefed Members on the progress report.

4.2 **The Chair** agreed that as the proposed Centre of Excellence in Paediatrics would occupy a huge site at the Kai Tak harbourfront, the key issues included its interface at ground level with the adjoining future promenade and the avoidance of placing unsightly elements on the side facing the waterfront.

4.3 **Mrs Carrie Lam** said that with the relocation of the

Kwun Tong public cargo working area, the Government would commence the construction of the some 700-metre long Kwun Tong Promenade Stage 2 this year. It was timely to examine how to make use of the long strip of idling space underneath the Kwun Tong Bypass during the construction period of the promenade. To this end, the Government was building a site office for the Energizing Kowloon East Office (formerly called the Kowloon East Development Office) underneath the Bypass. The site office was targeted to be officially opened in July this year; half of it would be used as office space and the other half as a public gallery with viewing platform. Noting that there was still plenty of idling space underneath the Bypass to the east of the site office, she invited the Kai Tak Task Force to comment on how to make good use of the idling space. She would ask the Energizing Kowloon East Office to brief the Kai Tak Task Force on the plan at its next meeting scheduled for 12 March 2012.

*(Post-meeting note: The Energizing Kowloon East Office briefed the Kai Tak Task Force on the plan at the Task Force's 10<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 12 March 2012.)*

4.4 **Mr Vincent Ng** remarked that the Kai Tak Task Force would be delighted to provide comments on the issue.

## **Item 5 Progress Report from Task Force on Harbourfront Developments in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing (Paper No. HC/03/2012)**

5.1 **Prof Becky Loo** took Members through the progress report.

5.2 Concerning the Avenue of Stars (AoS), **the Chair** remarked that there should be an opportunity for the New World Development Limited (NWDL) to carry out major redevelopment to enhance the waterfront area. He also suggested expanding the scope of the franchise for the retail kiosks/outlets because the variety of items being sold there was limited at present.

5.3 In responding, **Mrs Betty Fung** informed the meeting that in connection with the short-term improvement work to enhance the accessibility to the Hong Kong Museum of Art, LCSD was going to demolish part of the planters in the Salisbury Garden in front of the Museum to turn it into a public art gallery; and this would widen the entrance of the AoS. The works would commence in September for completion by the end of this year. LCSD also understood from the NWDL that they would provide more leisure and alfresco dining facilities facing AoS in the redeveloped New World Centre and the related work would be completed around 2016. On expanding the scope of the retail franchise, LCSD could further discuss with the AoS Management Committee.

#### **Item 6 Progress Report from Task Force on Water-land Interface (Paper No. HC/04/2012)**

6.1 As Mr Leung Kong-yui, Chair of the Water-land Interface Task Force could not attend the meeting, **the Chair** presented the progress report on his behalf.

6.2 In response to Prof Becky Loo's enquiry on why cross-harbour "water-taxi" services were not considered, **the Chair** explained that having regard to the water condition of the harbour, the Task Force Members were primarily looking at "water-taxi" services running parallel to the shoreline.

#### **Item 7 Management of Promenades under the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (Paper No. HC/05/2012)**

7.1 **The Chair** welcomed Miss Margrit Li, Assistant Director (Leisure Services) 1 of LCSD.

7.2 **Miss Li** presented the paper with the aid of a

PowerPoint.

7.3 **The Chair** commented that LCSD should enable a wider range of food and beverages (F&B) facilities, instead of just kiosks, at the waterfront. He also suggested using a more positive tone for the signages and encouraging visitors to relax and enjoy the waterfront.

7.4 **Mr Lam Kin-lai** shared the Chair's views. He also suggested that hawkers be allowed to enter the waterfront sites on holidays; and more varieties, like pet gardens in future promenades, be added.

7.5 **Mr Winston Chu** suggested that more trees and greeneries should be provided in parks having regard to the climatic condition of Hong Kong in the summer. **The Chair** concurred that more shades could be provided in SYSMP.

7.6 **Mr Vincent Ng** agreed that parks should be designed according to people's needs but architects were much restricted by the management's requirements in designing the parks. That said, he opined that LCSD had already made remarkable improvement in the management of parks in recent years. For instance, people were now allowed to walk, sit and lie on the lawn. He appreciated the adoption of creative park furniture and friendlier signage under the Park Deco Project, and considered it a successful initiative. Also, he relayed Mr Paul Zimmerman's comments that the Police's advice in relation to crowd management should be sought when the architectural design for waterfront parks was drawn up. This was because mills barriers were often used in crowd control operations but there was actually no space to store them when not in use, resulting in these unsightly items being placed in the open space of the waterfront parks.

7.7 **Mrs Betty Fung** made the following responses to Members' questions and comments:-



- (a) LCSD needed to adopt a consistent set of rules and practices in managing over 1,500 parks and playgrounds of different sizes. When designing and managing these leisure venues, LCSD would consult various stakeholders, including the District Councils;
- (b) the parks were heavily in demand and LCSD had to balance the conflicting needs of different users, for instance, by designating specific areas in parks to segregate users who pursued more active uses, like skateboarding, cycling, etc, from those who preferred more passive uses;
- (c) there might also be conflicts between designated and non-designated uses. One notable example was the competing uses of the six soccer pitches in Victoria Park. While the soccer pitches were heavily in demand, it was also the only venue on Hong Kong Island which could be used for holding major events like the Hong Kong Flower Show, the Hong Kong Brand Expo, the Standard Chartered Hong Kong Marathon, etc. During these events, there were complaints about the unavailability of the soccer pitches for football activities. As agreed with the Eastern District Council, LCSD had set a quota to control the number of days to be used for non-designated uses;
- (d) LCSD had tried its best to make available more pet gardens. As it would be difficult to turn existing parks into pet gardens, LCSD could only resort to new venues and had been working closely with the Lands Department (LandsD) in identifying and turning vacant government land into pet gardens. Since the 2010-11 Policy Address, LCSD had managed to increase the number of pet gardens by eight and would build another nine in the coming year;
- (e) LCSD was devising a new set of park signages which

would adopt a more friendly tone. She reiterated that LCSD would not stop people from doing activities which did not cause nuisances to others. For example, LCSD had promulgated departmental guidelines that people were allowed to step, lie or rest on all lawns in parks, except those landscaped areas where the shrubs and flowers were more vulnerable to damages; and

- (f) LCSD kept an open mind on the provision of F&B facilities in parks, especially those along the waterfront. For those smaller parks, it was quite difficult to find operators for the kiosks because the operation was not financially viable. But for those along the waterfront, like the Tsim Sha Tsui Promenade and the future Central promenade, there should be a business case to pursue F&B facilities. LCSD would try out different business models for F&B outlets after discussion with the relevant government departments and bureaux.

7.8 **Miss Li** supplemented that LCSD had been putting a lot of emphasis on the provision of sufficient trees and shelters to users when designing new parks. For those new parks which were expected to be used as venues for public events, LCSD could consult the relevant government departments, including the Police, during the design stage to see how best to accommodate the crowd control aspects and to provide sufficient space for storing mills barriers and other crowd control equipment.

7.9 **Prof Becky Loo** asked that information on the size of various harbourfront venues/facilities managed by LCSD as listed in the annex of the paper be provided to Members.

**LCSD**

*(Post-meeting notes: supplementary information circulated to Members on 22 May 2012).*

7.10 **Dr Peter Cookson Smith** opined that while various stakeholders were consulted during the consultation process, there was still room for improvement in the landscape design of

parks, e.g. to provide more trees and shaded seating.

7.11 Referring to paragraph 11 of the paper, **Prof Carlos Lo** asked whether LCSD had a team specifically dealing with the development and management of facilities along the waterfront; and whether there was a mechanism for LCSD to coordinate the planning, construction and management of these facilities.

7.12 Regarding the “Open Stage” Scheme, **Mr Tam Po-yiu** asked for the reasons for the low level of patronage despite their proximity to popular cultural venues like Hong Kong Cultural Centre (HKCC) and Kwai Tsing Theatre (KTT) and whether there was any abuse of the “first-come-first-served” booking system. He also asked whether the “Open Stage” venues were provided with adequate facilities and services that intending performers required. He opined that Members might learn from the experience to improve the management of waterfront venues.

7.13 Referring to the successful example of Cantonese Opera recently staged at the “Bamboo Theatre” at the West Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD), **Mr Shuki Leung** opined that the Government should promote similar models of land management and departmental coordination for short term public events at the waterfront.

7.14 **Mr Andy Leung** suggested that LCSD consider adopting a public-private collaboration (PPC) approach in the regeneration and revitalization of the older public open spaces in urban areas, in order to exercise greater flexibility in running the F&B facilities and updating the facilities in line with community need.

7.15 **Miss Li** said that LCSD had a specialized development team in its headquarters, which worked closely with Architectural Services Department and other relevant departments on project design in developing recreation, leisure and sports facilities. It would also seek the relevant national sports associations’ views on the safety arrangement and specifications of the design as

necessary. While there were sometimes local constraints, e.g. the existence of some underground utilities beneath the site, LCSD would continue to provide more trees and shaded/sheltered seatings in its parks as far as practicable. Local circumstances and operational requirements would also be taken into account at the design stage. With accumulated experience in project management, LCSD would build up a comprehensive database of more innovative design for future projects. To increase vibrancy of waterfront areas, Miss Li said that LCSD had been working closely with local organisations and District Councils in organising events such as the annual long distance races and painting activities along the promenade at Tsuen Wan in collaboration with the Tsuen Wan District Council.

7.16 **Mrs Fung** supplemented that:-

- (a) having operated the “Open Stage” pilot scheme for one year at LCSD’s three prime cultural venues, namely HKCC, KTT and Shatin Town Hall (STTH), it turned out that the response was less encouraging than expected except for STTH. While the location of HKCC was good, its piazza was also rented out to other performing groups and there might be some difference in views between the two groups of performers. To facilitate the street performances, LCSD had provided amplifiers and allowed them to collect donations, but street performers somehow preferred performing at the nearby subways and the Star Ferry Pier where there was a heavier pedestrian flow. It was indeed the low pedestrian traffic rather than the venue restrictions that had caused the low level of patronage at HKCC and KTT. LCSD still kept an open mind on the possibility of extending the scheme to parks but a number of technical considerations had to be overcome;
- (b) LCSD welcomed the private sector, either the developers or the real estate owners, to put up proposals to upgrade the public pleasure grounds. Recent examples were the

Harbour Road Garden and the Fleming Road Garden near Central Plaza. For some renovated or upgraded public pleasure grounds, the developers would continue to manage them for LCSD for a certain period of time through an entrustment deed; and

- (c) public pleasure grounds which had been allocated to LCSD would be managed by LCSD under the Public Health and Municipal Services Ordinance, (Cap 132). For those unallocated public open spaces (usually of smaller scale), they were often jointly managed by a host of government departments in accordance with the respective legal authorities vested in them.

7.17 **Mrs Carrie Lam** said that unallocated public open space not clearly owned by one single department was not the norm. For this reason and as mentioned earlier in the meeting, she would personally look into the new Central harbourfront, otherwise a sizeable part of it would fall into the status of “unallocated government land” under the purview of LandsD. The Administration needed to find a solution, instead of just fencing off the land and leaving it idle. The Cantonese Opera at WKCD example was a feasible solution, especially for a short period. Acknowledging the need to get people familiarised with the 40-hectare site for art activities, LandsD had given a short term tenancy to the WKCD Authority that allowed it to sublease or sublet the site for different kinds of activities without the need to revert to LandsD to apply for STT for each and every event. Before a dedicated authority was set up to take up the management of the new Central harbourfront, the Government was exploring along that direction to find an agent which would take care of all these matters meanwhile. Otherwise, an individual, company or non-governmental organisation (NGO) which would like to use the new Central harbourfront for organising an event would have to approach the various government departments.

7.18 On PPC, **Mrs Lam** said that in addition to the Harbour

Road Garden project, there were two projects in Wan Chai which were undergoing construction and upgrading works with the involvement of private developers. While major public open spaces, like Victoria Park, had to be put under the Government's control and management, there were merits for developers to come in and help upgrade the more localised parks. However, there had been newspaper reports alleging that the Government did the Harbour Road Garden upgrading project entirely for the company involved such that the whole garden had become the company's "Fung Shui" entrance. She considered this sort of accusations unhelpful and unjustified, and they might somehow inhibit government departments from assuming a more forthcoming role in considering good private sector proposals. She hoped that the Commission would give the Government the needed blessing to go for this kind of PPC projects, especially in more localised public open spaces because the public would benefit from the upgrading.

7.19 **Mr Andy Leung** declared interest that he was a member of the consultant team for the Harbour Road Garden project. He clarified that his intention to mention PPC was not so much related to projects initiated by developers at the adjoining sites, but the idea that the Government could invite the public to submit proposals.

7.20 In closing the discussion, **the Chair** said that the Commission would certainly support the Government in pursuing this kind of PPC projects. He thanked Mrs Fung and Miss Li; and said that LCSD and the Commission were in partnership to achieve the common objective of delivering a vibrant, exciting and user-friendly waterfront. He encouraged LCSD to be more innovative in problem-solving and to share its ideas and proposals with the Commission as early as possible.

## **Item 8 An Overview of Hong Kong Police Force's Policy on Crowd Management for Public Events (Paper No. HC/06/2012)**

8.1 **The Chair** welcomed Mr Cheung Tak-keung, Commandant (Police Tactical Unit), Mr Law Cheuk-hung, Deputy District Commander (Central) and Mr Chung Sze-pong, Deputy District Commander (Yau Tsim) of HKPF.

8.2 **Messrs Cheung and Law** presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.

8.3 **The Chair** asked whether the Police had some specific arrangement to remove the mills barriers off the site soon after the public events. **Mr Winston Chu** asked whether the Police could assist in the design of harbourfront projects so that sufficient storage space for mills barriers could be provided.

8.4 Quoting a tragic waterfront celebration incident for Rugby World Cup in Auckland (New Zealand) last year in which the actually attended event goers were several times more than the prediction given by the event organizers, **Mr Shuki Leung** asked whether the Police had any evacuation or contingency plan to handle similar situation when the number of participants turning up at a public event was much higher than expected.

8.5 **Prof Carlos Lo** appreciated that the Police had adopted a more proactive approach in crowd management by discussing with organisers of public events in advance. He opined that it would be advisable for the Police to provide input on the maintenance of law and order for public events at the design stage of harbourfront projects.

8.6 **Prof Becky Loo** asked about the definition of a crowd; the threshold used to trigger off the crowd management strategy; and the estimation of the size of the crowd (whether it was done by the Police internally or by the event organisers).

8.7 In response, **Mr Law** said that the Police had been consulted in the planning stage of Tamar Park. The Police had requested for installation of flood lights, public address system

and CCTV system in Tamar Park and in the future advance promenade in Central harbourfront. These features would make the open space safer for the public. Understanding that mills barriers were unsightly items and it would take time to move them from place to place among different locations, the Police had tried to reduce the number of mills barriers to be used in public events as far as possible. For instance, during the Chinese New Year Firework Display 2012, the Police had only set up mills barriers to cover half of Tamar Park.

8.8 **The Chair** opined that the design of uneven hard pavement and the adjoining landscaped area in the Tamar Park might increase the likelihood of accidents. He suggested that relevant departments review the situation when handling a large crowd during public events.

8.9 **Mr Law** said that the Police would offer suggestions and observations on the venue design from the public safety and crowd management angle. Before each public event, the Police would make a reconnaissance in the area to identify potential risks, and implement measures to divert the crowd away from the area with potential risk and control the capacity. In the situation of Tamar Park, the Police had divided the zone into different sections and controlled the number of people in each section to avoid domino effect in case of slip and fall accident.

8.10 **Mr Cheung** supplemented that:-

- (a) the Police was studying the possibility of using an alternative type of mills barriers with a better look.
- (b) the Police would do their best to arrange for the mills barriers to be removed as soon as practicable;
- (c) contingency or evacuation plan was always the key item in the Police's risk management process. It was important to consider whether the venue was suitable for the size of crowd and the Police had all along been



working closely with the organisers and the Fire Services Department to ensure that the maximum capacity was not exceeded and all escape routes were open and usable;

- (d) the Police gave opinion on the design of public open space from time to time from the perspective of public safety, both at the headquarters and district level, and would continue to do so; and
- (e) there was no hard and fast rule in the definition of crowd. The scale of police resources deployed for a public event also varied according to the size of the crowd turning up. On estimation of crowd size, the Police seldom did actual head-counting because of the manpower resources required, but would calculate on the basis of the ground area and the estimated density per square metre. During the event, the Police would normally deploy some officers at high point to assess the density of the crowd. If the size of the crowd was assessed to be reaching the capacity limit, the Police might implement measures to stop people from entering the area. The mood and attitude of people, the weather condition and topography of the venue were also factors to be considered.

8.11 In response to Mr Tam Po-yiu's enquiry, **Mrs Winnie Kang** said that the Security Bureau and DEVB were coordinating with the relevant government departments, including the Police, in working out the management and maintenance of the People's Liberation Army Dock site within the new Central harbourfront. All the necessary measures would be in place when the site was ready for opening.

8.12 In closing the discussion, **the Chair** said that the presentation was useful; and that the Commission would engage the Police again later to review the crowd management measures for public events at the advance promenade in the new Central

harbourfront.

**Item 9 Any Other Business**

*SeaEdge Symposium for Waterfront Development Leaders in Auckland from 28 to 29 March 2012*

9.1 **Mrs Winnie Kang** informed Members that Mrs Carrie Lam would lead a delegation to Auckland to attend the SeaEdge Symposium for Waterfront Development Leaders from 28 to 29 March 2012. Useful information gathered from the Symposium would be shared with Members.

**Harbour Unit**

9.2 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm.

**Secretariat  
Harbourfront Commission  
June 2012**