

**24th Meeting of Harbour-front Enhancement Committee
held at 2:15 pm on 15 December 2008
at 15/F, North Point Government Offices, 333 Java Road, Hong Kong**

Minutes of Meeting

Present

Prof Lee Chack-fan	Chairman
Dr Andrew Thomson	Representing Business Environment Council
Dr Ng Mee-kam	Representing Citizen Envisioning@Harbour
Dr Alvin Kwok	Representing Conservancy Association (CA)
Mr Vincent Ng	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Leslie Chen	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Mr Kim Chan	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Dr Paul Ho	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Ir Dr Greg Wong	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mr Mason Hung	Representing Hong Kong Tourism Board
Mr Louis Loong	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Paul Zimmerman	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour Limited
Mr Nicholas Brooke	
Mr David Ho	
Mr Michael Hui	
Mr Jimmy Kwok	
Mr Patrick Lau	
Mr Derrick Pang	
Mr Raymond Young	Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)
Ms Sharon Ho	Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport)5, Transport and Housing Bureau (THB)
Mr John Chai	Director of Civil Engineering and Development
Mrs Ava Ng	Director of Planning
Mr Jeff Lam	Assistant Director (Headquarters), Lands Department (LandsD)
Mr Andrew Tsang	Assistant Director (AD)(2), Home Affairs Department (HAD)
Miss Amy Yuen	Secretary

In Attendance

Mrs Susan Mak	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, Development Bureau (DEVB)
Ms Lydia Lam	Assistant Secretary (Planning)3, DEVB
Miss Cheung Hoi-shan	Assistant Secretary (Planning)5, DEVB
Mr C K Hon	Project Manager/Hong Kong Island and Islands, Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)
Mr C B Mak	Chief Engineer/Kowloon East, CEDD
Mr Raymond Lee	Chief Town Planner/Studies and Research, Planning Department (PlanD)

For Item 4

Mr C B Mak	Chief Engineer/Kowloon East, CEDD
Mr Peter Mok	Senior Engineer/Kowloon 2, CEDD
Mr Eric Yue	District Planning Officer/Kowloon, PlanD
Mr Eric Ma	Managing Director, Maunsell Consultants Asia Ltd (MCAL)
Mr Igor Ho	Associate, MCAL

For Item 5

Mr K K Li	Chief Engineer/Energy Efficiency B, Electrical and Mechanical Services Department (EMSD)
Mr S F Lam	Senior Engineer/Energy Efficiency B1, EMSD
Mr Barry Lau	Associate, Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd

Absent with Apologies

Prof Wong Sze-chun	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Prof Carlos Lo	Representing Friends of the Earth
Dr Anissa Chan	
Mr Samuel Mok	

Action

Welcoming message

The Chairman welcomed all attending the 24th meeting of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC). He said that CA had nominated Mr Rico Wong to replace Ms Lister Cheung, who left CA on 12 November 2008, as its alternate/regular representative to serve on HEC and its Sub-committee/Task Groups. The Secretary for Development

(SDEV) had agreed to CA's nomination and the change had taken effect from 10 December 2008 until the end of the current term on 31 August 2009. Revised membership of the HEC Sub-committee/Task Groups had been circulated to Members and they endorsed the revised membership. In addition, Mr Andrew Tsang had taken over from Ms Margaret Hsia as AD(2), HAD with effect from 19 November 2008.

Item 1 Confirmation of minutes of the 23rd meeting

1.1 **The Chairman** said that the Secretariat circulated the draft minutes of the 23rd meeting to Members on 8 December 2008 and received no proposed amendments.

1.2 At the meeting, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** proposed amendments to paragraph 3.3 of the draft minutes. He proposed replacing “building them underground” by “reducing the land use” and “the proposed temporary one” by “a new one further north”. **The meeting** agreed to incorporate Mr Zimmerman’s proposed amendments into the minutes.

Secretariat

Item 2 Progress reports from the three Sub-committee/Task Groups (Paper Nos. 24 – 26/2008)

A. Harbour Plan Review Sub-committee (HPR Sub-com) (Paper No. 24/2008)

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

2.1.1 **Mr Ng** reported that a project team led by a developer briefed the Sub-committee on the proposed development at the “Comprehensive Development Area (1)” zone at King Wah Road, which comprised office, eating place and shop and services uses. The proposed development was the subject of a section 16 planning application being processed by the Town Planning Board. Members’ views were reported in the progress report.

2.1.2 A project team led by THB presented a proposal to allow commercial helicopter operators to use the Wan Chai Temporary Helipad at the former Wan Chai Public Cargo Working Area until the commissioning of the

permanent helipad to the north-east of the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre. The Wan Chai Temporary Helipad was currently used by Government Flying Services for emergency and other essential flying services. Members expressed concerns on the noise impact of the proposal and asked questions about the frequency of commercial helicopter flights, operating hours, associated facilities, previous noise complaints, etc. The project team undertook to provide more information on the proposal to the Sub-committee for further consideration.

2.1.3 **Mr Ng** further reported that PlanD briefed the Sub-committee on the amendments to the approved Shau Kei Wan Outline Zoning Plan which were gazetted for public inspection on 7 November 2008. There were general discussions on the need to improve the environment of the inland area, reduce building height of waterfront sites upon redevelopment and improve connectivity along the harbourfront.

2.1.4 LandsD had submitted a paper on the short-term tenancies (STTs) in the harbourfront areas to the Sub-committee. Members agreed to discuss it at the next Sub-committee meeting scheduled for January 2009.

2.1.5 **Mr Ng** reported that the District Lands Office/Kowloon East explained the land administration practices in processing temporary waivers in the context of a proposal to erect a signage on the roof of MegaBox. Members considered it necessary to safeguard visual access to the harbour. While noting that some roof-top structures had already been erected on the subject building, the Sub-committee did not support the proposal which would result in an increase in building height.

2.2 **The Chairman** said that **Mr Nicholas Brooke** had suggested vide an email, which was tabled, to discuss at this meeting how applications for short-term works along the harbourfront could be dealt with together instead of in isolation. **Mr Brooke** said that there was a need to look at the impact of the infrastructure and construction works along the harbourfront for the next five to 10 years in an integrated manner. He considered

that HEC was an appropriate venue to look at the issue.

2.3 **The Chairman** said that since the HPR Sub-com would be looking at short-term land uses, it was appropriate for the Sub-committee to look at the issue first before discussion by HEC. **Mr Ng** said that the HPR Sub-com could help identify areas of concern and make recommendations to HEC for further consideration. Coordination among the bureaux and departments concerned was crucial for taking forward any recommendation. **The Chairman** suggested that **Mrs Susan Mak** consider how to deal with the issue. **Mrs Mak** said that pending the approval of the Legislative Council (LegCo) Finance Committee for the proposed set-up of a dedicated team in DEVB to handle harbourfront-related planning and land issues, DEVB would coordinate the information requested with a view to presenting it to HEC in future. **The Chairman** thanked Mrs Mak and suggested that the HPR Sub-com identify specific areas of concern in the meantime.

HPR Sub-com

2.4 With reference to a letter of 3 November 2008 from LandsD on proposed STTs for car park, display and sale of motor vehicles, open storage, commercial gardening and any combination of these uses in Kai Tak, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the Government should consider the policy on such STT applications. **The Chairman** said that while two items on Kai Tak would be discussed later at this meeting, he suggested that temporary car park proposals be considered in the examination of short-term land uses.

B. Task Group on Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (TGUDS) (Paper No. 25/2008)

2.5 **Ir Dr Greg Wong** presented the progress report. He reported that TGUDS Members were briefed by the study consultants on the findings of the public opinion collection exercise in the Stage 2 Public Engagement of the Study and the initial proposed design responses. Members requested that the Task Group should hold an informal meeting in January 2009 to examine in greater detail the written submissions received before they would comment on the initial design responses put forward by the study consultants. Members also suggested that a consensus building forum be arranged following the informal meeting. Those who had made written submissions and all other

interested parties should be invited to attend the forum.

2.6 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the consultants' draft design responses did not include other proposals with different ideas submitted since the launch of the public engagement. He proposed that the consensus building forum be organized by HEC with the help of PlanD.

2.7 **Mr Raymond Young** said that while HEC was an independent advisory committee with secretariat support from the Government, the HEC Secretariat had been allocated funding for arranging HEC activities including public engagement activities. If HEC was minded to organize such a forum, the Government would not duplicate efforts by organizing another concluding forum because of resource and PR considerations, and would present its preliminary views at the consensus building forum.

2.8 **Ir Dr Wong** said that Government resources and PlanD's help would be required no matter who was going to organize the forum. If HEC was the organizer, a consultant could be hired to organize the event. **Mrs Ava Ng** said that PlanD could provide the technical support required including mobilizing its consultants.

2.9 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** said that organization by HEC would give a sense of independence to the consensus building forum. **Dr Alvin Kwok** said that irrespective of the organizer, the purpose of the consensus building forum was to bring about a consensus over the various proposals. **Mr Brooke** said that while a consensus would not be possible in all aspects, and HEC should take on the responsibility to recommend what it considered to be the majority view to the Government. With the experience in the Kai Tak Planning Review, **Dr Ng Mee-kam** said that while it would be impossible to have a consensus, the majority views that emerged would have greater legitimacy.

2.10 **Mr Zimmerman** said that with good debates on various ideas (such as to go for an antique tram or a travelator in the Central harbourfront), arguments could be teased out and would assist in finding the solutions. **Mr Jimmy Kwok** said that the role of the Government was important regardless of who would be the organizer of the forum. If there was no statutory requirement, he considered it appropriate for the Government and

HEC to organize the forum jointly.

2.11 **Mr Young** said that the Government could work together with HEC to organize the consensus building forum. He cautioned that the public would not like to see a never ending process of public consultation forums and considered that the Government would in any case have to make the final decisions after considering the public's views. **The Chairman** suggested and **Ir Dr Wong** agreed that TGUDS would finalize the arrangements at its informal meeting in January 2009. In response to Mr Zimmerman, **Mrs Ng** said that PlanD would prepare technical responses to the key issues with input from other departments before the coming informal meeting.

TGUDS

PlanD

C. Task Group on Management Model for the Harbourfront (TGMMH) (Paper No. 26/2008)

2.12 In his capacity as Chairman of TGMMH, **Prof Lee Chack-fan** presented the progress report.

2.12.1 **Prof Lee** reported that Mr Vincent Ng, Prof Carlos Lo, Dr Sujata Govada and representatives from DEVB and Transport Development (TD) visited Liverpool and London on 2-7 November 2008. After the visit, Prof Lo and Dr Govada presented a report on the visit to TGMMH. Members generally considered the experience valuable and emphasized the importance of leadership and public participation in formulating a management model for the Hong Kong harbourfront.

2.12.2 Mr Patrick Lau, who attended and spoke in his personal capacity at the Dubai Waterfront Conference (16-18 November 2008), shared his experience with TGMMH. He also agreed to circulate a summary of the cases he collected at the Dubai Conference with the assistance of the TGMMH Secretary.

2.12.3 **Prof Lee** reported that Members noted though the 'Design and Tender' Model of Peak Galleria presented by DEVB could not be a solution for the entire harbourfront, it could be a mode to manage certain part(s) of the harbourfront in future.

2.12.4 **Prof Lee** also reported that Members agreed to conduct a visit to Singapore and Sydney in February 2009. The TGMMH Secretariat would further consult Members to fix the details.

2.12.5 TGMMH also discussed how to follow up on Items 7(b) and 8(a)-(f) of the issues raised by Mr Paul Zimmerman on 11 August 2008.

Item 3 Matters arising

3.1 **The Chairman** said that there was no specific matter for follow-up at this meeting.

Item 4 Kai Tak Development (KTD) - Progress Update (Paper No. 28/2008)

4.1 **The Chairman** welcomed Messrs C B Mak and Peter Mok of CEDD, Mr Eric Yue of PlanD and Messrs Eric Ma and Igor Ho of MCAL. **Mr Mak** introduced the item and **Mr Ho** presented his PowerPoint.

4.2 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** enquired whether temporary public access to Kai Tak would be provided before completion of the long-term development. **Mr Paul Zimmerman** asked if the broad land use plan would be improved. **Mr Vincent Ng** asked whether it would be possible to provide the promenade, the runway park and other open spaces at the same time when the Cruise Terminal project would be completed. **Ir Dr Greg Wong** enquired about the timetable for the Multi-purpose Stadium Complex.

4.3 **Mr Mak** said that while in the coming two to three years, most areas of Kai Tak would be construction sites for the Shatin to Central Link (SCL), Central Kowloon Route, Cruise Terminal and decontamination works, CEDD was liaising with Home Affairs Bureau (HAB) and the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD), which looked after the implementation of the runway park and promenade, on the possibility of delivering these at the same time as the completion of Cruise Terminal. Since commencement of the Kai Tak Engineering Review, there had been new developments that might require amendments to the approved Outline Zoning Plan, namely, preservation of the

remains of Longjin Bridge and change of the Kai Tak Nullah into Kai Tak River. On the implementation programme of the various projects other than the Cruise Terminal which would be completed in 2013, the target completion date of the public housing estate and the Government offices was around 2013-14. The Government had already announced the timetable for the SCL. The KTD was now at the implementation stage and the Kai Tak Engineering Review would be completed soon. On the Multi-purpose Stadium Complex which was a project of HAB, **Mr Mak** understood that the tentative date of completion was 2018-19.

4.4 **Dr Andrew Thomson** agreed to the views that early accessibility to the runway park and continuous public engagement were key issues. **Mr Mak** said that the HEC Secretariat informed Members of the public exhibition of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) report on 10 December 2008. A separate public consultation process on the EIA report was being administered by the Environmental Protection Department. The Kai Tak EIA Report Executive Summary, hard copies of which were deposited with the HEC Secretariat for Members' reference if required, contained a brief summary of the EIA. **Mr Mak** said that the Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan had been formulated with extensive public engagement under a three-stage process where HEC had been heavily involved. CEDD would continue engaging HEC and the public during the detailed design stage. The KTD would be implemented in a number of years and there would be many opportunities for HEC and the public to provide feedback on the individual projects of the development.

4.5 **Mr Kim Chan** suggested that consideration be given to implementing quick-win projects, landscaping and nurseries in the hinterland of Kai Tak. **Mr Eric Yue** said that for the area located to the northeast of the Sung Wong Toi Park, there would be an STT for staging a carnival event during Christmas and the Chinese New Year. (Post-meeting note: LandsD advised that the applicant had withdrawn his application for the STT.) According to the Outline Zoning Plan, the long-term use of this area was primarily for open space, residential and commercial uses. On STTs in the area, **Mr Yue** understood that LandsD was reviewing them from time to time.

4.6 **Mr Zimmerman** said that there was a management issue for the KTD and a need for an authority to take charge of the development and ensure smooth interfaces among individual projects. He said that DEVB should take up that role. **Dr Ng Mee-kam** said that given the large scale of the KTD, careful planning was required. She asked about the possibility for the public to use the area in the near future.

4.7 **Mr Raymond Young** said that the Kai Tak Supervisory Team (Super Team) chaired by SDEV had been looking after the implementation of the KTD. He added that he was a member of the Super Team and would channel Members' views on short-term uses in Kai Tak to the Super Team. He clarified that the Kai Tak Planning Review had been completed after extensive public engagement. The issue raised by Members was strictly speaking not a planning issue. Instead, it was an issue of how to programme the various works under the KTD which would allow the implementation of short-term waterfront enhancement projects for the public.

DEVB

4.8 **The Chairman** thanked the representatives of CEDD and MCAL for their presentation and discussion with HEC.

**Item 5 District Cooling System (DCS) at the KTD -
Underground Plant Rooms' Operational Facilities
on the Open Space at Runway Boulevard (Paper No.
27/2008)**

5.1 **The Chairman** welcomed Messrs K K Li and S F Lam of EMSD and Mr Barry Lau of Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd. **Mr Li** introduced the item and **Mr Lam** proceeded with his PowerPoint presentation.

5.2 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** asked about the business model for the DCS, possible tariff, and possible redundancy of facilities provided with advance in technological development. **Dr Alvin Kwok** appreciated the environmental friendliness of the project and enquired whether the ventilation outlets and plant rooms were located at the best sites, whether sculpture-like structures would be used to beautify these sites and suggested adopting solar panels onto the staircases leading to the underground plant rooms. **Ir Dr Greg Wong** enquired about the possibility of using common utilities tunnel for housing all the

underground utilities including the DCS piping network in the KTD. **Dr Andrew Thomson** asked whether the cooling load estimate of the DCS had taken into consideration the new eco-buildings to be built in KTD which would be more energy efficient.

5.3 **Mr Patrick Lau** welcomed the plan and said that in order to implement the vision of blending in with the surrounding environment, EMSD should bear such in mind in the final design. He also reminded EMSD to allow sufficient loading capacity in the deck above the underground plant rooms to support enhancement initiatives above ground. **Mr Kim Chan** suggested that the room for future expansion and back-up facilities and maintenance etc. should adequately be allowed for. He also stated concerns on possible nuisance generated by the DCS such as noise. He asked also how the DCS could fit into the overall plan for the KTD.

5.4 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that so far he had not seen the overall plan but just parts of the KTD. He asked why the southern underground plant rooms of the DCS could not be put in other locations like under the runway park. He questioned the design of the ground accesses. He asked whether the ventilation outlets would cause nuisance to the public and whether EMSD had provided green walls as shown in the sketch proposal previously and which department was responsible for maintaining them. He enquired whether the operational facilities would limit public enjoyment of the areas around them, and whether the DCS would limit the loading capacity of the runway boulevard for harbourfront enhancement proposals.

5.5 **Mr Li** said that EMSD had commissioned a consultancy study on the implementation of DCS at KTD in 2007. Taking into account the different development phases of the KTD which would start in 2010 for anticipated overall completion in 2021, the study found that the DCS project was financially viable with a breakeven period of around 27 years which is within the normal service life of the DCS installation. The Government intended to outsource the project to the private sector under a design, build and operate contract. The system could start operation to cater for the first phase of the developments, including public housing and the Cruise Terminal. The appointed contractor would continue to develop the system to match with the development

programme for the later phase. Major equipment like chiller plants, etc., would be procured/installed in phases matching the development needs. The overall system efficiency could also benefit from the future technological advancement. On the locations of the plant rooms, the northern chiller plant room would be built above-ground near the EMSD headquarters building in Kowloon Bay, and the southern chiller plant and seawater pump house would be constructed underground below the runway boulevard. Given that Government offices and private buildings would be located in the northern part, and hotels and the tourism node and Cruise Terminal at the southern tip of the runway, and all these developments were large air-conditioning load centres, the northern and southern plant rooms had thus been carefully located in the currently proposed locations close to the load centres for an energy-efficient and cost effective design.

5.6 **Mr Li** said that in the consultancy study, redundancy and reliability studies had been carried out. The water pipes would be running in a looped network. In case of minor damages caused by construction of other facilities to the water pipes causing leakage, there would be no need for an immediate shut-down. The contractor could repair the pipes at night so that the air-conditioning service would not be interrupted. In case of water pipe burst due to severe interference, by switching the valves, water supply could be restored within hours. In-door temperatures of the affected buildings were expected not to rise to an unacceptable level during this short period. Suitable redundancy levels had been built in the DCS system design to cater for the need of maintenance and predictable unavoidable failure. The intended reliability level of the DCS was targeted as good as public utilities in Hong Kong. EMSD had all along been coordinating and liaising with other departments including CEDD and PlanD in the development of the DCS in fitting with the KTD outline plan. The locations of the DCS plant rooms and water pipe network had been determined with their advice. Given that the planned Government premises and facilities in the KTD would take up about 15% of the total subscription to the DCS and if another 50% of the developments, from the private sector, would be attracted to subscribe to the DCS, making a total of 65% subscription, then the DCS project would be financially neutral. Since the tariff of the DCS service would be pitched at no more than that of a traditional water-cooled air-conditioning system

using cooling towers, the DCS would be more competitive to attract private subscription.

(Post-meeting note: After meeting, EMSD has clarified that the three percentage figures above should be 35% for the planned Government premises and facilities, 15% for the private sector and 50% for the total respectively.)

5.7 Regarding whether the seawater outfalls could be located within the Kai Tak Approach Channel to improve the water quality, **Mr C B Mak** said that the temperature of the discharge water from the DCS was a bit higher than that of seawater. It would require a bigger water body for cooling down and therefore should more preferably be discharged to the open sea. As regards the common underground utility tunnel, Highways Department (HyD) had found after a study that gas mains, water mains and electricity cables should not be accommodated in the same tunnel.

5.8 **Mr Li** said that Members' views on the design of the street furniture would be noted and be incorporated in the future design, build and operate contract. On the possible adoption of solar energy, such a requirement was called for under a Government circular on energy efficiency and renewable energy features in public work projects and would be followed. In respect of the vision of blending in with the surrounding environment, EMSD would liaise with other departments in the final design. On the shapes, greening and possible nuisance of the street furniture proposed for the DCS, he further explained with actual examples and the mitigation measures. With respect to the loading above the underground plant rooms, due regard would be paid to the functional use of the future park above, with the example of the Tsim Sha Tsui Centenary Garden. He said that the consultancy study had included an environmental assessment and concluded that the seawater discharged from the plant back to the sea would not affect the water quality of Victoria Harbour. As the plants and equipment of the DCS would be built underground, the noise and vibration problems could be dealt with collectively and more efficiently than individual plants inside individual buildings.

5.9 **Dr Kwok** asked whether the DCS would enhance or reduce the possibility of implementing temporary harbourfront

enhancements for the public. **Mr Zimmerman** was concerned about the possibility of restricting emergency vehicular access use above the underground plant rooms of the DCS. He suggested that the underground component of the DCS be relocated to the areas under the Cruise Terminal platform or under the highway supporting the Cruise Terminal. **Mr Li** said that the southern chiller plant room would be situated under an area zoned “Open Space”. **Mr Mak** supplemented that the area above the southern underground plant rooms could support fire-fighting engines with suitable design catering for the loading requirement. **Mr Li** said that construction of the southern underground plant rooms of the DCS was planned to start in 2010 for completion in 2012. The site would then be handed over to other departments for open space development. EMSD would liaise with the departments on the possibility of implementing temporary harbourfront enhancements. **Mr Jimmy Kwok** hoped that EMSD would conduct pilot runs for the DCS to avoid future break-downs.

5.10 **Mr Derrick Pang** suggested that the Government design the DCS, or clearly specify the requirements incorporating Members’ comments in the tender for the proposed design, build and operate contract. **Mr Li** agreed to follow up on this.

5.11 **Dr Ng Mee-kam** asked how the tariff of the DCS would be set to attract maximum usage and how the Government would promote use of the DCS. **Mr Li** said that the tariff would be set by a working group formed by the concerned bureaux and departments. As mentioned before, all Government developments within the KTD would use the DCS. EMSD would continue to promote the DCS to the private developers in the KTD after funding approval from the LegCo Finance Committee. He was confident given the lower cost of air-conditioning provided by the DCS.

5.12 **The Chairman** thanked the representatives of EMSD and Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd for their presentation and discussion with HEC.

Item 6 Any other business

A. Applications for short-term works along the harbourfront

6.1 **The Chairman** said that this item had been covered under

Item 2A.

B. Harbourfront Connectivity - Along and with the hinterland

6.2 **The Chairman** said that following the HEC meeting on 18 August 2008, the Secretariat circulated to Members a note prepared by HyD, PlanD and TD on the matter on 31 October 2008. On 10 December 2008, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested discussing the subject at this meeting.

6.3 **Mr Zimmerman** proposed that HEC have a meeting with HyD and TD to look at harbourfront connectivity in a holistic manner and ask them to advise their strategies and provide the maps. **The Chairman** suggested that the Secretariat liaise with the two departments for them to share with HEC on the subject at an appropriate time.

Secretariat

C. Date of next meeting

6.4 **The Chairman** said that the next meeting would be held on 23 February 2009 at the Conference Room, 15/F, North Point Government Offices.

6.5 There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:20 pm.

**Harbour-front Enhancement Committee Secretariat
February 2009**