

19th Meeting of Harbourfront Commission
held at 3:00 pm on 23 March 2015 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
Mr Paul CHAN	Secretary for Development, Vice-Chair
Mrs Margaret BROOKE	Representing Business Environment Council
Mr LEUNG Kong-yui	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Mr LAM Kin-lai	Representing Conservancy Association
Mrs Karen BARRETTO	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Andy LEUNG	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Evans IU	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Mr TAM Po-yiu	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Mr LAU Chun-kong	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr Ivan HO	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design
Mr Peter WONG	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Louis LOONG	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Ms Debby CHAN	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour
Mr CHAN Hok-fung	
Mr Walter CHAN	
Ms Lily CHOW	
Mr Eric FOK	
Mr Brian David LI	
Mr Raj Sital MOTWANI	
Mr Thomas CHOW	Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)
Mr LING Kar-kan	Director of Planning
Ms Emily MO	Assistant Commissioner (Tourism)2, Tourism Commission (TC)
Mr Albert LEE	Assistant Commissioner/Urban, Transport Department

Mr Edwin TONG	(TD) Project Manager (Hong Kong Island & Islands), Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Mr Richard WONG	Assistant Director (Leisure Services)2, Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
Mr CHUNG Siu-man	Assistant Director/Planning & Services, Marine Department (MD)
Miss Christine AU	Secretary

In Attendance

Mr Thomas CHAN	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Mr Allen FUNG	Political Assistant to Secretary for Development
Miss Fannie KONG	Press Secretary to Secretary for Development
Mr Larry CHU	Assistant Secretary (Harbour) 1, DEVB
Mr Frederick YU	Assistant Secretary (Harbour) Special Duties, DEVB
Miss Ingrid TJENDRO	Assistant Secretary (Harbour) 2, DEVB
Mr Peter MOK	Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB
Mr Jim LAM	Senior Estate Surveyor/Technical Information, Lands Department (LandsD)

Absent with Apologies

Mr CHAN Ka-kui	
Mrs Ayesha Macpherson LAU	
Mr Vincent NG	
Prof Becky LOO	Chair, Task Force on Harbourfront Developments in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing

For Agenda Item 3

Ms Cordelia LAM	Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport)2, Transport and Housing Bureau (THB)
Mr Albert LEE	Assistant Commissioner/Urban, TD

For Agenda Item 8

Mrs Margaret BROOKE	Representative of HBF
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN	Representative of Designing Hong Kong (DHK)

Welcoming Message

The Chair welcomed all to the meeting. He informed Members that Ms Cathy CHU had taken over the post of Commissioner for Tourism from Mr Philip YUNG with effect from 22 December 2014. He thanked Mr YUNG for his contributions to the work of the Commission. He also told Members that Ms Emily MO, Assistant Commissioner (Tourism)² of TC, was attending on behalf of Ms Cathy CHU; Mr Albert LEE, Assistant Commissioner/Urban of TD, was attending on behalf of Mrs Ingrid YEUNG; Mr Edwin TONG, Project Manager (Hong Kong Island & Islands) of CEDD, was attending on behalf of Mr HON Chi-keung; Mr Richard WONG, Assistant Director (Leisure Services)² of LCSD was attending on behalf of Ms Michelle LI; and Mr CHUNG Siu-man, Assistant Director/Planning & Services of MD, was attending on behalf of Mr Michael WONG.

Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of the 18th Meeting

1.1 **The Chair** said that the Secretariat had circulated the draft minutes of the 18th meeting to Members on 23 February 2015. After incorporating the proposed amendments received, the revised draft minutes were circulated to Members on 6 March 2015.

1.2 **Ms Debby CHAN** further proposed to amend paragraph 7.3 of the revised draft minutes to read as follows:-

“Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN reiterated his suggestion at the last meeting to compile a calendar of ongoing activities and events related to harbourfront projects and events which the Commission could utilize as publicity opportunities.”

1.3 After incorporating Ms Debby CHAN's proposed amendment, the revised draft minutes were confirmed at the meeting.

Item 2 Matters Arising

A. *Planning for Victoria Harbourfront: Approach and Process (Paragraph 8.22 of the minutes of the 18th meeting)*

2.1 **The Chair** reported that the Harbour Unit was working with the Planning Department (PlanD) and MD to review the functional zoning plan of the harbour, and would report to the meeting in due course.

2.2 **Mr Thomas CHAN** supplemented that Members' aspiration to have a comprehensive strategy on harbour planning was noted when marine spatial planning (MSP) was discussed at the last meeting. As agreed, PlanD would work with MD to update the functional zoning plan underpinned in the Planning Study on the Harbour and its Waterfront Areas (Harbour Plan Study) that was put forward more than a decade ago. Focus would also be placed on strengthening district-based harbourfront enhancement in order to tie in with the review of the activities and concentrate efforts on implementing selected water-land interface initiatives, such as water sports which was under the purview of the Home Affairs Bureau. Hopefully, a more updated plan could be presented to Members at the next meeting. Given the scope of MSP, it would be a challenge, in terms of time and resources, for the Government to commit to a full-blown review study at this juncture. It was considered more conducive to engage Members' views after reviewing and updating the functional zoning plan first, and consider how best to target efforts in taking forward the matter thence.

2.3 In response to Ms Debby CHAN's enquiry on the

committed timing to undertake a MSP exercise, **Mr Paul CHAN** said that in terms of resources and priorities, it was challenging to commit to such a comprehensive study. PlanD and MD would make joint efforts to enhance the functional zoning plan in the Harbour Plan Study, and DEVB would continue to strengthen the implementation of district-based enhancement and selected water-land interface initiatives.

B. Progress Update of the Proposed Establishment of a Harbourfront Authority in Hong Kong (Paragraph 7.3 of the minutes of the 18th meeting)

2.4 In response to Ms Debby CHAN's enquiry, **Miss Christine AU** said that as the events and activities referred in paragraph 7.3 of the minutes (on the compilation of a calendar of ongoing activities and events related to harbourfront projects which HC could utilize as publicity opportunities) were in relation to Phase II Public Engagement Exercise (Phase II PE) which had already completed in December 2014, there was no further update on this front.

C. Water Quality at Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter (Paragraph 3.3 of the minutes of the 18th meeting)

2.5 **The Chair** said that a joint written response from CEDD and the Drainage Services Department on the issue was circulated to Members on 6 March 2015. CEDD had also made a response to the Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island at its last meeting held on 10 February 2015.

D. Coach and Goods Vehicle Parking at the Harbourfront (Paragraph 5.4 of the minutes of the 18th meeting)

2.6 **The Chair** said that the issue would be discussed under agenda item 3 of this meeting.

Item 3 Coach and Goods Vehicle Parking at the

Harbourfront (Paper No. HC/01/2015)

3.1 **The Chair** welcomed Ms Cordelia LAM of THB and Mr Albert LEE of TD to the meeting. **Mr Albert LEE** presented the paper with the aid of a PowerPoint.

3.2 **The Chair** commented that the problem should not be tackled on a case-by-case basis. He pointed out that the presentation did not set out any long term strategic solution to address the issue, such as building multi-storey car parks at suitable locations. Short term tenancy (STT) car parks should only be a stopgap measure.

3.3 **Mr Albert LEE** responded that the presentation covered the practical measures undertaken by TD under the present framework in particular on the efforts made to identify replacement sites for coaches and goods vehicles (GVs) as well as the constraints faced when incorporating additional provision of car parking facilities in new developments. There was genuine parking demand for coaches at a few hot spots within the harbourfront areas. Even if multi-storey car parks could be developed, their utilisation would be doubtful as the locations might not be convenient to drivers. While a feasibility study for developing a multi-storey car park in Kwai Chung had commenced, various issues still needed to be addressed, including whether a standalone car park could be an effective solution to meet the car parking demand from the vicinity, utilisation, local traffic impact, environmental impact and local views, *etc.* TD would look for other possible measures to address the issue in the long run.

3.4 **Mr LING Kar-kan** said that PlanD had been working with TD on the issue, and there was no easy solution to tackle the problem entirely, especially for commercial vehicles. For coaches, many operators deliberately chose to wait at limited on-street spaces which were close to tourist hotspots. While a multi-storey car park could provide a sizable number of car parking spaces, their utilisation rate might not be high as drivers

normally would still prefer to park their vehicles close to their workplaces or homes. If additional parking spaces had to be allocated in new developments, it would give rise to increase in gross floor area (GFA) and building bulk. PlanD would continue to facilitate TD in addressing this issue under the current planning framework and the Government would welcome innovative suggestions from Members as well as the trade.

3.5 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** commented that coaches and GVs should be treated separately. He opined that coaches within the harbourfront were usually doing quick pick-ups or drop-offs or some waiting but they would not park there for long. Their bringing in people to the waterfront also helped bring vibrancy to the area. Their presence, therefore, could be tolerated. However, for GVs, parking areas for them should only be close to port or industrial areas. These areas should be convenient for their daily operations.

3.6 **Mr Ivan HO** expressed a different view and opined that coaches waiting at the waterfront would cause inconveniences to other uses. Overseas waterfront cities would not allow coaches to wait at the city centre, and tourists had to walk a certain distance to some popular tourist spots. TD's presentation did not provide any feasible solutions for Members to comment on. He asked THB and TD to provide a more constructive solution on the issue.

3.7 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** echoed that coaches should not be allowed to wait at the waterfront, but should be allowed to drop off/pick up tourists at certain locations. For GVs, a holistic approach involving all relevant departments should be adopted to identify possible long-term solutions such as increasing penalty in order to discourage illegal parking on the street.

3.8 **Ms Debby CHAN** objected to the proposed STT parking sites at Wa Shun Street and Bailey Street in Hung Hom. She asked if coach parking facilities would be incorporated into

the future development at the existing Rumsey Street multi-storey car park site. She also enquired the reason of not incorporating any coach parking provision in the redevelopment of the Middle Road multi-storey car park site. She said that if TD claimed that based on the traffic impact assessment (TIA) and surveys conducted for the Middle Road site that there was no need to incorporate coach parking facilities in the redevelopment, the same logic would suggest that additional coach parking facilities at Hung Hom to cope with the demand from the same area would not be necessary. Instead of granting new STTs, she proposed that TD should identify development projects within the waterfront or in the vicinity to tourist spots for building car parks in order to meet the demand.

3.9 **Mr Thomas CHOW** said that the Commission should focus its efforts on addressing parking issues that would affect public enjoyment at the waterfront, instead of scrutinising the car parking problem of the whole of Hong Kong which fell outside the Terms of Reference of the Commission. He agreed that the current situation at several hotspots, for example the Avenue of Stars and Salisbury Road and the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre, was not satisfactory because some coach drivers were taking advantage of the leniency of the Police. He believed that while picking up and dropping off tourists at the road kerb would be required at these spots, coaches waiting for their passengers for a long time while blocking the traffic should not be allowed having regard to the nearby traffic conditions. The management of coaches at these spots should be further looked into but the focus should not be on putting in more coach parking spaces, as coaches would rather pick up or drop off their passengers than parking in areas with crowded traffic conditions.

3.10 **Mr Andy LEUNG** concurred that coaches and GVs were two different issues to be looked into. Members should focus more on coach parking, which was more relevant to public enjoyment at the waterfront. He considered the current situation a management issue which required collaboration among different stakeholders including the Police and the trade.

Due to service need and traditional operation model, additional parking spaces or multi-storey car park might not be effective to attract coach drivers to leave those hotspots. In the long term, relevant departments could conduct a more specific assessment on the demand for coach parking and number of lay-bys at these hotspots. For GV's, it was a different issue which required joint effort to adjust drivers' mindset and a review of the existing operation model in order to resolve the problem.

3.11 **Mr LING Kar-kan** echoed that the Commission should focus on harbourfront enhancement rather than parking problem as a whole. He said that many STT car parks were being used because many newly-formed waterfront sites would be available for such use for some time before implementation of their permanent uses. These STT car parks would be surrendered when permanent development took place. PlanD would try to identify replacement sites at the hinterland but it might not be easy in some cases.

3.12 **Ms Cordelia LAM** responded that THB and TD had been monitoring the demand and supply situation of car parking spaces, and were aware that the STT car parking sites at the waterfront would be phased out gradually. TD was working with relevant government departments to explore different ways in addressing the issue. While developing multi-storey car parks could be one of the options, its effectiveness would be further studied as some of the proposed locations might not be close to tourist hotspots and hence not convenient to drivers. TD would also continue to communicate with the Police in stepping up enforcement actions.

3.13 **Mr Albert LEE** appreciated Members' comments in respect of separating coaches and GV's. According to TD's observation, in general Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV's) using the STT car parking sites at the waterfront were not construction vehicles, tankers or container trucks. These HGV's would like to park near relevant facilities such as wholesale food markets or public cargo working areas for operational convenience. For

the Middle Road multi-storey car park site, TD had carried out a comprehensive traffic impact assessment, and concluded that there was a surplus of coach parking spaces provided in the vicinity. Meanwhile, the tourism trade in particular coach drivers would like to wait near tourist hotspots for the sake of convenience and the Middle Road site was not considered to be close enough. TD was proposing to provide some STT car parking sites away from the tourist hotspots in harbourfront area and the desired arrangements would be for coaches to park and wait at these STT sites until it was time for pick-up at the hot spots. The two sites at Wa Shun Street and Bailey Street in Hung Hom (which were both pending permanent development) were proposed in alignment of this approach. TD had not refused and would not refuse to surrender a STT parking site when permanent development was ready, but it did require time to identify suitable replacement sites.

3.14 **Ms Emily MO** said that the Travel Industry Council of Hong Kong was aware of the illegal parking problem near some tourist hotspots, and had been encouraging relevant shops and restaurants to manage the traffic outside their premises. These efforts, together with the Police's stepped-up enforcement actions, had been effective in improving the traffic situation in some areas.

3.15 **The Chair** thanked THB and TD for their presentation but would like for them to phase out STT car parking sites within the harbourfront areas as soon as practicable, and report to the Commission on the latest situation in a year's time.

THB and TD

Item 4 Progress Report from Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island (Paper No. HC/03/2015)

4.1 **The Chair**, in his capacity as the Chair of the Task Force, briefed Members on the progress report. **Members** noted the contents of the report.

4.2 **Miss Christine AU** supplemented that the Secretariat had issued invitation to all Members of the Task Force to join the Working Group on the Urban Design Study for the Wan Chai North and North Point Harbourfront Areas. Up to now, nine organisational members, three individual members and two co-opted members had joined the Working Group, and its 1st meeting was scheduled for 31 March 2015.

Item 5 Progress Report from Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development (Paper No. HC/04/2015)

5.1 As Mr Vincent NG, the Chair of the Task Force, was unable to attend this meeting, **the Chair** presented the progress report on his behalf. **Members** noted the contents of the report.

Item 6 Progress Report from Task Force on Harbourfront Developments in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing (Paper No. HC/05/2015)

6.1 As Prof Becky LOO, the Chair of the Task Force, was unable to attend this meeting, **the Chair** presented the progress report on her behalf. **Members** noted the contents of the report.

Item 7 Progress Report from Task Force on Water-land Interface (Paper No. HC/06/2015)

7.1 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui**, in his capacity as the Chair of the Task Force, briefed Members on the progress report. **Members** noted the contents of the report.

Item 8 Any Other Business

A. *Research on Victoria Harbourfront Dining by Students of Worcester Polytechnic Institute*

8.1 **The Chair** informed Members that students from the Worcester Polytechnic Institute (WPI) were invited by HBF and DHK to conduct harbourfront-related researches in Hong Kong on a regular basis; and a research on harbourfront dining was conducted this year (the Research). He welcomed representatives of HBF and DHK to brief Members on the findings of the Research.

8.2 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** of HBF and **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** of DHK presented their findings with the aid of a PowerPoint.

8.3 **The Chair** considered the Research useful as it brought some focus to the issue which had been discussed in the Commission, and identified potential opportunity areas in which the Commission could work. He suggested that the Harbour Unit could coordinate relevant government departments to explore possible designated areas for food and beverages (F&B) and work on suggested the F&B signage system; while the three geographical task forces could contemplate on the short term recommendations within their specific areas.

Harbour Unit

8.4 **Mr Ivan HO** said that a few years ago, the Government conducted a Victoria Harbour Icon Design Competition for the Harbourfront Signage Scheme (HSS) which aimed at improving the signage system for leading people to the harbourfront. He asked the relevant government departments to report on the status of HSS, and advise whether the HSS could be easily integrated into this proposal as a short term measure to improve signage directions to the harbourfront, and in particular to existing F&B facilities.

Harbour Unit

8.5 **Mr Andy LEUNG** opined that early on in the design stage of promenades, the Government could already consider providing basic supporting and utility facilities for F&B outlets, e.g. electricity, water supply, drainage and toilet facilities. He also suggested reviewing the licensing requirements for various

kinds of F&B outlets with reference to successful overseas experiences in order to attract more high quality and innovative F&B facilities to the harbourfront area. He gave the example of incorporating a certain degree of flexibility in the lease conditions for the hotel sites at Kai Tak Development so that more interaction across boundaries of different sites would be permitted.

8.6 **Mr Brian David LI** said that he was surprised that only a few F&B facilities could be found along the harbourfront, and that a long time was required to obtain necessary restaurant licences. Considering that regulation and execution were the two main issues, he suggested launching a pilot scheme to test the water, and review the impact including public response to the scheme for future improvement.

8.7 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** remarked that it was not easy to operate F&B outlets especially at the waterfront because of the regulatory framework and the business environment. Pending the establishment of HFA which could hopefully handle and tackle matters on this front, he suggested that the Harbour Unit could work with the three geographical Task Forces, and coordinate with relevant government departments to take forward the proposal at the locations as identified in the Research.

8.8 **Mr LAU Chun-kong** questioned if the Research had identified whether the existing F&B operations were on government land or within private properties. To roll out a pilot scheme, the Government should consider whether F&B operation at the harbourfront was financially viable for investors, having regard to factors such as affordable rent, lease conditions under land grant, and construction costs of the necessary structures, *etc.* **The Chair** responded that a public-private partnership model might be explored.

8.9 **Mr CHAN Hok-fung** cautioned that while the community generally supported the idea of having more alfresco dining facilities at the harbourfront, these outlets might bring

nuisance to the local residents if they were set up near residential areas. Therefore, pilot schemes, if launched, should stay near commercial areas, such as the new Central harbourfront. Also the question of supporting utilities and structures, such as drainage and toilet facilities, and the issue about occupancy of public open space for commercial activities had to be addressed.

8.10 **Mr TAM Po-yiu** opined that as the harbourfront was still under transformation and to avoid domination by large enterprises, it might be preferable to start pilot schemes at a relatively small scale for two types of F&B facilities: one which involved the erection of supporting structures and systems, and one for mobile food stalls. To encourage creativity and diversity, these F&B operators could be allowed to engage in businesses other than those explicitly prohibited under the regulatory framework; and suitable weighting could be given for creativity in the tender specifications. The Commission could also hold discussion with the F&B trade in order to better understand their business requirements and views on the proposal.

8.11 **Mrs Margaret BROOKE** thanked Members for their comments, and said that while the Research might not have covered all issues, it aimed to arouse people's interests, continue the discussion and come up with some ideas for further pursuit in the best possible way.

8.12 **Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN** agreed that the Commission could conduct site visits and make plans for the 20 strategic dinning destinations identified in the Research as each of them had its own character. If the relevant DCs and the Commission could agree on the types, locations and the designation of space for the harbourfront F&B facilities, a lot of issues including licencing procedures, might be resolved more easily. To address the issue of occupancy of public space by F&B facilities, the Government could devise a charging scheme for using different types of public space.

8.13 **Miss Christine AU** appreciated Members' aspiration for more alfresco dining at the harbourfront, as well as the Study done by HBF and DHK, which had identified 20 strategic dining destinations. Noting that Members would like to conduct pilot projects, she suggested leaving it to the geographical Task Forces to look into questions such as site ownership, constraints, layouts and business viability, *etc.* of the proposed destinations. At the macro-level, she reported that the Financial Secretary had announced in the 2015/16 Budget the proposal of promoting Food Trucks in Hong Kong and the improvement of the alfresco dining environment in Hong Kong. The Secretariat would invite responsible departments to brief Members on this front at suitable times. Regarding the HSS, the Victoria Harbour icon had been used in various signages including those in the new Central harbourfront. The Harbour Unit would continue to work with CEDD to work out more routes, and to use the icon as a recognisable element to attract both local residents and visitors to the harbourfront.

8.14 **Mr Edwin TONG** agreed that once a consensus on the intention and scope of a promenade project was reached, CEDD could design the project to suit the purpose as far as practicable having regard to site constraints.

8.15 **Mr Richard WONG** concurred that there were constraints at the existing promenades for alfresco dining and F&B activities, but there were also successful examples like the Avenue of Stars. LCSD would keep an open-mind and welcome suggestions to enhance the signage scheme and harbourfront activities. LCSD would continue to organise more cultural, sports and recreational activities at suitable promenade areas. Regarding the Food Truck proposal, LCSD had been working with the relevant government bureaux and departments to explore appropriate sites to have the idea realised.

8.16 **The Chair** thanked Mrs Margaret BROOKE and Mr **Task Forces & the** Paul ZIMMERMAN for the presentation. He suggested that **Harbour Unit** Task Forces review the practicality for F&B facilities of the

proposed destinations within their respective geographical areas, and the Harbour Unit look at broader issues including the regulations, challenges and the HSS.

B. The Secretariat's Handling of Planning Matters and Updating of Action Areas Table

8.17 **Miss Christine AU** said that a Member had raised some comments on the Secretariat's handling of planning related matters and updating of the action areas table. With the aid of a PowerPoint, she briefed Members on the current practice and the suggested improvement measures.

8.18 **The Chair** said that the Town Planning Board (TPB) usually needed to decide on planning matters before confirmation of relevant meeting minutes by the Commission. He suggested that the letters to the TPB should be more elaborated and the letters would be posted onto the Commission's website for public information.

8.19 **Mr Thomas CHOW** said that he had no strong view on posting the letters to the TPB on the Commission's website but wondered if it would set a precedent hence obliging the Commission to post all of its other correspondences with organisations or members of the public onto its website as well.

8.20 **Mr LEUNG Kong-yui** said that these letters prepared by the Secretariat for communication with the TPB should be treated differently from the meeting minutes. While the confirmed meeting minutes could be put onto the website for public information, it was not appropriate to put these correspondences onto the Commission's website as the public would then have knowledge of individual Members' views before gaining their confirmation. The Secretariat could always circulate these letters to Members for information.

8.21 **The Meeting** agreed to prepare more detailed letters to the TPB, but these letters would not be put onto the **the Secretariat**

Commission's website.

8.22 **Miss Christine AU** said that the action area table was a summary report setting out the progress made on individual harbourfront enhancement proposals. The number of STTs along the entire 73km harbourfront was sizable and they were of different uses. The current action area table aimed to maintain a balance between providing sufficient information for Members' reference without overloading them.

8.23 **The Chair** commented that each task force should be kept informed of the STTs within their geographic remit from time to time, while leaving the Harbour Unit as the gatekeeper to monitor and examine STTs within the harbourfront areas, and bring up those which Members might be interested for discussion.

8.24 **Mr LING Kar-kan** said that some enhancement proposals would have a long development programme due to technical constraints. As it would involve considerable workload and time for the departments concerned to update the table each time and there would not be significant changes to these proposals every three months, it might not be necessary to update the table more frequently than the current arrangements of a six-month gap. If Members were interested in knowing the progress of a particular proposal, the Secretariat could always provide specific information upon request.

8.25 **Mr Ivan HO** opined that timing of updating the action area table was more important than the frequency. As the Commission's current term was going to end in the coming June, it might not be necessary for Members to discuss the proposals in the table in detail at this stage. It would be more useful to provide updated information to Members for deliberation by the start of the next term in July or August 2015.

8.26 **The meeting** agreed to keeping the current format of the action area tables and circulating the updated action area **the Secretariat**

table in the new term for their decision on the frequency of making updates.

8.27 There being no other business, the meeting ended at 6:30 pm.

**Secretariat
Harbourfront Commission
June 2015**