

Harbour-front Enhancement Committee
Sub-committee on Wan Chai Development Phase II Review

Minutes of Ninth Meeting

Date : 12 December 2005
Time : 9:00 a.m.
Venue : Conference Room at 15/F,
North Point Government Offices,
333 Java Road, North Point, Hong Kong

Present

Mr. Leung Kong-yui	Chairman Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Mr. Paul Zimmerman	Representing Business Environment Council
Dr. Ng Mee-kam	Representing Citizen Envisioning@Harbour
Dr. Greg Wong	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr. Hardy Lok	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour Limited
Dr. Chan Wai-kwan	
Mr. Stephen Chan	
Mr. Steve Chan	
Mr. Patrick Lau	
Mr. Robin Ip	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands) 1, Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau
Ms. Sharon Ho	Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport) 5, Environment, Transport and Works Bureau
Mr. L T Ma	Project Manager/Hong Kong Island and Islands, Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr. Anthony Kwan	Assistant Director/Metro and Urban Renewal, Planning Department
Mr. Chow Ying-shun	Project Manager (Major Works), Highways Department
Mr. Kwan Chi-wai	Chief Engineer/Traffic Engineering (Hong Kong), Transport Department
Mr. Donald Wong	Assistant District Officer (Wan Chai), Home Affairs Department
Mr. Bosco Chan	Secretary

In Attendance

Ms. Lydia Lam	Assistant Secretary (Planning) 3, Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau
Mr. Roy Li	Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (3), Planning Department
Mr. Chui Wing-wah	Chief Engineer/Harbour Area Treatment Scheme Drainage Services Department
Mr. S K Lam	Chief Engineer/Hong Kong (2), Civil Engineering and Development Department
Ms. Iris Tam	Representing City Planning Consultants Ltd
Dr. Sujata S Govada	Representing City Planning Consultants Ltd
Miss Flora Lai	Representing City Planning Consultants Ltd
Mr. Eric Ma	Representing Maunsell Consultants Asia Ltd
Mr. Kenneth To	Representing Kenneth To & Associates
Mr. David Fok	Representing Kenneth To & Associates
Mr. M Y Wan	Representing Wheelock Properties
Mr. Frankie Cheng	Representing Wheelock Properties
Mr. Douglas Woo	Representing Wheelock Properties
Mr. Chris Law	Representing Oval Partnership
Mr. Sada Lam	Representing Oval Partnership
Mr. Simon Lee	Representing Oval Partnership
Mr. Louis Yu	Representing Arts Centre

Absent with Apologies

Mr. Charles Nicholas Brooke
Dr. Alvin Kwok

Action

The Chairman welcomed **Mr. Chow Ying-shun** who is replacing Mr. Adrian Ng from Highways Department.

Item 1 Confirmation of minutes of 8th meeting

- 1.1 The revised draft minutes of the 8th meeting circulated on 8 December 2005 were confirmed with no amendments.

Item 2 Matters Arising

- 2.1 **The Chairman** said that as most of the matters arising from the last (8th) meeting held on 26 October 2005 would be covered by the meeting, he suggested not to go through them separately.

Item 3 Proposed youth hostel and arts center cum hotel development at the ex-A-King slipway site

- 3.1 **The Chairman** welcomed the team led by Mr. Kenneth To of Kenneth To and Associates (KTA) in attending the meeting to brief the Sub-committee on a proposal to develop the ex-A-King Slipway site into a youth hostel and arts center cum hotel.
- 3.2 **Mr. Chris Law** of Oval Partnership presented their proposal with the aid of a powerpoint presentation. He highlighted the following points:-
- The ex-A-King site was used as a shipyard in the past and the main theme of the development proposal was to provide a link between Victoria Park and Victoria Harbour.
 - The site in concern and the Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter (CBTS) were the only two remaining sites within the Victoria Harbour which still possessed the characteristics of having all their activities closely connected with the Victoria Harbour. That heritage should be preserved as far as possible which the existing promenades along the Harbour lacked.
 - The development proposal aimed at re-vitalising the typhoon shelter area through bringing in art and craft, introducing tourism related activities and restoring waterfront activities so that people could enjoy the harbour in a close distance. It would also aim at providing a place for development of the local young artists.
 - It would include public space, boardwalk, floating pontoon, arts and cultural facilities, a hostel, landscaped garden and a hotel.

- Investigations had been conducted with regard to building height and it seemed that there would be an opportunity for constructing a landmark building with a plot ratio of 12.2.
- The proposal could be implemented through the concerted efforts of the government, private sector and cultural groups.

3.3 **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** asked for comparison with the idea raised by the public of providing an artificial beach at that site. He pointed out that a shipyard had interface with the water and thus complied with the Harbour Planning Principles (HPPs) promulgated by the HEC. He asked whether the development proposal could maintain that water-land interface. **Mr. Patrick Lau** requested for more information on how the proposal could restore the past activities and attractions at the CBTS. **Dr. Ng Mee-kam** noted that the proposal included a hostel and a hotel which would likely have impacts on the traffic and environment. She asked for further information regarding studies on those aspects.

3.4 In response, **Mr. Kenneth To** advised that their proposal would be more suitable than an artificial beach. Not only that their proposal could bring more people to the waterfront, it could also provide opportunities for art, culture and community activities. Through such activities, the past attractions at the CBTS could be restored. **Mr. Chris Law** added that in order to attract people to the site and the Harbour, the proposal would be designed for mixed use with a critical mass for regular activities. In their preliminary design, the hostel and hotel would be of small scale with about 30 to 40 rooms and 200 to 250 rooms respectively. Activities could be arranged such that people would be meeting or visiting that place at different time intervals, and the impacts on traffic and other environmental aspects would likely to be small.

3.5 **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** said he would support any proposal at that corner of the CBTS which could link the Victoria Park with the Harbour on the condition of provision of berthing,

public facilities, such as toilets and showers, and accesses free of charge to the public. He asked whether the proposal would be in conflict with the possible alignments of CWB. In response, **Mr. L T Ma** advised that for some of the Trunk Road concepts under consideration, the proposal might have conflicts with the slip road tunnel connecting Victoria Park Road westbound to the Trunk Road. He also expressed concern as to whether KTA's proposal would require reclamation. **Dr. Ng Mee-kam** asked about the size of the pontoon being proposed.

- 3.6 **Mr. Chris Law** replied that the proposal would not involve any reclamation. As to the size of the pontoon, it was not yet fixed. He further opined that the pontoon could be moved around to suit. He said that pontoon was an alternative to conventional seawall and could allow people to get close to the Harbour.
- 3.7 In response to **Dr. Sujata S Govada**, **Mr. Chris Law** said that there would not be any negative impact on the livelihood of the people at the CBTS. He said that the provision of public toilets and showers, as suggested by Mr. Zimmerman and which KTA would consider, might also help to reduce the odour problem at the CBTS.
- 3.8 **The Chairman** pointed out that the Envisioning Stage of HER should end formally on the date of the meeting. As KTA's proposal had just been presented, he asked for members' views on whether KTA proposal should be considered amongst other opinions received from the public in preparing the concept plans at the next stage of HER. **Dr. Ng Mee-kam** said that the inclusion of KTA proposal or not was an issue that would require careful deliberation as there should have been ample opportunities in the past few months for the public to raise ideas earlier for the Sub-committee to consider. **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** said that any proposal from the public should be welcomed and be considered in preparing the concept plans.
- 3.9 On the point of how to reflect to the public on the submission

of KTA's proposal and why their views had not been solicited, **Dr. Greg Wong** suggested giving a remark in the Envisioning Stage report that the proposal was received after the Consolidation Forum and for that reason, it was not reported to the public before. **The meeting** agreed.

- 3.10 **Mr. M Y Wan** said that he had attended several of the public forums with a view to perceive the public's expectation for formulating a proposal to meet their expectation. The proposal had therefore been revised repeatedly to that end hence it was not possible to present the proposal earlier. He said that they would submit the proposal to Town Planning Board for consideration as soon as possible and would further liaise with the Government on interface with the Trunk Road project.

Item 4 Expert Panel report, outcome of Consolidation Forum and revised draft report on Envisioning Stage of HER

- 4.1 **The Chairman** said that the report by the Expert Panel was circulated to all Sub-committee members and discussed at the last meeting held on 26 October 2005. He enquired on the members' view on the acceptance of the report and the recommendations therein.
- 4.2 **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** said that he and the organization he represented were not in a position to endorse the report but could acknowledge the receipt of it.
- 4.3 **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** said that the Sub-committee could endorse the report, but that did not necessarily mean agreeing entirely with the recommendations made by the Expert Panel which could still be considered further. **Dr. Greg Wong** opined that besides physically receiving the report, the Sub-committee should be more definitive and form a view on whether or not to endorse the report and, if not, the Sub-committee must state clearly which part of the report the Sub-committee did not agree with reasons. **Dr Chan**

Wai-kwan responded that he personally had no problem in endorsing the report of the Expert Panel but would like to clarify the procedural matters. He said that as many of the recommendations made by the Expert Panel would have to be followed up by Government, the Sub-committee might not be in a position to endorse the report. He added that the discussion at the last meeting indicated that most of the recommendations were agreeable to the Sub-committee, the Sub-committee could therefore form a view on the recommendations and had the same reflected in the report of the Envisioning Stage of HER prepared by City Planning.

- 4.4 **Dr. Ng Mee-kam** said it would be strategically preferred if the Sub-committee could come to a consensus on the report of the Expert Panel before moving into the next stage. She said that she personally had no problem in endorsing the report.
- 4.5 **Mr. Stephen Chan** said that he had pointed out in the public forums and charrettes that the Central and Western District Council (C&WDC) supported the construction of the CWB as soon as possible in order to relieve traffic congestions in Central. He was of the view that there had already been sufficient and thorough discussions by the public and Expert Panel on the transport case. He noted that the Expert Panel's recommendations were generally acceptable by the public and he personally would accept the report. He proposed the Sub-committee endorsing the report formally.
- 4.6 **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** said that he accepted the Expert Panel's recommendations but was not in a position to endorse the report of the Expert Panel because the Panel was not briefed on the HPPs and that the study on sustainable transport planning along the north shore of Hong Kong Island was incomplete. He supplemented that, among others, the north-south traffic connections had not been dealt with, the amount of land currently being used for roads had not been calculated nor reviewed and the land use had not been used as an indicator in the study. He opined that the sustainable transport planning study would need to be continued before

going to the Realization Stage. In response, **the Chairman** reminded the meeting that the brief for the Expert Panel had been discussed and agreed by both the Task Force and Sub-committee and the Expert Panel had fully completed their work to the brief.

- 4.7 **Mr. Kwan Chi-wai** disagreed that the north-south traffic had not been addressed and said that the relevant data were included in the submissions from Transport Department to the Expert Panel. He also advised that Slip Road 1 (from the east-bound of the Trunk Road to Wan Chai North) would assist in alleviating the north-south traffic conditions.
- 4.8 **Mr. Hardy Lok** said that he supported Mr. Zimmerman's comments. He added that using the word "endorse" might be too strong. He supported Dr. Chan Wai-kwan's suggestion of moving ahead and further considering the Expert Panel's recommendations in the meantime. He said flexibility should be allowed for possible modification to the recommendations in the future.
- 4.9 **Dr. Greg Wong** said that as most of the Sub-committee members agreed to the endorsement of the report with some had opined that more issues could have been covered, he suggested endorsing the report formally with the raised comments noted. **Mr. L T Ma** supported the suggestion and opined that those comments should be followed up as further work of the Sub-committee if required.
- 4.10 **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** reiterated that he could endorse the recommendations but not the report as the cost of land used for transport infrastructure had not been properly taken into account.
- 4.11 **Mr. Hardy Lok** said he had reservation on that part of report concerning "reserved capacity".
- 4.12 **Mr. Steve Chan** remarked that he supported comments made by Mr. Hardy Lok and Mr. Paul Zimmerman.

- 4.13 In response to **Dr. Ng Mee-kam, the Chairman** said that, on behalf of the Sub-committee, he had already sent letters of appreciation to each and every member of the Expert Panel. All to note
- 4.14 **The Chairman** said at the Consolidation Forum held on 12 November 2005, the WDII consultant, Maunsell, had consolidated the ideas and proposals received from the public during the Envisioning Stage and come up with two groups of suggestions: ideas that might not be pursued further and ideas that could be pursued further with possible consolidated ideas based on different alignments of CWB. He added that the presentations at the Consolidation Forum had been uploaded on to the HEC's website for public's views sharing and seven submissions were received including one from a Sub-committee member.
- 4.15 At the request of **the Chairman, Mr. Eric Ma** presented, with the aid of a powerpoint, ideas and proposals received from the public during the Envisioning Stage of HER and their suggestions on the ideas proposed not to be pursued. Those ideas included:-
- Deep tunnel concept to North Point
 - At-grade road concept
 - Flyover concept (along the existing coastline)
 - Flyover concept (along the existing breakwater of CBTS)
 - Moorings along the Wan Chai waterfront
 - Openable footbridge linking the two breakwaters of CBTS
 - Artificial beach at CBTS
 - "Inland alignment" for building the CWB
- 4.16 **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** said that for evaluating different concepts, there would be some "trade-off" i.e. cost and benefit. He pointed out that the technical issues raised by Maunsell, which were not expressed in economic or monetary terms, could not assist in deciding the trade-off. He was of the view that the indicators developed under HER were also inadequate for deciding on the "trade-off" in order to arrive at a holistic plan. He said that the indicators should

include matters such as number of permanent jobs created, amount of land used for roads. He added that for the above reasons, it would not be appropriate at that stage to exclude ideas or proposals that the public had requested the Sub-committee to consider, simply for engineering difficulties.

4.17 **Dr. Chan Wai-kwan** noted that the presentation by Maunsell was basically the same as that presented at the Consolidation Forum and had not been updated by taking into account comments or suggestions received at the Forum. He said that the third draft of the report for the Envisioning Stage of HER should adequately reflect the outcome of the Consolidation Forum.

4.18 **Dr. Chan Wai-kwan** then made several specific comments. He said that while that there were two comments at the Consolidation Forum welcoming the flyover concept, the general view was that it would not need to be pursued further. As for the idea of an openable footbridge linking the two breakwaters of the CBTS, there were views at the Forum against dropping it. He added that there were also strong public aspirations for developing the ex-PCWA as a water sport and entertainment area for public enjoyment. He suggested that the proposal from Mr. Charles Nicholas Brooke of converting the temporary helipad at the ex-PCWA into permanent use could be dropped as it was not consistent with public's aspirations. He remarked that another important issue raised at the Forum, which was not reflected in Maunsell's presentation nor in the third draft of the report for the Envisioning Stage of HER, was that the CWB would only be a partial solution for the sustainable transport planning of the northern shore of Hong Kong Island and a full solution might be outside the scope of HEC. He recalled that ETWB had said at the last meeting that the issue of sustainable transport planning fell under the ambit of the Transport Advisory Committee. He suggested the Sub-committee to consider whether there was the need to keep track on the development in that respect. He also suggested that any ideas or proposals that were dropped at the

present stage should be revived at a later stage if there were sufficient justifications.

- 4.19 **Dr. Ng Mee-kam** said that she had not attended the Consolidation Forum. She was of the view that the consultants should have provided more relevant information for and against those wishes or ideas received from the public during Envisioning Stage so as to facilitate the public in deciding on what ideas or proposals could be dropped and not pursued further.
- 4.20 **Mr. Steve Chan** said that he had pointed out in the Consolidation Forum that the Wan Chai District Council (WCDC) objected to all commercial helipad proposals at Wan Chai. As for the flyover concept, he was of the view that it could not be excluded due to insufficient information. He also concurred with Dr. Chan Wai-kwan's suggestion regarding reviving dropped ideas or proposals if there were sufficient justifications.
- 4.21 **Ms. Iris Tam** responded that suggestions made by Maunsell regarding ideas or proposals that should not be pursued further were in fact highlighting to the public those ideas which might be contrary to the HPPs, sustainability principles and indicators developed under HER or the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (PHO). She quoted the at-grade road concept and proposed moorings along Wan Chai shoreline as examples. She added that the whole package of the recommendations of the Expert Panel was reflected in the third draft of the report. As for KTA's proposal, she said that there would be difficulties in incorporating it in the concept plans as details of the proposal were not clear and thus it was not possible to assess whether the proposal would conflict with the HPPs. She also disagreed with Mr. Zimmerman's comment on the lack of sufficient indicators and principles for evaluating the concept plans. She emphasized that the evaluation of concept plans would be Realization Stage activity.
- 4.22 **Mr. Eric Ma** echoed that Maunsell's presentation at the

Consolidation Forum was trying to highlight for feedback from the public those ideas which might conflict with the HPPs or the PHO. In addition, they would also like to remind the public about the technical or environmental issues associated with certain ideas.

4.23 **Dr. Ng Mee-kam** reminded that paragraph 7.3.1 of the current revised draft report for the Envisioning Stage should be revised to clarify the purpose of making suggestion on ideas or proposals not to be pursued further.

City
Planning

4.24 **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** re-iterated the point of lack of sufficient indicators and principles for evaluating the concept plans and said that measurable indicators had yet to be derived. He further commented that PHO demanded for preservation and maintenance of the Harbour which might not necessarily exclude reclamation for facilitating good use of the Harbour.

4.25 **Dr. Chan Wai-kwan** highlighted the suggestion in paragraph 9.2.1(a) of the report for the Envisioning Stage, if the report was endorsed by the Sub-committee, that it was not necessary to have a concept plan without the CWB. He said that it would amount to a change in the stance of the Sub-committee, from being open on the issue to supporting the CWB. He stressed that the Sub-committee should then consider how to convey to the public its concerns about enhancing the harbour-front, when building the CWB, as well as the sustainable transport planning of the area.

4.26 **Dr. Chan Wai-kwan** also suggested those ideas, which might involve reclamation in the strict legal sense but not in the common understanding of the general public, should not be excluded at the present stage, and that HEC might consider establishing a set of planning principles for dealing with those harbour-front enhancement ideas which might involve reclamation in the strict legal sense. **The Chairman** commented that HEC might not be an appropriate body to handle that issue which were related to legal interpretation of the PHO.

- 4.27 **Mr. Patrick Lau** said that the spirit of views or ideas received from public was more important. He said that for example, the idea of an openable bridge linking the existing breakwaters represented an aspiration to get close to the Harnour by means such as the breakwater and the artificial beach at CBTS. If there were technical issues associated with those ideas, the Sub-committee should consider whether there were other means to satisfy such aspiration.
- 4.28 **Dr. Greg Wong** said that before proceeding to the next stage, the Sub-committee should first decide on the key issues such as whether the Sub-committee would support building the CWB. Ideas from the public should be further considered as far as possible and some of them might fall away by default.
- 4.29 In response to the question on whether the relevant District Councils would support the CWB, **Mr. Stephen Chan** reiterated that the C&WDC had passed motions supporting the construction of the CWB, **Mr. Patrick Lau** said that the issue was not discussed at the Eastern District Council (EDC) and **Mr. Steve Chan** said views were divided at the WCDC.
- 4.30 **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** stated his support for “a” CWB, but not “the” CWB, and it had to be built underground to divert traffic away from the surface roads so as to minimize land intake for surface roads.
- 4.31 **Dr. Chan Wai-kwan** reiterated that if the Sub-committee decided to support the CWB, a clear message should be passed to the public that it was only a part of the sustainable transport planning solutions recommended by the Expert Panel. **Dr. Ng Mee-kam** agreed. She then questioned on whether the flyover option would need to be pursued as there was little support from the public.
- 4.32 As there was no objection to a CWB, **the Chairman** concluded that the Sub-committee supported the construction of a CWB. He said that it should be quite obvious that the at-grade road concept would not need to be pursued further as

it would contradict with the HPPs. He added that while there was little public support to the flyover concept, subject to detailed assessment by the consultant, it might require lesser reclamation as compared with the tunnel concept and the risk of legal challenge might need to be considered if the flyover concept was dropped at the present stage.

- 4.33 **Mr. Steve Chan** agreed that the flyover concept should not be excluded at the present stage.
- 4.34 **Mr. Patrick Lau** reminded on the need to consult the locals before deciding on which concept to be adopted with the necessary details such as the connections and impacts on the surrounding presented. **Dr. Greg Wong** agreed.
- 4.35 **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** suggested deleting the word “shallow” in paragraph 9.2.1(a) of the draft report for the Envisioning Stage and dropping the flyover concept as it would affect the harbour-front.
- 4.36 **Dr. Chan Wai-kwan** said that although he personally was not in favour of the flyover concept, he said that it should still be shown to the public at the Realization Stage with a clear reminder that it would require lesser reclamation so that the public could make an informed choice.
- 4.37 Regarding whether the flyover concept would involve reclamation or not, **Mr. Hardy Lok** said that the spirit of the PHO would include the consideration of whether the Harbour would be sterilized. He suggested keeping both the flyover and tunnel concepts open at the present stage. Nevertheless, he agreed that the at-grade road concept could be dropped. In addition, he said that it would not be fair to ask the public to provide further justifications for reviving their ideas or proposals as the public would not have the resources required and it should be for the Government or their consultants to explain why individual ideas or proposals from the public were not feasible.
- 4.38 Regarding the need of the slip roads, **Mr. Kwan Chi-wai**

pointed out that the Expert Panel had expressed support to four slip roads, three in Wan Chai and one at Causeway Bay. **Ms. Sharon Ho** supplemented that the relevant information were included in the submissions by the Transport Department to the Expert Panel. She added that in planning a road, cost-benefit analysis could be assessed.

- 4.39 As to whether the deep tunnel concept should be dropped, **Dr. Greg Wong** pointed out that according to the consultant's information, the deep tunnel concept would not be functionally better than a shallow tunnel concept and would require additional reclamation at North Point. If that was the case, the deep tunnel concept would not be able to satisfy the requirement of PHO as the extent of reclamation was not minimized. For that reason, the deep tunnel concept should be dropped. **Mr. L T Ma** further clarified that the additional reclamation associated with the deep tunnel concept was not related to the slip road at Causeway Bay but due to the fact that the tunnel portal was shifted eastward to North Point. **The Chairman** suggested that subject to the consultant providing data to confirm that the deep tunnel concept would require more reclamation, that concept should be dropped. **The meeting** agreed and requested the HER Task Force to follow up. HER Task Force
- 4.40 **Dr. Ng Mee-kam** suggested that the HER Task Force to consider variations in the design of the proposed slip roads and the impact on the harbour-front. HER Task Force
- 4.41 With regard to Mr. Brooke's suggestion of converting the temporary helipad at the ex-PCWA into permanent use, **the meeting** agreed that it should be dropped at that stage.
- 4.42 Regarding the third draft of the report for the Envisioning Stage of HER, **the meeting** agreed to request the HER Task Force to discuss it further. HER Task Force
- 4.43 **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** said that the latest draft of the report for the Envisioning Stage and the minutes of the last (8th) Sub-committee meeting confirmed earlier in that meeting, in

particular, paragraph 3.6, did not reflect the view of the Chairman of the Expert Panel that the scale of P2 could be reduced once CWB was in place. He requested to amend the report and the minutes accordingly. **The Chairman** asked **the Secretary** to double-check the audio records.

Secretary

(Post-meeting note: The Secretary had reported in the HER Task Force meeting held on 20 December 2005 that he had checked the audio record of that meeting and confirmed that that minutes of the last Sub-committee meeting, especially paragraphs 3.6 and 3.9, correctly reflected the statements made by the Chairman of the Expert Panel at the meeting. After discussion, the Task Force meeting agreed that no change to confirmed minutes was required.)

Item 5 Work plan for Realization Stage of HER

5.1 **The Chairman** suggested requesting the HER Task Force to discuss the proposed work plan of the Realization Stage in details. **The meeting** agreed.

HER Task
Force

Item 6 Progress report on HER (Paper No. WD 16/2005)

6.1 **The meeting** noted the progress report.

Item 7 Any Other Business

7.1 **Mr. Paul Zimmerman** said that he noted a new billboard was recently erected near the Cross-Harbour Tunnel approach. He opined that the billboard was contradictory to the HPPs. **Mr. Robin Ip** agreed to check with Lands Department on the details.

(Post-meeting note: Subsequent to the presentation by Lands Department on temporary harbour-front land use at the HEC meeting on 24 November 2005, the department would take into consideration the HPPs when considering the

temporary use of harbour-front land. It has also asked departments concerned to consider the possibility of greening harbour-front land that would be vacant for three years.)

- 7.2 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:05pm.

Secretariat, HEC Sub-committee on
Wan Chai Development Phase II Review
February 2006