

**Ninth Meeting of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee  
held at 2:30 pm on 24 November 2005  
at 3/F, 3 Edinburgh Place, Central, Hong Kong**

**Minutes of Meeting**

**Present**

Professor Lee Chack-fan	Chairman
Dr Andrew Thomson	Representing Business Environment Council (BEC)
Mr Leung Kong-yui	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Dr Ng Mee-kam	Representing Citizen Envisioning@Harbour
Mrs Mei Ng	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Vincent Ng	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects (HKIA)
Mr Kim O Chan	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Ir Dr Greg Wong Chak-yan	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Louis H B Loong	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Dennis Li	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour Limited (SPH)
Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke	
Mr Chan Chit-kwai, Stephen	
Dr Chan Wai-kwan	
Mr Chan Yiu-fai, Steve	
Mr Kwok Chun-wah, Jimmy	
Professor Lam Kin-che	
Mr Thomas Chow	Deputy Secretary (Transport)1, Environment, Transport and Works Bureau
Mr Bosco Fung	Director of Planning
Mr John Chai	Director of Civil Engineering and Development
Mr Lau Ka-keung	Deputy Commissioner for Transport/Planning and Technical Services
Miss Wong Yuet-wah	Secretary

**In Attendance**

Mr Robin Ip	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau (HPLB)
Mr L T Ma	Project Manager/Hong Kong Island and Islands, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)

Mr Talis Wong	Chief Engineer/Kowloon, CEDD
Mr Raymond Lee	District Planning Officer/Kowloon, Planning Department (PlanD)
Mr Raymond Wong	Chief Town Planner/Sub-Regional Planning, PlanD
 <u>For item 2</u>	
Ms Christine Tse	District Planning Officer/Hong Kong, PlanD
 <u>For item 3</u>	
Miss Au King-chi	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)3, HPLB
Mr Danny Lau	Principal Assistant Secretary (Planning and Lands)5, HPLB
Mr Vincent Fung	Principal Assistant Secretary (Culture)1, Home Affairs Bureau (HAB)
Mr P L Kwan	Project Manager/Kowloon, CEDD
Mr Anthony Kwan	Assistant Director/Metro & Urban Renewal, PlanD
Ms Cynthia Liu	Chief Manager (Special Projects), Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)
 <u>For item 4</u>	
Mr Kelvin Chan	Senior Town Planner/Kowloon 1, PlanD
 <u>For item 6</u>	
Mr Simon Yu	Assistant Director (Estate Management), Lands Department (LandsD)
Mr Edwin Chan	Chief Estate Surveyor (Estate Management), LandsD
 <u>Absent with Apologies</u>	
Dr Kwok Ngai-kuen, Alvin	Representing Conservancy Association
Mr Leslie H C Chen	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Mr Chan Kwok-fai, Bernard	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mrs Aliana Ho	Representing Hong Kong Tourism Board
Professor Jim Chi-yung	
Mr Lau Hing-tat, Patrick	
Ms Lee Wai-king, Starry	
Mr Wu Man-keung, John	
Mrs Rita Lau	
Ms Margaret Hsia	Permanent Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands)
	Assistant Director (2), Home Affairs Department (HAD)

## Action

### Welcoming Message

(a) **The Chairman** welcomed all Members to the ninth meeting of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC). He said that Mr Dennis Li, the alternate member of SPH, attended the meeting for the first time, that Mr John Chai had replaced Mr Tsao Tak-kiang as Director of Civil Engineering and Development, and that Ms Margaret Hsia had replaced Mr Patrick Li as Assistant Director (2) of HAD. He also welcomed Miss Au King-chi of HPLB and her delegation, Ms Christine Tse of PlanD as well as Messrs Simon Yu and Edwin Chan of LandsD to present the respective items to the HEC.

(b) **The Chairman** said that as some Members had to leave the meeting earlier for other urgent matters, the order of the items of the original agenda would be revised.

### Item 1 Confirmation of minutes of the eighth meeting

1.1 The revised draft minutes of the eighth HEC meeting incorporating a minor amendment to the attendance list proposed by Mr John Wu were confirmed without amendments.

### Item 2 Planning concepts of the approved Central District (Extension) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) (Paper No. 28/2005) (original item 5)

2.1 **Ms Christine Tse** presented the concepts behind the OZP. **Mr Bosco Fung** added that the planning of the area had gone through a due process of extensive public consultation and deliberation by the Town Planning Board (TPB). The current land use proposals for the area reflected broad consensus of the community at the time of plan preparation. **The Chairman** invited Members' views on the presentation and a letter of 4 November 2005 from Mr Paul Zimmerman, in the capacity of the Convenor of Designing Hong Kong Harbour District (DHKHD). The letter was addressed to the Legislative Council Panel on Planning, Lands and Works (LegCo Panel) and related to PlanD's presentation and the Tamar project. The LegCo Panel discussed the Tamar project at its meeting on 22 November 2005.

2.2 Taking into account the history of the OZP, **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** considered it sufficient to refine certain zoning proposals on the OZP so as to provide more details on the development parameters and design guidelines for these proposals. Taking the groundscraper as an example, he suggested that the public be provided with information on the gross floor area for various uses in the development, so that they could express views in the preparation of a planning brief for the development. **Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke** said that the groundscraper concept would produce a much larger building foot print than a normal high-rise development, hence its cost-effectiveness might need to be reviewed taking account of the prevailing market situation and latest building technology. He also enquired if the traffic and other services requirements generated from the proposed developments in the area had been catered for in the planned infrastructure provision.

2.3 **Dr Andrew Thomson** supported an integrated waterfront in Central, to take into account the findings of the Harbour-front Enhancement Review – Wan Chai, Causeway Bay and Adjoining Areas (HER) and the Central Harbourfront and Me project. The Harbour Business Forum (HBF) was also examining the Central District (Extension) OZP, including the groundscraper proposal. Preliminary observations indicated the need for further enhancement of vibrancy, building forms and integration of people with the harbour-front.

2.4 In view of the large foot print, **Mr Vincent Ng** considered it necessary to increase the permeability, open space and the non-building area of the groundscraper site for the public. He suggested that 3D models be produced for reference of the public when the planning brief was prepared for public consultation. **Mr Dennis Li** said that SPH was concerned about the data provided by Transport Department (TD) to the Expert Panel on Sustainable Transport Planning and Central - Wan Chai Bypass (CWB), which showed that, given the scale of the current proposed developments in the harbour-front area, the traffic condition might saturate by 2016 despite the construction of the CWB and Road P2. He requested the Government to advise on the long term solutions to the anticipated traffic problems.

2.5 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** agreed that details of the groundscraper should be provided to the public when the planning brief was prepared. As different uses would generate

different traffic patterns at various times, the traffic impact on the planning of the area should be carefully considered. **Dr Ng Mee-kam** supported the idea of enhancing the planning and design aspects of the area. She enquired if there would be additional connections between the harbour-front and the adjoining areas in addition to the three open space corridors, and if sustainability assessment would be adopted during the process.

2.6 **Mr Jimmy Kwok** suggested that the connectivity and integration of the area with the adjoining areas might need to be improved in order to increase the vibrancy. To reduce road usage, consideration should be given to marine transport for servicing the area, such as for movement of refuse. To facilitate the public to better appreciate the impacts of development around the harbour, **Mr Steve Chan** requested the Government to provide a visual impact study on the harbour-front developments viewed from the Peak. This request was declined. **Ir Dr Greg Wong** suggested dividing the groundscraper site into several smaller sites, with better connectivity by footbridges.

2.7 **Mrs Mei Ng** considered that the planning of open spaces in the area should be people and district-oriented, with multiple elements gearing towards greater vibrancy. The planning process should also be on-going to allow public participation.

2.8 **Mr Bosco Fung** said the TPB had agreed that planning and design briefs for the groundscraper and the adjacent waterfront developments should be prepared. The groundscraper concept was actually a proposal originated from some of the objectors to the Central District (Extension) OZP published in 1998. The concept was accepted by the TPB and was subsequently incorporated in the revised OZP. The design requirements for the groundscraper could be further discussed when the planning brief was prepared. During the preparation of the planning brief, the public, HEC, District Council, etc would be consulted. Regarding the visual impact of harbour-front development when viewed from the Peak, there were already restrictions on building heights along the harbour-front to minimize adverse visual impacts.

2.9 **Mr K K Lau** said TD had provided the data to the Expert Panel before the Expert Panel Forum on 3 September 2005, which had also been uploaded to the HEC website. According to the data, with the CWB, the volume/capacity ratios of the

CWB and the Gloucester Road would be 0.7 and 0.9 respectively by 2016, which meant that both roads would not reach their full capacity at that time. The Expert Panel opined that in order to make development sustainable in transport term, other transport management measures in addition to the CWB should be adopted. TD would work towards this direction. On connectivity between the promenade and inland areas, there would be at-grade pedestrian crossings in addition to the proposed three corridors.

2.10 **The Chairman** thanked PlanD for their presentation.

**Item 3 West Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD) Development – Way Forward (original item 4)**

3.1 **Mr Danny Lau** gave a Power Point presentation on the outcome of the public consultation and the proposed additional development parameters and conditions for the WKCD project.

3.2 In response to Members' questions and comments on the opinion survey, the proposed canopy and the proposed independent statutory WKCD body, **Miss Au King-chi** said that the telephone polls were conducted by the Public Policy Research Institute (PPRI) of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University based on established academic practice. The methodology used in collecting and analysing public views was robust and findings reliable. The margin of error as stipulated in their report was considered acceptable. Regarding the proposed canopy, the PPRI considered that the public views thereon were inconclusive. As to the independent statutory body proposed for WKCD, the Government aimed to consult the public in the second quarter of 2006. In the interim, HAB and HPLB would continue to engage concerned parties including HEC and listen to their views on WKCD.

3.3 **Mr Vincent Ng** said that according to an Internet survey conducted by HKIA amongst its members, of those who responded, 27% supported the canopy and 62% objected to it. The Institute was also concerned whether the prescribed cultural facilities were genuinely serving the public need. On the West Kowloon Waterfront Promenade, he suggested that its vibrancy be further enhanced. **Mr Jimmy Kwok** considered that there was a demand for more performing venues. He said that the WKCD could be connected with the promenades on the Hong Kong side by efficient sea transport, and that the proposed

canopy, if maintained by recycled materials, built in various heights and decorated with colourful lighting, would be a successful landmark for Hong Kong.

3.4 **Miss Au** said that the WKCD would be developed on a self-financing basis, bringing in market creativity and innovation. As regards the facilities for the promenade, she noted that the three screened-in Proponents had proposed various facilities for public use. **Mr Vincent Fung** supplemented that since 2002 consultation with the cultural sector had started. On performing arts, there was a consensus on the demand for venues and a venue with more than 10,000 seats capable for various arts performances was proposed in the area. While there was a consensus on the demand for more museums, there were diverse views on the scales and themes of the museums required. To stimulate more ideas on the theme of museums, the Government took an initial step to suggest some themes in the 2003 Invitation For Proposals (IFP) for reference by proponents. Subsequently, proposals of museums with other different themes were received.

3.5 In response to **Mr Steve Chan's** comments on building height restrictions along the harbour-front of West Kowloon, **Miss Au** said that the Government was concerned with the building heights of the area and that it suggested including the planning parameters, such as the distribution and heights of buildings, in the draft OZP for consultation during the statutory planning process. After the TPB approved the OZP, the proponents would be required to revise their proposals taking into account the revised planning parameters. **Mr Anthony Kwan** said that though the WKCD was not within the view corridor for the protection of the ridgelines under the existing Urban Design Guidelines of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, the Government was very concerned about the building heights of the area. Stepped-height approach would be adopted and the public would be consulted on the planning parameters including the plot ratio, building heights as well as the proportion between residential and commercial gross floor areas and cultural facilities in the area.

3.6 With reference to overseas experience, **Dr Ng Mee-kam** suggested that more public consultation on the WKCD development be conducted by the private sector to meet the demand of the public. **Dr Thomson** enquired how the proposals to locate the cruise terminal and the multi-purpose stadium at Kai

Tak could be integrated with the WKCD development. **Miss Au** said that the three screened-in proponents had plans to connect the development with neighbouring transport nodes. Government would also need to ensure effective coordination in the delivery of arts and cultural services in the territory.

3.7 **Mrs Mei Ng** said that the public views received during the consultation might be biased and that a strategic environmental assessment should be applied to the proposed canopy. She asked how the development of the cultural facilities would be co-ordinated with the commercial areas and how the proposed independent statutory WKCD body would solve the problem of co-ordination. She enquired whether it was fair to stick to the three screened-in proponents while the planning parameters were changed.

3.8 **Miss Au** said that the Government would further consider the co-ordination issue and the proposed set-up of the independent statutory body for WKCD, having regard to legal advice. These would be provided for in the Project Agreement and other legal documents. She added that the public would be consulted on the establishment of the body in the second quarter of 2006 and that the 2003 IFP allowed flexibility for the revision of planning parameters, other than the mandatory requirements like the cultural facilities, in an attempt to shape the WKCD in response to public needs. As long as such revision would not make the project as a whole more attractive and less onerous to the Proponents than it was on the date of the close of submission of Proposals under the IFP, it was considered fair to those who had chosen not to participate in the IFP. With the public views collected in the current round of consultation, the Government had proposed new requirements for the Proponents to consider if they would like to continue down the IFP path, and subject to their responses, these new parameters would form the basis for revising their proposals. **Miss Au** said that Government attached great importance to the need for public consultation and would continue to listen to public views in pursuing the project.

3.9 **The Chairman** thanked Miss Au and her delegation for their presentation and response.

**Item 4 Progress reports from the three Sub-committees  
(Paper Nos. 25 – 27/2005) (original item 2)**

## **A. Sub-committee on South East Kowloon Development (SEKD) Review (Paper No. 25/2005)**

4.1 **Mr Kelvin Chan**, Secretary of the Sub-committee on SEKD Review, presented the progress report on behalf of Dr Chan Wai-kwan who had left the meeting. **Mr Chan** said that the Sub-committee discussed the draft Outline Concept Plans (OCPs) of Kai Tak Planning Review on 2 November 2005 and had neither endorsed nor opposed to the OCPs. Sub-committee Members were concerned about the approach to tackle the environmental problems at Kai Tak Approach Channel, the proposed locations of the cruise terminal and multi-purpose stadium, the connectivity with the surrounding districts as well as the sustainability performance of the OCPs. These concerns were also shared by the TPB Members. The Sub-committee anticipated that its concerns would be considered together with the public comments collected in the Stage 2 Public Participation.

## **B. Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review (HPR) (Paper No. 26/2005)**

4.2 **Mr Vincent Ng** presented the progress report.

4.2.1 **Mr Ng** informed the meeting that a private developer had put forward a preliminary design concept for a temporary promenade and public park at the Hung Hom Bay waterfront, which was one of the possible sites considered for “quick-win” enhancement. While the private initiative was welcomed, the Sub-committee considered that the needs of the local community should be fully taken into account in the design of the project.

4.2.2 The TPB considered the DHKHD’s application for rezoning the former Government Supplies Depot site at Oil Street on 28 October 2005. It decided not to agree to the proposed zoning amendments as the present “Comprehensive Development Area” zone already required the developer to submit a Master Layout Plan for any proposed scheme on the site for TPB’s approval, and would allow sufficient flexibility in the layout and design of the future development on the site. However, the TPB requested PlanD to review the parameters of the development with a view to amending the planning brief.

4.2.3 As regards the Central Ferry Piers Participatory Programme, an exhibition of enhancement concepts was held in mid to late November 2005 at two locations in the area and a public forum was scheduled for 26 November 2005 at the roof garden above Central Ferry Piers No. 3. Upon the conclusion of these public events, the consultant would prepare a public participation report and a design brief for the enhancement of the area. The Sub-committee would then further discuss how to take forward the concepts of the design brief with the various parties concerned.

**Sub-committee  
on HPR**

4.2.4 On the proposed stormwater pumping station at Sheung Wan, the Sub-committee discussed the proposal presented by the Drainage Services Department (DSD) on 15 June and 10 August 2005 in the light of the HPPs. DSD then submitted to the TPB a planning application for the proposed pumping station, taking into account the Sub-committees' comments. The Sub-committee's concerns were conveyed to the TPB on 10 November 2005. The TPB would consider the planning application on 10 December 2005.

(Post-meeting note: The revised scheme for the stormwater pumping station was approved with conditions by the TPB on 10 December 2005.)

**C. Sub-committee on Wan Chai Development Phase II (WDII) Review (Paper No. 27/2005)**

4.3 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** presented the progress report.

4.3.1 **Members** noted that the report of the Expert Panel on Sustainable Transport Planning and CWB supported the construction of the CWB. It also recommended a number of short, medium and long-term measures to better implement sustainable transportation for improving the general quality of life. The report was uploaded to the HEC website in end October 2005.

4.3.2 A Consolidation Forum of the Envisioning Stage of the HER was held on 12 November 2005. Some participants of the Forum considered that two of the ideas, i.e. the urban beach and the openable

footbridge linking the breakwaters of the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter, which were suggested by the consultants not to be pursued further, should be included in the Realization Stage for further consultation. The outcome of the Forum would be considered by the Sub-committee and incorporated into the report for the Envisioning Stage of HER at the coming Sub-committee meeting before discussing the way forward for the Realization Stage.

**Sub-committee on  
WDII Review**

4.3.3 During the public engagement of the HER Envisioning Stage, the public expressed their wish that the CWB on flyovers should not be constructed though the consultants remarked that this flyover concept would involve less reclamation than the tunnel concepts. The Sub-committee would further discuss this issue with reference to the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance and might revert to the public on this.

**Sub-committee on  
WDII Review**

4.4 In connection with Highways Department's recent enquiry on a social occasion about the possibility of constructing the part of the CWB outside of WDII in the first instance, **Mr Leung** opined that the Sub-committee should prepare a time-table for the HER project including the preparation of the draft OZP for reference by all stakeholders concerned. **Mr Thomas Chow** clarified that the Government would consider building the CWB after a conclusion on the layout and alignment of the CWB within WDII was reached under the WDII Review.

**Sub-committee on  
WDII Review**

4.5 In response to **Mr Vincent Ng**'s question on the extent of reclamation, **Mr Leung** said that more reclaimed land would be required to stabilize a tunnel section in shallow sea than supporting a flyover. **Mr L T Ma** supplemented that the consultant would provide the Sub-committee with detailed information on the extent of reclamation under the various concepts for further consideration.

**Sub-committee on  
WDII Review**

4.6 **The Chairman** informed the meeting that the quorum had lost, but the meeting would continue.

## **Item 5      Matters arising (original item 3)**

### **A.   OCPs and Stage 2 Public Participation Programme of Kai Tak Planning Review (para. 2.1.1 of the minutes of**

## **the eighth meeting)**

5.1 The item had been covered under the progress report of the Sub-committee on SEKD Review.

### **B. Transcript and audio record of the Expert Panel Forum on Sustainable Transport Planning and CWB (para. 2.4 of the minutes of the eighth meeting)**

5.2 **The meeting** noted that the Sub-committee on WDII Review decided on 26 October 2005 that there was no need to prepare the transcript of the Forum. It also agreed that the audio record would not be uploaded to the HEC website but would be made available to Members upon request.

### **C. Sustainability indicators for Kai Tak Planning Review and WDII Review (para. 3.8 of the minutes of the eighth meeting)**

5.3 **The meeting** noted that for Kai Tak Planning Review, a summary of the preliminary sustainability assessment was incorporated in the Consultation Digest for discussion in Stage 2 Public Participation. As regards the HER, the finalized sustainability development principles and indicators developed under this review, which had incorporated public's comments, would be included in the report of the HER Envisioning Stage.

### **D. Informal group meeting on institutional mechanisms (para. 4.8 of the minutes of the eighth meeting)**

5.4 **The Chairman** said that the first informal group meeting was held on 16 November 2005. The Chairman, Dr Chan Wai-kwan, Dr Andrew Thomson, Mr Nicholas Brooke as well as representatives of HPLB and PlanD attended the meeting. The second meeting would be held in mid-December 2005. **Dr Ng Mei-kam** had accepted the invitation to consolidate the information on overseas experience in waterfront management.

**HEC secretariat  
Dr Ng**

(Post-meeting note: The second meeting of the informal group will be rescheduled.)

### **E. PlanD's presentation on the planning concepts of the approved Central District (Extension) OZP (para. 5.13 of the minutes of the eighth meeting)**

5.5 The item had been discussed under item 2.

**F. Procedures for endorsing Members to attend overseas conferences (para. 7.1 of the minutes of the eighth meeting)**

5.6 **The meeting** noted the proposed procedures for endorsing Members to attend overseas conferences prepared by the HEC secretariat. As the quorum had lost, **the meeting** agreed that the HEC secretariat should seek Members' endorsement of the proposed procedures by email after meeting.

**HEC secretariat**

**G. Design competition for enhancement of waterfront in Eastern District (para. 7.2 of the minutes of the eighth meeting)**

5.7 **The Chairman** said that **Mr Stephen Chan** attended the Working Group for Waterfront in Eastern District meeting on 17 October 2005. On the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter, the HER Task Force would liaise with the Eastern District Council.

**HER Task Force**

**H. HEC motion mechanism (para. 7.8 of the minutes of the eighth meeting)**

5.8 **The Chairman** said that **the HEC secretariat** had circulated to Members a set of proposed procedures for HEC motions and a paper prepared by the BEC explaining its motion and the relevant issues as requested by Mr Paul Zimmerman. As Members might wish to discuss the proposed motion procedures in more detail, and the issue of temporary land use would be discussed under agenda item 6, the proposed motion procedures for HEC and BEC's paper should be discussed after the discussion on LandsD's presentation under agenda item 6. **The meeting** agreed to the arrangement.

**I. LandsD's presentation on temporary harbour-front land use (para. 7.9 of the minutes of the eighth meeting)**

5.9 **The meeting** noted that the item would be discussed under agenda item 6.

**Item 6 Temporary harbour-front land use (Paper No. 29/2005)**

6.1     **Mr Simon Yu** presented the paper. **Ir Dr Greg Wong** enquired whether there were plans to plant at the edges of vacant land along the harbour-front before the land was put to permanent uses. **Mr Yu** said that for harbour-front land that would be vacant for more than three years, LandsD would request departments concerned to consider the possibility of greening it. **Dr Andrew Thomson** asked if and how the HPPs would be applied when considering the temporary use of vacant harbour-front land. **Mr Yu** said that LandsD would take into account the HPPs in future when considering the temporary use of harbour-front land. **The Chairman** thanked Mr Yu for his presentation.

LandsD

6.2     **The Secretary** presented the proposed procedures for HEC motions circulated to Members, which were to facilitate discussion of Members. **Ir Dr Greg Wong**, **Mr Kim Chan** and **Mr Leung Kong-yui** suggested that the proposed authorization by the respective member organizations be relaxed. On the proposed 21 days' advance notice, **Mr Leung** considered that it should not be applied to motions on procedures for discussion. As the quorum had lost, **Mr Robin Ip** suggested and **the Chairman** agreed that the HEC secretariat revise the proposed procedures taking into account Members' views for discussion at the next HEC meeting.

HEC secretariat

## **Item 7     Any Other Business**

### **A.     HEC briefings**

7.1     **The Chairman** said that two HEC briefings had been held on 5 January and 6 April 2005 respectively. The one scheduled for 3 August 2005 was cancelled as there was no request for presentation. The HEC secretariat had since 3 August 2005 received some requests for presentation to HEC, which were relevant to the ambit of the Sub-committees. The secretariat had referred these requests to relevant Sub-committees for consideration. If no other items which were relevant for presentation to HEC were received by 30 November 2005, the briefing scheduled for 7 December 2005 would be cancelled.

(Post-meeting note: As the HEC secretariat had not received any request for presentation, the HEC briefing scheduled for 7

December 2005 was cancelled.)

7.2 On the proposed schedule of 2006 HEC briefings, the HEC secretariat had reserved the Conference Room at 15/F, North Point Government Offices for the afternoon of 1 March, 7 June, 6 September and 6 December 2006, all being the first Wednesday of the respective months. **The Chairman** suggested that Members mark their diaries. The HEC secretariat would inform Members if the briefings were confirmed.

**HEC secretariat**

#### **B. Date of next meeting**

7.3 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:00 pm. The next HEC meeting would be held on 26 January 2006 (Thursday).

(Post-meeting note: The next HEC meeting has been rescheduled for 16 February 2006 (Thursday).)

**Harbour-front Enhancement Committee Secretariat  
April 2006**