

立法會
Legislative Council

Paper No. WKCD-157
(These minutes have been
seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/HS/2/04

**Subcommittee on
West Kowloon Cultural District Development**

**Minutes of sixth meeting held on
Friday, 22 April 2005, at 3:10pm
in the Chamber of the Legislative Council Building**

- Members present** : Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC (Chairman)
Hon James TO Kun-sun (Deputy Chairman)
Hon James TIEN Pei-chun, GBS, JP
Hon Albert HO Chun-yan
Dr Hon LUI Ming-wah, JP
Hon Margaret NG
Hon Mrs Selina CHOW LIANG Shuk-ye, GBS, JP
Hon Jasper TSANG Yok-sing, GBS, JP
Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBS, JP
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP
Hon CHOY So-yuk
Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, GBS, JP
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, JP
Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, JP
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP
Hon LEE Wing-tat
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming, SBS, JP
Hon Ronny TONG Ka-wah, SC
Hon CHIM Pui-chung
Hon Patrick LAU Sau-shing, SBS, JP
Hon Albert Jinghan CHENG
Hon KWONG Chi-kin
- Members absent** : Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai, S.B.St.J., JP
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, JP

Hon SIN Chung-kai, JP

- Public officers attending** : Mr Patrick HO, JP
Secretary for Home Affairs
- Mr Michael SUEN, GBS, JP
Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands
- Miss AU King-chi, JP
Deputy Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands
(Planning and Lands)
- Ms Lolly CHIU, JP
Deputy Secretary for Home Affairs
- Mr Vincent FUNG
Principal Assistant Secretary for Home Affairs
- Ms Anissa WONG, JP
Director of Leisure & Cultural Services
- Mr CHUNG Ling-hoi, JP
Acting Deputy Director of Leisure & Cultural Services
- Mr Bosco FUNG, JP
Director of Planning
- Mr KWAN Pak-lam, JP
Project Manager/Kowloon
Civil Engineering and Development Department
- Attendance by invitation** : People's Panel on West Kowloon
- Ms Cyd HO
Representative
- Mr LEUNG Man-tao
Representative
- Spring-time Group Ltd
- Mr KO Chi-sum
CEO & Producer
- Clerk in attendance** : Miss Odelia LEUNG
Chief Council Secretary (1)4
- Staff in attendance** : Ms Pauline NG

Assistant Secretary General 1

Ms Bernice WONG
Assistant Legal Adviser 1

Ms Alice AU
Senior Council Secretary (1)5

Mr Anthony CHU
Council Secretary (1)2

Miss Michelle NIEN
Legislative Assistant (1)3

Action

I Confirmation of minutes

- (Paper No. WKCD-124 -- Minutes of meeting on 23 March 2005
Paper No. WKCD-125 -- Checklist of follow-up actions required of
the Administration)

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 March 2005 were confirmed.

II Meeting with deputations and the Administration

(1) *Shortfall and long-term needs in the development of arts and culture in Hong Kong*

- (Paper No. WKCD-113 -- Submission from People's Panel on West Kowloon
Paper No. WKCD-138 -- Further submission from People's Panel on West Kowloon
Paper No. WKCD-123 -- Submission from Spring-time Group Limited
Paper No. WKCD-127 -- Covering paper provided by the Administration on "Shortfall and long-term needs in the development of arts and culture in Hong Kong"
Paper No. WKCD-128 -- Supplementary information provided by the Administration on "Operation of museums in Hong Kong" (Annex A1 to WKCD-127)
Paper No. WKCD-129 -- Information provided by the Administration on "Need for Venue of Cultural and Performing Groups" (Annex A2 to WKCD-127)
Paper No. WKCD-130 -- Government's Response to the

- submission made by People's Panel on West Kowloon (Paper No. WKCD-113) (Annex B to WKCD-127)
- Paper No. WKCD-131 -- Information provided by the Administration on "Culture and Heritage Commission (CHC) Policy Recommendation Report – Government response and the latest development" (Annex C to WKCD-127)
- Paper No. WKCD-132 -- Information provided by the Administration on "Research on museums development by the CHC Working Group on Museums" including discussion papers for four of the eight meetings held from January 2001 to August 2002 (Annex D to WKCD-127)
- Paper No. WKCD-133 -- Information provided by the Administration on time taken to plan and construct museums in Hong Kong (Annex E to WKCD-127)
- Paper No. WKCD-134 -- Information provided by the Administration on "Reference materials on the preferred themes of the museums in the West Kowloon Cultural District" (Annex F to WKCD-127)
- Paper No. WKCD-135 -- Information provided by the Administration on "Calculation method of performance venues' usage rates" (Annex G to WKCD-127)
- Paper No. WKCD-136 -- Information provided by the Administration on "Data on world-class museum facilities" (Annex H to WKCD-127)
- Paper No. WKCD-137 -- Information provided by the Administration on consideration of cultural vision and software implementation capabilities of the proponents in the assessment of the screened-in proposals (Annex I to WKCD-127)
- Paper No. WKCD-110 -- Information paper provided by the Administration on "Shortfall and long-term needs in the development of arts and culture in Hong Kong"
- Paper No. WKCD-106 -- Information paper dated 21 March 2005 on "West Kowloon Cultural District and Public Private Partnerships" provided by the Administration

Paper No. WKCD-126 -- List of follow-up actions required of the Administration arising from the meeting on 8 April 2005)

2. The Subcommittee deliberated (Index of proceedings attached at the **Annex**).

3. Ms Cyd HO and Mr LEUNG Man-tao of People's Panel on West Kowloon (PPWK) presented PPWK's latest submissions (Paper Nos. WKCD-113 and 138) to the Subcommittee. Their views were summarized as follows:

- (a) To a certain extent, the perceived shortage of performance venues was caused by the use of such venues for non-cultural activities. Moreover, the lack of co-ordination among different managers of performance venues also created difficulties for potential hirers. All these would give rise to the wrong impression that the performance venues were already fully utilized.
- (b) Notwithstanding the Government's claim that it had made reference to various studies in considering the four preferred themes of museums in the West Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD), their actual need was questionable as the Invitations for Proposals (IFP) also allowed the proponents to propose other themes with good justifications. This approach apparently ran contrary to best international practices which required an overall assessment on the functional need and financial implications of the proposed facilities before a decision was made. It was unsatisfactory to specify requirements of proposed hardware facilities arbitrarily without due consideration to the software side.
- (c) The Government should abort the single-package development approach and dispense with the mandatory requirement of canopy. WKCD could be developed in phases. In the meantime, the Government should formulate a long-term policy for the development of arts and culture in Hong Kong.

4. Mr KO Chi-sum of the Spring-time Group Limited (Spring-time) stated that while Spring-time had entered into a partnership agreement with one of the screened-in proponents, he was addressing the Subcommittee as an arts professional involved in the production of arts and cultural programmes. Mr KO presented his latest views on the WKCD project as follows:

- (a) The success of a number of cultural programmes including the Arts Festival in recent months had attested to the existence of a solid audience base for quality arts and cultural programmes.

- (b) Past experience had shown that the development of new performance venues such as the Hong Kong Cultural Centre and Kwai Tsing Theatre would bring about a substantial expansion of the audience base for arts and cultural programmes.
- (c) In view of the fast-changing arts and culture scene in Hong Kong, it was impractical to ask the Government to formulate an arts and cultural blueprint first before contemplating the development of WKCD.
- (d) Hong Kong already had a cultural policy based on the Culture and Heritage Commission's Policy Recommendations Report (CHC Report) published in 2003. It should be noted that for some groups, the arts and culture blueprint was essentially related to the Government's funding policy.
- (e) WKCD could become a major attraction for both local people and tourists alike by exemplifying the diversities of local arts and culture.

(Post-meeting note: Spring-time's submission (Paper No. WKCD-123) which was tabled at the meeting was subsequently issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1368/04-05.)

5. The Subcommittee thanked the deputations for their valuable views.
6. Referring to the covering paper and its annexes (Paper Nos. WKCD-127 to 137) provided by the Administration, the Chairman noted that for the eight meetings held by the CHC Working Group on Museums from January 2001 to August 2002 to deliberate the future development of museums in Hong Kong, only some discussion papers were provided, and there were no minutes of meetings at all. He enquired about the reasons for such omission. In response, the Principal Assistant Secretary for Home Affairs apologized to the Subcommittee for the omission. He explained that efforts had been made to locate the said minutes of meetings. However, it was found that the relevant contract staff providing secretariat support to the Working Group had not prepared relevant minutes of meetings.
7. Ms Margaret NG sought the deputations' view on whether the development approach adopted by the Government with sole emphasis on hardware facilities in the IFP could adequately address the shortfall in the infrastructure and other deficiencies in supporting the development of arts and culture in Hong Kong. Ms Cyd HO replied that the Administration must improve the management of existing performance venues before the real usage situation could be ascertained to justify the need or otherwise for new facilities in the WKCD. Mr LEUNG Man-tao supplemented that with the shared use of performance venues by non-cultural activities, it would be very difficult to

ascertain the existing shortfall in the infrastructure. He also pointed out that Hong Kong needed a high level statutory organization similar to CHC, with participation from different sectors, to monitor the implementation of the arts and cultural policy. Mr KO Chi-sum said that the Government should give priority to the provision, through the clustering effect of WKCD, of a good business environment for arts and cultural groups to cultivate the audience. He reiterated that the demand of cultural facilities would be “supply-led”.

8. Advising on the progress of the Administration’s actions to follow up on the CHC Report, the Secretary for Home Affairs said that the Government had accepted 94 out of CHC’s 108 recommendations. Three committees had been set up in late 2004 to advise the Home Affairs Bureau on implementation of the accepted recommendations pertaining to performing arts, libraries and museums. These committees had commenced work and started in-depth discussion on improvement of the current use of venues, resource allocation and enhancement of the role and functions of the existing facilities.

9. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung opined that the planned provision of facilities in WKCD could not cater for the real demand of arts and culture in Hong Kong. He was particularly dissatisfied that no provision had been made to build a suitable venue for holding rock concerts which were popular among the people. Highlighting the need to ensure the prudent use of public funds, he pointed out that once the hardware facilities were built, they should be put to good use. Otherwise, their provision would serve no real purpose. Mr LEUNG also reiterated his strong opposition against the proposed canopy and the preferred themes of museums in WKCD.

10. Concerned about the long-term development of arts and culture, Mr LEE Wing-tat enquired about the Government’s vision for WKCD say in 10 to 15 years. He pointed out that without good content and quality programmes, the hardware facilities would become a white elephant. In this connection, he was worried that given the substantial recurrent expenditure required for the operation of museums and the private developer’s wish to make the most profits out of WKCD, insufficient provision would be allocated for the development of software content.

11. Ms Emily LAU expressed concern about the over-provision of performance venues in Hong Kong, and enquired about the Administration’s measures to improve the low usage rates of some performance venues managed by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD).

12. In response, the Administration stated the following points for members’ consideration:

- (a) It was the Government’s policy to give priority to arts-related use of performance venues. More than 80% of the activities held in major performance venues managed by LCSD were arts-related.

Major performance venues were seldom used for non-cultural activities.

- (b) In order to maximize the utilization of performance venues, bookings for non-arts activities would be accepted for the vacant sessions.
- (c) Except for Ko Shan Theatre which had become a specialized venue for Cantonese Opera performances, efforts made by the Government to develop the character of specific performance venues had not met with much success. This might be attributed to the availability of many performance venues all over the territory which offered a choice for the organizers to stage their performances in venues most accessible to their targeted audience.

(2) ***Disclosure of West Kowloon Reclamation Concept Plan Competition Report of the Technical Panel***

- (Paper No. WKCD-118 -- Information Paper on “West Kowloon Reclamation Concept Plan Competition”
- Paper No. WKCD-119 -- “Concept Plan Competition for the Development of an Integrated Arts, Cultural and Entertainment District at the West Kowloon Reclamation, Hong Kong – Report of the Jury”
- Paper No. WKCD-120 -- “West Kowloon Reclamation Concept Plan Competition – Report of the Technical Panel” dated January 2002)

13. Both Mr Patrick LAU and Mrs Selina CHOW declared their interest as members of the Jury of the West Kowloon Reclamation Concept Plan Competition (WKR CPC).

14. The Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (SHPL) highlighted the main points in the information papers provided by the Administration (Paper Nos. WKCD-118 to 120) as follows:

- (a) The 2001 WKR CPC was held and adjudicated according to international best practice.
- (b) The Technical Panel was set up to provide advice on the technical aspects of the competition entries to the Jury. The Jury made the decision on the winning entries having considered the advice from the Technical Panel.
- (c) The Administration had considered the feasibility of the Foster design scheme before a decision was made to adopt it as the basis

of the master plan for WKCD. Though there were problems, they were not insurmountable and could be addressed in later design stages.

15. Mr LEE Wing-tat, Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Mr Albert HO and Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung expressed grave concern that given the doubts raised by the Technical Panel about the technical feasibility of the canopy, they were entirely unconvinced that such a design feature should be included as a mandatory requirement in the IFP. The members also enquired about the Government's consideration on the financial aspects involved with the construction and maintenance of the proposed canopy. They were concerned that the substantial financial requirements might be one of the reasons why the Government had decided to adopt a single-package development approach for WKCD.

16. In response, SHPL reiterated that the problems identified by the Technical Panel in the CPC stage were not insurmountable. The canopy, with modifications being made to the Foster scheme design, was eventually included in the IFP as a mandatory requirement. The proponents were required to submit broad technical assessments and solutions to demonstrate the technical feasibility of their proposals. They were also required to propose solutions to mitigate the impact or overcome development constraints. In varying degrees, the proposals made by the three screened-in proponents had attested to the technical feasibility of the canopy.

Motion

17. Dr KWOK Ka-ki was unconvinced by the Administration's explanation and considered that the Administration should provide more information to facilitate members' consideration. As such, he proposed the following motion:

“That the Subcommittee urges the Government to expeditiously provide the following documents:

- (a) a full account of the comments on the “canopy” of the prize-winning entry (i.e. the Foster and Partners design) as set out in the report of the Technical Panel;
- (b) the report on the technical feasibility study conducted by the Government in respect of the construction of the “canopy” proposed in the prize-winning entry (i.e. the Foster and Partners design); and
- (c) the report on the study conducted by the Government in respect of the financial arrangements involved in constructing the “canopy” proposed in the prize-winning entry (i.e. the Foster and Partners design).” (Translation)

18. The Subcommittee agreed to proceed with the motion.

19. In their capacities as members of the Jury, Mr Patrick LAU and Mrs Selina CHOW briefly explained the respective role and considerations of the Technical Panel and the Jury of the WKR CPC.

20. Mr Abraham SHEK reiterated his strong opposition to the proposed canopy.

21. Regarding the information provided by the Administration, Mr Patrick LAU, Mrs Selina CHOW and Mr Abraham SHEK considered that the information provided was adequate and there was no need to ask for further information.

22. Regarding the motion proposed by Dr Kwok Ka-ki, SHPL made the following comments:

- (a) The Competition Document of CPC bound the Government, the competition entrants and parties involved in the assessment and adjudication of the entries. Paragraph 33 of Section I stipulated that “the assessment process will be carried out in strict confidence. The organizer shall not disclose the details of the assessment.” The Administration decided to disclose the main report of the Technical Panel after soliciting the consent of the Panel members. Further disclosure of the assessment of individual entries might harm the competitive or financial position of the competition entrants. In addition, members of the Technical Panel were well aware of the arrangement that their assessments were confidential and privy to the Jury only.
- (b) The Administration had considered technical feasibility of the canopy at various stages but a feasibility report had not been compiled. The Administration considered inappropriate to disclose internal discussion paper on the technical feasibility of the canopy.
- (c) The Administration had undertaken to disclose financial information in relation to WKCD at a later stage subject to the condition that it would not weaken the Administration’s negotiating position with the proponents.

23. The Chairman put the motion to vote. Nine members voted for and four members voted against the motion. The Chairman declared that the motion was carried.

Admin 24. To facilitate members’ consideration, the Administration was requested to provide the following in writing before the next meeting:

- (a) a breakdown of the usage rate of each performance venue for cultural and non-cultural purposes for the past three years;
- (b) a breakdown of the patronage rate of cultural events in performance venues for the past three years; and
- (c) the Government's arts and cultural policy.

III Any other business

25. Due to time constraint, the Subcommittee agreed to defer discussion on "Proposed duty visit to Abandoibarra in Spain" to the next meeting.

26. The Chairman reminded members that the next meeting of the Subcommittee would be held on Friday, 6 May 2005 at 8:30 am to continue discussion with the Administration on "Shortfall and long-term needs in the development of arts and culture in Hong Kong". Members agreed to invite representatives from the Ink Society to present their latest views on WKCD.

27. Members endorsed the meeting schedule of the Subcommittee for May and June 2005 which was tabled at the meeting and subsequently circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1366/04-05 on 25 April 2005.

28. The meeting ended at 5:53 pm.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
2 June 2005

**Proceedings of the sixth meeting of the
Subcommittee on West Kowloon Cultural District Development
on Friday, 22 April 2005, at 3:10 pm
in the Chamber of the Legislative Council Building**

| Time marker | Speaker | Subject(s) | Action required |
|--------------------|---|--|------------------------|
| 000000 - 000200 | Chairman | Confirmation of minutes of the meeting held on 23 March 2005 (Paper No. WKCD-124) | |
| 000201 - 000525 | Chairman | <u>Shortfall and long-term needs in the development of arts and culture in Hong Kong</u> Introductory remarks | |
| 000526 - 001716 | People's Panel on West Kowloon (PPWK) | PPWK's latest views on the West Kowloon Cultural District Development (WKCD) | |
| 001717 - 002638 | Spring Time Group Ltd. (Spring-time) | Spring-time's latest views on WKCD | |
| 002639 - 002857 | Chairman Administration | Minutes of the eight meetings of the Cultural and Heritage Commission (CHC)'s Working Group on Museums from January 2001 to August 2002 | |
| 002858 - 004837 | Ms Margaret NG PPWK Spring-time Administration | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Methodology to set priority for the proposed hardware facilities - The Administration's explanation on its arts and cultural policy that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) most of CHC's recommendations had been accepted by the Government; and (b) three committees had been set up to follow up on the implementation of the accepted recommendations. | |
| 004838 - 005346 | Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung Spring-time | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provision of hardware facilities must depend on the demand of the public - As proposed, the WKCD could | |

| Time marker | Speaker | Subject(s) | Action required |
|-----------------|--|---|---|
| | | not cater for different needs of the community, in particular a venue for holding rock concerts which were popular among the public | |
| 005347 - 010156 | Mr LEE Wing-tat Administration | Concern about the long-term cultural vision of the Government | |
| 010157 - 011031 | Ms Emily LAU Administration Chairman | Proportion of cultural- and non-cultural events held in performance venues managed by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) | The Administration to provide information as per paragraph 24(a) of the minutes |
| 011032 – 011407 | PPWK | Problems with the management and operation of performance venues managed by LCSD | |
| 011408 - 001515 | Spring-time | Redevelopment of existing cultural facilities could not achieve the same clustering effect of WKCD | |
| 011516 - 011732 | Chairman Administration Ms Emily LAU | Patronage rates of cultural events | The Administration to provide information as per paragraph 24(b) of the minutes |
| 011732 - 011824 | Chairman | <u>Disclosure of West Kowloon Reclamation Concept Plan Competition Report of the Technical Panel</u> Introductory remarks | |
| 011825 - 012128 | Administration | Presentation of the Administration's papers (WKCD-118 to 120) | |
| 012129 - 013443 | Mr LEE Wing-tat Administration | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Government's consideration of the technical and financial aspects of the canopy and its subsequent inclusion in the Invitation for Proposals (IFP) as a mandatory requirement - The Administration's explanation that: | |

| Time marker | Speaker | Subject(s) | Action required |
|-----------------|---|---|-----------------|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the Jury had considered problems associated with the canopy as contained in the Technical Panel's report; (b) the problems with the canopy were not insurmountable; (c) the IFP required proponents to include feasibility study on canopy; (d) the Administration's assessment had confirmed the technical feasibility of the canopy; and (e) the Administration could tap into the know-how of the private sector so that the latest development in both the construction methods and materials for the canopy could be adopted. | |
| 013444 - 020119 | Dr KWOK Ka-ki Administration Chairman | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consideration and studies conducted by the Administration to make the canopy a mandatory IFP requirement - Role and function of the Technical Panel - The Administration's explanation that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the Technical Panel was set up to advise the Jury on technical aspects of the entries; (b) the assessment process of the Concept Plan Competition was carried out in strict confidence; the Administration should not disclose the details of the assessments; (c) technical assessment was done by the Administration at various stages as internal discussion. No reports were available and it was inappropriate to disclose the internal discussion papers; and | |

| Time marker | Speaker | Subject(s) | Action required |
|-----------------|--|---|-----------------|
| | | <p>(d) financial information would be disclosed at a later stage subject to the condition that it would not weaken the Administration's negotiating position.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Moving of motion | |
| 020120 - 020738 | Mr Albert HO Administration | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Problems with the ownership, management and maintenance of the canopy and the costs involved - The Administration's explanation that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the Administration had invited the private sector to participate in the development of WKCD due to fiscal constraints at a time when the property market was at a slump; (b) the proponents were required to submit their solutions and the technical and financial assessment on the canopy; and (c) although the Administration had a baseline estimate, the proponents' figures could be different as they were based on a different set of solutions. Part of the assessment of the proposals would be on the technical and financial aspects of the canopy. | |
| 020739 - 020939 | Mr Tommy CHEUNG Chairman | Voting on Dr KWOK Ka-Ki's motion | |
| 020940 - 021158 | Mr Albert HO Chairman Administration | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Request for an information paper on feasibility studies on canopy conducted by the Administration - The Administration's explanation that IFP also required the proponent to submit broad technical assessments and solutions to demonstrate the technical feasibility of their proposals, including the canopy. | |

| Time marker | Speaker | Subject(s) | Action required |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|---|-----------------|
| 021159 - 021339 | Ms Emily LAU Administration | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Decision process of the Jury in the determination of the winning entries | |
| 021340 - 021819 | Ms Margaret NG Administration | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Availability of the documents referred to in the motion proposed by Dr KWOK Ka-Ki - The Administration's explanation that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the comments on the "canopy" of the Foster and Partners design was one of the 161 annexes to the report of the Technical Panel; (b) there was no formal report on the technical feasibility assessment made by the Government in respect of the construction of the "canopy" proposed in the Foster and Partners design; (c) report on the study conducted by the Government in respect of the financial arrangements involved in constructing the "canopy" proposed in Foster and Partners design would be disclosed at a later stage; and (d) the competition brief for the Concept Plan Competition also contained the suggested facilities such as hotel/residential/office developments. | |
| 021820 - 022343 | Mr Abraham SHEK | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Opposition to the proposed canopy and single-package development approach - Did not support the proposed motion as it was not fair to Foster and Partners | |
| 022344 - 022629 | Mr Patrick LAU | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sufficient information had been provided by the Administration in relation to the assessment of the Jury - The Jury had considered the advice of the Technical Panel in determining the winning entries | |

| Time marker | Speaker | Subject(s) | Action required |
|-----------------|--|---|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Information on assessment studies conducted after the Concept Plan Competition should not be disclosed while the assessment on the screened-in proposals was still ongoing | |
| 022630 - 023057 | Mrs Selina CHOW | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Jury had considered the report of the Technical Panel - For design concept competition, design came before the technical feasibility - The Administration would need to account for the assessment studies it had conducted after the Concept Plan Competition when the successful proponent was eventually chosen - The IFP required the proponents to suggest better solution for the canopy to achieve the desired effect of the design | |
| 023058 - 023359 | Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Justification for the canopy as a mandatory requirement - Concern about the canopy which led to the single-package development approach | |
| 023400 - 023557 | Chairman Administration | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Whether the single-package development approach was adopted to resolve the ownership problem of the canopy - The Administration's explanation on the justification for the proposed canopy and the ongoing consultation to decide the way forward for the WKCD project | |
| 023558 - 023821 | Dr KWOK Ka-ki Chairman | Voting of the motion | |
| 023822 - 024145 | Chairman Mr LEE Wing-tat Mr Abraham SHEK Ms Emily LAU | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Date of next meeting - The Subcommittee agreed to invite the Ink Society to attend the next meeting to give its latest views on the project - Request for information on Hong | The Administration to provide information as per paragraph 24(c) of the minutes |

| Time marker | Speaker | Subject(s) | Action required |
|--------------------|----------------|--|------------------------|
| | | Kong's arts and cultural policy - Schedule of future meetings | |

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
2 June 2005