

**立法會**  
***Legislative Council***

LC Paper No. CB(1) 848/04-05(01)

Ref: CB1/HS/2/04

**Meeting of the Subcommittee on  
West Kowloon Cultural District Development  
on 4 February 2005**

**West Kowloon Cultural District Development**

**Updated background brief**

**Introduction**

At the meeting of the House Committee on 21 January 2005, members decided to form a subcommittee to study and follow up issues relating to the development of West Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD) including its interface with arts and cultural development, land use and planning, environmental considerations, financing implications and arrangements, and other related matters (the Subcommittee). This paper provides an update on the latest development of WKCD to facilitate the deliberation of the Subcommittee. A brief setting out the background to the development of WKCD and views expressed by members of the Council on the development was issued on 29 November 2004 vide LC Paper No. CB(1)318/04-05(02) (**Appendix I**).

**Deliberations by the Panel on Planning, Lands and Works**

2. Following the announcement of the stage one screening results of the Invitation For Proposals (IFP) by the Chief Secretary at the Council on 10 November 2004, the Panel on Planning, Lands and Works (the Panel) embarked on various activities to follow up on the subject. These include inviting the Administration to explain the screening results, visiting the exhibition of the three screened-in proposals, inviting both the screened-in proponents and the screened-out proponent to introduce their proposals and listening to the views of interested organizations. A summary of the views expressed by organizations is in **Appendix II**. In addition to the previously expressed concerns about the adoption of single package approach, the mandatory requirement of a canopy and the absence of long-term arts and

cultural policy, members raised the following new major areas of concern:

- (a) the consultation period for the screened-in proposals, which has been extended from the original period of one month to 15 weeks until end of March 2005, is inadequate for members of the public to express views;
- (b) the proposed plot ratios in the three screened-in proposals far exceed the reference plot ratio of 1.81 in the IFP. A comparison of the plot ratios and development schedules of the screened-in proposals is in **Appendix III**; and
- (c) there is a complete lack of transparency of the financial arrangements for the screened-in proposals.

3. At the meeting of the Panel on 30 November 2004, the Panel passed three motions urging the Administration to review the single package approach, extend the consultation period to six months and disclose the financial information contained in the screened-in proposals. The wording of the motions is in **Appendix IV**.

### **Discussion by the House Committee**

4. Pursuant to the motions passed by the Panel, the Chief Secretary for Administration wrote to each individual member on 6 December 2004 explaining the reasons for not disclosing the financial information contained in the screened-in proposals at this stage. One of the major reasons put forth was that disclosure of the financial arrangements would weaken the Government's bargaining power. Members were not convinced of the reasons. At the meeting of the House Committee on 13 December 2004, members supported the proposal made by Hon James TIEN, Hon LEE Wing-tat and Hon LAU Kon-wah, to request the Government to make public, within one month, the financial information contained in the screened-in proposals. Members consider that disclosure of the financial arrangements will enhance the transparency and acceptability of the WKCD project and strengthen the bargaining power of the Government as a result.

### **Motion debate by the Council**

5. On 5 January 2005 Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit moved a motion on WKCD urging the Government to extend the public consultation period to six months, make public all the proposals including the financial information, remove the mandatory requirement of a canopy, withdraw the single-package approach and formulate long-term and sustainable policies on arts and culture. At the motion

debate, the Chief Secretary for Administration pledged that before signing any provisional agreement with the successful proponent, the Government would arrange for the full disclosure of all the financial information. The information would include all financial proposals submitted by the screened-in proponents and subsequent revisions, if any, as well as the final financial package of the selected proposal. Notwithstanding the Administration's pledge, the motion as amended by Hon James TO Kun-sun was passed by the Council. The wording of the motion passed by the Council is in **Appendix V**.

6. A list of the relevant papers with their hyperlinks is in **Appendix VI**.

Council Business Division 1  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
3 February 2005

## **Appendix I**

# **立法會 Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. CB(1) 318/04-05(02)

Ref: CB1/PL/PLW

### **Panel on Planning, Lands and Works**

#### **West Kowloon Cultural District**

##### **Background brief**

#### **Purpose**

This paper sets out the background to the development of the West Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD) and views expressed by members of the Council on the development.

#### **WKCD site**

2. The proposed WKCD is a waterfront site of 40 hectares at the southern tip of the West Kowloon Reclamation (WKR). The WKR is one of the ten Airport Core Programme projects primarily aimed to provide land for a transport corridor to accommodate the West Kowloon Highway, Airport Railway and connection for the Western Harbour Crossing. The southern portion of WKR was originally zoned for a regional park (13.79 hectares), commercial (5.02 hectares) and residential (0.77 hectares) development as well as other open spaces (7.94 hectares) and government, institution and community (1.45 hectares) uses.

3. To serve the developments in the southern part of WKR, the Administration submitted a funding proposal for the construction of a complementary road network and associated drainage and sewerage works at an estimated cost of \$914 million. The funding proposal was approved by the Finance Committee on 16 October 1998.

#### **Development of a Performance Venue and Replanning of WKR**

4. In October 1998, the Chief Executive (CE) announced in his Policy Address the planning of a new state-of-the-art Performance Venue on WKR as

a catalyst to upgrade Hong Kong's image as an Asian entertainment capital. In February 1999, the Hong Kong Tourist Association published the Final Report of the Study on the Feasibility of a New Performance Venue for Hong Kong. The Study concluded that Hong Kong needs a new international performance venue to meet growing demand for such a facility, to support the development of arts and culture in Hong Kong, to promote event tourism as well as to promote Hong Kong as the event capital of Asia. The Study also identified a site of 5.5 hectares on WKR for the purpose of building a performance venue and suggested that the entire southern section of WKR should be developed into a new arts, culture and tourist district which would create a critical mass of activities around the new performance venue.

5. In his 1999 Policy Address, the CE undertook to create a new look for the Victoria Harbour such that the future waterfront promenade would provide arts, cultural and entertainment opportunities that would enrich the quality of life and attract tourists with the unique local culture. For this purpose, the CE also announced its plan to hold an open competition to enlist the help of local and overseas professionals. On 16 November 1999, the CE in Council ordered that the use of the southern portion of WKR should be fundamentally reviewed to facilitate the development of a world-class integrated arts, cultural and entertainment district.

6. On 18 November 1999, the Administration briefed the Panel on Planning, Lands and Works (PLW Panel) of its decision to review the land uses of the southern portion of WKR for the development of a world-class integrated arts, cultural and entertainment district. To facilitate the development, the Administration also decided to delete part of a then existing works contract on WKR that would be affected by the replanning of the area. The contract in question comprised mainly roads, footbridges and drainage works, with a contract sum of \$299 million. According to the Administration, the value of completed works which might become abortive was estimated to be about \$24 million. While PLW Panel members generally supported the replanning of WKR, some members criticized that since the contract in question commenced only in December 1998, if the Administration had made better planning and co-ordination, the financial loss arising from the abortive works would have been avoided.

7. On 13 December 1999, the Administration briefed the Panel on Home Affairs (HA Panel) on the development of a performance venue on WKR. Members expressed concerns that Government's cultural policy might be dictated by the infrastructure development and that the development on WKR might become a property development under the guise of an integrated arts, cultural and entertainment district.

## **WKR Concept Competition**

8. On 9 March 2000, the Administration briefed members of the PLW Panel on the details of the WKR Concept Competition. The Administration then stressed that there was no linkage between the Competition and the eventual development right of the area and that it would not be bound in any way to develop WKR in accordance with the winning design. In response to members, the Administration advised that there were divided views among the development industry and relevant professionals on whether the development right of WKR should be granted to one developer. Small developers objected to granting the development right of WKR to one developer and considered that the Administration should reserve the flexibility of disposing of the land of WKR in separate packages. Large developers, however, had not expressed strong view over the issue. The Administration then advised members that it had yet to decide how the development right of WKR would be disposed of.

9. In April 2001, the Administration launched the open Concept Competition to invite conceptual plans for the development of the southern tip of WKR into an integrated arts, cultural and entertainment district. The Concept Competition attracted a total of 161 entries from local and overseas participants. The result of the Competition was announced in February 2002. The first prize was awarded to the submission by a team led by Foster and Partners (Foster scheme).

10. In September 2002, the Administration set up a Steering Committee for Development of the West Kowloon Cultural District (Steering Committee), chaired by the Chief Secretary for Administration, to plan and guide the implementation of the West Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD) project.

11. In October 2002, the Administration announced the decision of the Steering Committee to adopt in principle the Foster scheme with some modifications as the conceptual basis for the masterplan for the WKCD.

12. In March 2003, the Administration announced its intention to invite development proposals for the WKCD from the private sector in mid-2003.

## **Invitation for Proposals**

13. On 5 September 2003, the Administration launched the Invitation for Proposals (IFP) for the development of the WKCD. The IFP invites, among other things, submission of a preliminary masterplan based on the development brief and supporting technical, financial and operation proposals, including the amount of land premium offered, if any, and a comprehensive business plan setting out a strategy for establishing the WKCD as a world class arts, cultural and entertainment attraction. The IFP also requires proponents to demonstrate

that they have sound financial backing, the ability to finance their proposed level of investment and a sustainable financing plan.

14. Under the IFP, proponents are required:

- (a) to provide the following core arts and cultural facilities:
  - Theatre Complex comprising three theatres with seating capacities of at least 2,000, 800 and 400 seats, respectively;
  - Performance Venue with a seating capacity of at least 10,000 seats;
  - Museum Cluster comprising four museums of differing themes with total Net Operating Floor Area of at least 75,000 square metres;
  - Art Exhibition Centre with Net Operating Floor Area of at least 10,000 square metres;
  - Water Amphitheatre; and
  - At least four Piazza Areas.
- (b) to provide the canopy proposed in the Foster scheme, covering at least 55% of the development area; and
- (c) to demolish and re-provision the Tsimshatsui Fire Station Complex.

It is stated in the IFP that the Government's baseline which is intended as a base reference for proponents in drawing up their proposals assumes a plot ratio of 1.81. Proponents may submit proposals deviating from the development parameters stipulated in the Government's baseline. The successful proponent will be required to plan, design, finance, construct, procure, fit out and complete the WKCD and subsequently operate, maintain and manage the core art and cultural facilities for a period of 30 years. A land grant of the site for a term of 50 years in favour of the successful proponent will be executed at such time as Government considers appropriate after the execution of the project agreement. It is expected that construction works will commence by April 2006 and the core arts and cultural facilities will operate in phases from 2010 onwards. The deadline for submission of proposals is noon, 19 March 2004.

## **Extension of deadline for submission of proposals for WKCD**

15. After the Administration launched the IFP for the development of the WKCD on 5 September 2003, LegCo continued to follow up the issue in various forums. Questions were raised at the Council meetings on 12 and 19 November 2003. The PLW Panel and the HA Panel held two joint meetings on 18 and 25 November 2003 to receive views from 18 deputations coming from the arts, cultural, building, property and estate sectors. A summary of views expressed by these deputations is in **Appendix I**. A motion was also passed at the Council meeting on 26 November 2003 urging the Government to, inter alia, comprehensively review the project, thoroughly consult the relevant sectors and the public, and uphold the principles put forward by the Culture and Heritage Commission in formulating the development plan. The wording of the motion is in **Appendix II**.

16. In view of the call by many deputations and LegCo Members that more time should be provided to proponents for preparing proposals, the Chief Secretary, in his response at the motion debate on 26 November 2003, announced the extension of the deadline for submission of proposals for three months, i.e. from 19 March 2004 to 19 June 2004.

## **Result of Invitation for Proposals**

17. The PLW Panel was briefed on the result of the IFP at its meeting on 14 July 2004. The Administration received five proposals in response to the IFP. The proponents who made submissions are: World City Culture Park Limited, Sunny Development Limited, Swire Properties Limited, Dynamic Star International Limited and LAM Sze-tat. The proposals would be assessed by a Proposals Evaluation Committee (PEC) chaired by the Permanent Secretary for Housing, Planning, and Lands (Planning and Lands) and assisted by a dedicated assessment team drawn from the relevant bureaux and departments of the Government. According to the Administration, only proposals that comply with the Mandatory Requirements will be assessed by the PEC.

## **Financing of the project and land issues**

18. One of the major controversies over the WKCD project is the financial arrangement. Unlike other public works projects listed under the Public Works Programme and funded by the Capital Works Reserve Fund, the WKCD will be run on a self-financing basis and will not involve public funding. The project covers 40 hectares of land. A land grant of the site for a term of 50 years in favour of the successful proponent will be executed at such time as the Government considers appropriate after the execution of the project agreement. Since no public funding is involved for the works within the WKCD area, there

is no need to seek funding approval from the Finance Committee of LegCo. Questions have therefore been raised on whether the Administration has circumvented the normal procedure of seeking approval for expenditure in public works, and whether the Administration has breached its usual accounting practice. In this respect, the PLW Panel requested the Legal Service Division of the LegCo Secretariat to provide its legal opinion on the questions at the meeting of the PLW Panel on 27 April 2004. According to the Legal Adviser, in view of the Administration's decision of not treating the development of the WKCD as a project within the public works programme and the Administration's advice that the project does not involve the charging of expenditure on the general revenue, there is no legal requirement that the Administration must follow the procedure for seeking approval for creating a charge on the general revenue for funding the project. However, in the light of Article 64 of the Basic Law, which provides that the Government shall be accountable to LegCo, the Government has the duty to satisfy LegCo that the current mode of development was not preferred to circumvent the approved procedure and to provide details on the technical issues relating to the Administration's accounting practice to the satisfaction of LegCo Members. The decision on whether to use public funds to finance the project is an executive decision. It would be legitimate for the LegCo to ask the Government to satisfactorily account for the decision that the proposed mode of financing is a sound policy decision.

19. Some members are gravely concerned about the proposed single package approach in the delivery of the WKCD project. Given the scale of the project, some members are of the view that the single package approach may result in restricting the choice of bidders, in particular the participation of small and medium-sized developers. Undesirable tender prices may be resulted and the Government may place itself in an unfavourable position in negotiating the details of the project. Some members consider that the project should be divided into separate tenders and part of the land could be put up for sale and the sale proceeds could then be used for developing cultural facilities.

20. According to the Administration, the conventional way of dividing the project into smaller packages and inviting tenders would require the Government to draw up its own master layout plan based on uncertain assumptions of what would be commercially viable in an integrated development. Conducting multiple tender exercises would present the Government with the extremely difficult task of drawing up multiple sets of complex interlocking land leases. The Administration considers that tendering out smaller packages with a view to using the land sale proceeds for developing the cultural facilities impractical and this would involve hypothecating the general revenue.

21. The majority of members of the PLW Panel are not satisfied with the proposed land and financial arrangements for the WKCD project. The Panel

passed a motion in this regard at the meeting on 27 April 2004. The wording of the motion is in **Appendix III**.

### **Planning control**

22. Since the entire site of WKCD was zoned "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Arts, Cultural, Commercial and Entertainment", some members have raised concern about the lack of planning control over the future development of the site. Apart from reiterating the intention to subject the WKCD to the statutory town planning control, the Administration undertakes that after a Provisional Agreement is signed with the successful proponent, it will submit the development parameters of the selected scheme, including the maximum gross floor area and plot ratio for domestic and non-domestic development, maximum building heights and open space requirements to the Town Planning Board for inclusion in the South West Kowloon Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). The amended OZP will be subject to the normal statutory process in accordance with the Town Planning Ordinance (TPO) (Cap. 131). Any future change to the approved OZP will have to follow the statutory requirements under the TPO.

### **Canopy**

23. According to the IFP, the proponents were required to include, in the formulation of the preliminary masterplan, a canopy as the signature design feature covering at least 55% of the development area to create a singular waterfront landmark. Members are concerned about the technical viability of the canopy and its cost-effectiveness given its high construction and maintenance cost. An oral question in this respect was raised at the Council meeting on 19 May 2004.

24. The Administration is of the view that there are no particular design problems with the canopy. Proponents are required to carry out technical studies to address special design consideration and maintenance plan for the canopy detailing the arrangements for the cleaning, maintenance and repair. The Administration has to see the proponents' proposals before knowing how much the canopy will cost and assess it in the overall financial scheme. At the present stage, the Administration does not believe that the technical or financial aspects of the canopy requirement will affect the viability of the project.

### **Public involvement**

25. Another major concern of members is lack of transparency and public involvement in the selection of the proposals. Members note that the

assessment panel will comprise senior civil servants only. The Administration is of the view that to avoid possible conflict of interest, which may invite legal challenges from unsuccessful proponents, participation of any individuals other than selected senior civil servants in the assessment panel will be undesirable. However, to enhance public involvement, the Administration undertakes that all proposals which have satisfied the mandatory requirements will be put up for exhibition. Exhibits prepared by the proponents showing details of the technical aspects of the proposals and the proposed arrangements regarding operation, maintenance and management of the arts and cultural facilities will be displayed. Public forums will also be held during the exhibition period to solicit view from the public on the proposals.

### **Other concerns**

26. Other concerns expressed by members concerning the WKCD project include the following aspects:

- (a) formulation of a comprehensive arts and cultural policy to complement the WKCD hardware facilities. The Administration should review the relationship between the WKCD and the overall cultural policy of Hong Kong. Reference should be made to the recommendations of the Policy Report by the Culture and Heritage Commission;
- (b) participation of the arts and cultural sector in the project. A tripartite relationship including the arts and cultural sector, the Government and the successful proponent for the WKCD should be established for working out the operation and management mode of the WKCD; and
- (c) the need to set up an independent authority to take charge of the WKCD project.

### **Latest development**

27. At the Council meeting on 10 November 2004, the Chief Secretary for Administration made a statement on WKCD and announced the results of stage one of the assessment process and the next steps. According to the screening result, the proposals from Swire Properties Limited and Mr LAM Sze-tat do not meet the basic requirements specified by the IFP. These proposals will not be considered further. The other three proposals that meet the basic requirements will be further assessed in accordance with the criteria. Public consultation on these three proposals is scheduled to commence in mid December 2004.

28. A chronology of events relating to the WKCD is in **Appendix IV**. A list of relevant papers with their hyperlinks at the LegCo Website is in **Appendix V**.

Council Business Division 1  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
29 November 2004

## Appendix I

### Joint Meeting of Panel on Planning, Lands and Works and Panel on Home Affairs

#### West Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD) Summary of concerns/views raised by various organizations (as at 25 November 2003)

Subject	Organization	Concerns／Views
(I) Canopy	The Association of Architectural Practices Ltd.	The preliminary design of the canopy cannot comply with the requirements under the Buildings Ordinance and the Fire Services Ordinance, etc. Yet the Government fails to respond positively to that problem and simply treats it as a part of the future design, hence feasibility of the design remains doubtful.
	The Hong Kong Institution of Engineers	No compelling need to build the 120 m high glass canopy. There are long term maintenance and replacement considerations similar to the problem of aging high rise buildings in Hong Kong. The capital cost of the canopy is high and so is the recurrent maintenance cost.
	Zuni Icosahedron Ltd.	Objects to Norman Forster's design. The nature of the relevant plan is an architectural design rather than development plan.
	Museum of Site	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Might contravene the Buildings Ordinance as well as other legislation.</li><li>• High costs of construction and maintenance.</li></ul>

Subject	Organization	Concerns／Views
(I) Canopy <i>(cont.)</i>	Museum of Site (cont.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The design of Foster &amp; Partners imposes limits on various scopes, including the construction and environmental planning, the interests of small developers, the planning strategies of diversified enterprise within the business sector and the foreseeable interests and long-term strategies of the cultural sector in the next 30 years. It also affects the objective assessments made prudently by bureau secretaries. The over-emphasis on Foster &amp; Partners' design is tantamount to putting the cart before the horse!</li> <li>• However, it will also give rise to problems if the Government hastily abandon Foster &amp; Partners' design. It should invite representatives from Foster &amp; Partners to explain the case.</li> </ul>
	Urban Watch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The first prize winning design of the canopy has won both praise and criticism. Its functions, characters, energy-saving ability and whether or not it can serve as a symbol for Hong Kong have to be further explored.</li> <li>• Hence, the decision on the canopy should be made after open discussion, instead of made by a few key officials.</li> </ul>
(II) Single Arrangement Package	Government Cultural Services Grades' Alliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No objection in principle to awarding the project by way of a single package arrangement.</li> <li>• A coordinated development plan, a well-adjusted completion schedule for different facilities, as well as an agent to manage the development of various facilities in a holistic way should be put in place.</li> </ul>
	Hong Kong Institute of Real Estate Administration	It would be unfair, unjust and unacceptable to the community at large should the development right of the West Kowloon reclamation area be granted to one developer.
	The Hong Kong Institution of Engineers	No sufficient justifications for awarding the development right to a single developer.

Subject	Organization	Concerns／Views
<b>(II) Single Arrangement (cont.)</b>	<b>Package</b> The Association of Architectural Practices Ltd.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The design of a “continuous and connecting” canopy does not equal to an “indivisible” one, it is not a necessity for the canopy to be constructed by a single consortium.</li> <li>• The West Kowloon project has right from the onset emphasized on the appearance and consistency in design but overlooked the detailed features. Specific arrangements will be discussed only after the developer has been selected. The Government will then negotiate with the single selected developer on behalf of the public. The whole process is done the wrong way round.</li> <li>• The threshold is too high and unfair to the small and medium sized developers. This will indirectly create the chance for monopoly.</li> <li>• As there are not many negotiation targets around, the result of the negotiation is very likely be “biased towards one side” and the ultimate interests of the community cannot be sufficiently protected.</li> <li>• The complexity involved in the single package arrangement might result in the adoption of foreign design and consultancy at the expense of the job opportunities of the local professional service sectors.</li> </ul>

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Concerns／Views</b>
<b>(II) Single Arrangement (cont.)</b>	Hong Kong Institute of Architects	Technically it is entirely feasible and appropriate to implement Forster's Sky-canopy and conceptual design phase by phase. The relevant Development Board should handle technical coordination with reference to a set of established Control Drawings.
	The Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The single package arrangement might give rise to a number of problems, such as favouritism to a large developer, the need for proper risks sharing, the need to cope with the changes that are bound to arise over the project life span, and the likelihood of Government being constrained by post-contract changes.</li> <li>• From both contractual and technical points of view, the Development can be, and should be, broken down into a series of packages without necessarily compromising its integrated design and operation.</li> </ul>
	Hong Kong Institute of Planners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Government should explain how they could minimize and address envisaged problems of a single package approach.</li> <li>• The Government should also explain what other implementation approaches have been examined and why they were considered not feasible.</li> </ul>
	The Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The WKCD is a real estate development project.</li> <li>• The single package approach is disruptive to the operation principle of free market and participation will be limited to a few capable proponents.</li> </ul>

Subject	Organization	Concerns／Views
<b>(II) Single Package Arrangement (cont.)</b>	Project Hong Kong	Regarding the controversial issue of “whether the operation, maintenance and management should be awarded to a single developer”, the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administration Region should not merely consider “which approach is the most convenient way to operate, maintain and manage” but also the issue of “which approach is the best for facilitating and improving the cultural development in Hong Kong”.
	Urban Watch	Will such a large-scale development led by a single developer with full control of its design lead to a monopoly on the products concerned? How can the quality and completion time of the cultural items be ensured if such items just serve as frills and bear a monotonous appearance?
<b>(III) Invitation for Proposals (IPF)</b>	Zuni Icosahedron Ltd.	The ambiguity in the contents of IFP is disadvantageous to the proponents
	The Association of Architectural Practices Ltd.	Many details in the IFP are yet to be discussed with the successful proponent. Other information such as the development schedule, design details, technical feasibility studies, operation and management details, and so on, remains unknown and thus poses enormous risks to both the Government and the developer.
	Hong Kong Institute of Architects	The plot ratio and time frame for each phase of the project should be capped appropriately. The public should be consulted on all layout plans, design details and their effects on urban design and view aspects. They should afterwards be reviewed and approved by the Town Planning Board (TPB). All financial and operational arrangements should be reviewed and approved by the Legislative Council.

Subject	Organization	Concerns／Views
<b>(III) Invitation for Proposals (cont.)</b>	The Hong Kong Institution of Engineers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The emphasis of the IFP is not arts and culture property development proposal with 500 000 sq.m. of commercial residential floor area but with no upper limit. The development intensity is likely to be higher and planning merits overlooked. Such situation seems unsatisfactory.</li> <li>• The proposal specifies some 200 000 sq.m. of arts and cultural facilities. The successful bidder is a developer and is likely to put its emphasis into the hardware of performing arts. The IFP only specifies sketchy requirements of a culture management plan. An arts and cultural district requires much more than grandeur buildings to be successful in promoting local cultural developments.</li> </ul>
	The Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although the Government appears to benefit from transferring risks to the project proponent, it does not change the simple fact that taxpayers will eventually pick up the bill. The procurement strategies must therefore be devised with caution.</li> <li>• The proposed procedural land grant is undesirable. Too much risk seems to be placed on the proponent who will commit a huge investment based on very loose terms. In the case of a dispute, the Government will not be in a strong bargaining position.</li> <li>• For allocation of undivided shares for the core cultural and arts facilities, the ownership right is unsatisfactory. Allocation of maintenance responsibility will be complex because of the different standards and services involved.</li> </ul>

Subject	Organization	Concerns／Views
<b>(III) Invitation for Proposals (cont.)</b>	Museum of Site	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The IFP guidelines are completed in an acute lack of research data.</li> <li>• The IFP guidelines have also failed to provide the necessary information or lead the developer to study soft information in great depth for strategic assessment purposes.</li> <li>• The ratio of commercial development to cultural facilities should be 7:3, and no relaxation should be allowed.</li> </ul>
	Project Hong Kong	<p>The Government should review afresh the project contents and requirements set out in the IFP, especially the requirements and requests of the innovative cultural sector, so as to ensure that the items of the project will facilitate local cultural development and provide supporting facilities for sustainable development such as human resources training, education, trial, study and development, etc.</p>
<b>(IV) Assessment Criteria and Selection Process</b>	Project Hong Kong	<p>Enhance the transparency of the tender process and publicize relevant assessment criteria, especially the need to put in place a system to ensure that the innovative cultural sector is provided with the right to participate and the right to speak.</p>
	The Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors	<p>The proponents' submissions must be structured to permit evaluation against clear and distinct criteria.</p>
	Hong Kong Institute of Planners	<p>The credibility of the selection panel and openness of the selection process are critical to establishing the legitimacy of the selected scheme. At some point before the selection of the winning bids, the views of the public and the TPB should be gauged on the submitted proposals.</p>
	The Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong	<p>Selection process and standards are both unclear.</p>

Subject	Organization	Concerns／Views
(V) Deadline for Submission of Proposals	Zuni Icosahedron Ltd.	The six-month period is insufficient.
	Project Hong Kong	If the subject requires more time to nurture a consensus in the community, the Government should consider deferring the tender closing date.
(VI) Relationship between the WKCD Development and the Arts and Cultural Policy	Hong Kong Institute of Planners Museum of Site	To work out a comprehensive cultural policy that is accepted to all.
	Government Cultural Services Grades' Alliance	The operator can fit into the Government's policy on long term cultural development.
	Hong Kong Institute of Archaeology	<p>The Government should explain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• what is Hong Kong's cultural policy?</li> <li>• what is Hong Kong's long term position on culture?</li> <li>• what is the current situation of the arts and culture in Hong Kong?</li> <li>• what is the public's demand for culture and arts?</li> <li>• what is the concept of the West Kowloon project?</li> </ul>

Subject	Organization	Concerns／Views
<b>(VI) Relationship between the WKCD Development and the Arts and Cultural Policy (cont.)</b>	Project Hong Kong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Administration should seriously review the relationship between the WKCD and the overall cultural policy of Hong Kong, sufficiently display its commitment towards the West Kowloon project and that it will not easily give up or shift its responsibility to the operators.</li> <li>• Consideration should be given to the three points raised in the Policy Report by the Culture and Heritage Commission (The Commission), namely the “Integration of facilities within the district”, “Complementarity with other cultural facilities” and “Respecting cultural software”, and attention should be paid to cross-district as well as cross-sector coordination.</li> <li>• The planning and development of West Kowloon should be considered from the perspective of “cultural logic”.</li> </ul>
	Hong Kong Christian Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should refer to the Commission’s recommendations and work out a comprehensive cultural policy that is accepted by all. Such a policy should then be complemented rather than led by hardware.</li> <li>• The Government should expeditiously work out a comprehensive cultural policy that is accepted to all.</li> <li>• The WKCD should be operating under the “non-profit making” principle, instead of running entirely on a commercial basis.</li> <li>• The WKCD should be operated jointly by the Government, the business sector and the community.</li> <li>• Nurturing should start from early childhood.</li> <li>• The “sustainable” perspectives should be adopted.</li> </ul>

Subject	Organization	Concerns／Views
<b>(VI) Relationship between the WKCD Development and the Arts and Cultural Policy (cont.)</b>	Zuni Icosahedron Ltd.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To work out a comprehensive cultural policy that is acceptable to all.</li> <li>• What is needed most is human resources development, hence education should be the theme of the West Kowloon Project.</li> </ul>
	Hong Kong Arts Centre	<p>The Government should explain the relationship between the WKCD and the existing arts and cultural framework, including the future development and roles of both the Leisure and Cultural Services Department and the Arts Development Council.</p>
<b>(VII) Public Consultation</b>	Hong Kong Christian Service	<p>Members of the public should be allowed to participate in the discussions relating to the WKCD.</p>
	Zuni Icosahedron Ltd.	<p>The public consultation exercises should be conducted in the form of in-depth group discussions.</p>
	Project Hong Kong	<p>The operation system should offer full protection for the participation right of creative industries, with a view to forming a tripartite partnership comprising the creative industries, the SAR Government and developers.</p>
	Hong Kong Institute of Real Estate Administration	<p>The Administration should invite the public and representatives from professional bodies to join the various advisory committees.</p>
	The Association of Architectural Practices Ltd	<p>The community should be extensively consulted on the parts relating to the arts to solicit opinions from different sectors. Professional and relevant organizations should be allowed to participate in the discussion and evaluation process, as well as formulating the finalized development details before working on the outlook details.</p>
	Hong Kong Institute of Architects	<p>Relevant public exhibitions and discussions should be conducted before finalizing any major development plans.</p>

Subject	Organization	Concerns／Views
<b>(VII) Public Consultation</b> <i>(cont.)</i>	Hong Kong Institute of Planners	<p>The Government has failed to consult the public or the relevant professional bodies when drafting the present IFP.</p> <p>The Government should maintain dialogue with the public, professional institutes and the arts/cultural community on the project and the Government should make decisions based on a more inclusive and transparent process.</p> <p>At this stage, the Government needs to clarify to the public on such issues as the rationale behind changes made to the original winning scheme, the selection criteria, and the proposed implementation/development method.</p>
	The Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong	<p>The public should be consulted extensively.</p>
	Museum of Site	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Neither the Leisure and Cultural Services Department nor the Hong Kong Arts Development Council (HKADC) had conducted any consultation exercises in relation to individual items (such as the types of museums Hong Kong needs) before the Government published the IFP. While the approval criteria and the construction details of the relevant museums are listed in detail in the IFP, the HKADC has never systematically consulted our some 100 arts consultants on the “West Kowloon” project, nor has the Home Affairs Bureau consulted thoroughly the Sham Shui Po and Yau Tsim Mong District Councils on the “West Kowloon” project.</li> <li>• In brief, no formal extensive consultation with the cultural sector has been conducted on the directions and abstract figures regarding the cultural facilities proposed in the IFP.</li> </ul>

Subject	Organization	Concerns／Views
<b>(VIII) Development control and future management of the West Kowloon Cultural District</b>	Hong Kong Arts Centre	To establish a WKCD Steering Committee with participation of representatives from the arts sector, with a view to overseeing the operation of the WKCD in the long run.
	Hong Kong Christian Service	To establish a “WKCD Development Board” comprising representatives from the Government, business circle, the cultural and arts sectors, as well as members of the public. The Board will take care of the arts and cultural development in future.
	Hong Kong Institute of Architects	To establish a “WKCD Development Board”, the members of which will include representatives from the cultural and arts sectors, Legislative Council, professional groups, regional districts, real estate industry and the Government.; as well as to coordinate the development by phases according to an Overall Master Layout Plan and conduct consultation exercises.
	The Hong Kong Institution of Engineers	An IFP issued in respect of the property development and a separate IFP issued in respect of the cultural district funded by the Government (with proceeds from the 700 000sq. m. gross floor area land sale) will relieve the artists from any financial and management entanglement with the developer concerned.

Subject	Organization	Concerns／Views
<b>(VIII) Development control and future management of the West Kowloon Cultural District</b> <i>(cont.)</i>	Hong Kong Institute of Planners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Government needs to explain how it intends to maintain planning and development control throughout the whole development time frame of the project which has a leasehold term of 50 years.</li> <li>• Once the Government has selected a winning scheme, the key development parameters and/or the master development plan should be incorporated into the Outline Zoning Plan. Future changes to the scheme could then be monitored and controlled through the established statutory planning procedures to allow public scrutiny.</li> <li>• A management board should be set up to oversee the Cultural District from its design/development and operation throughout the entire leasehold period. The board should comprise members who are representative of a wide range of interests, from the development sector, the arts community to individuals from both the public and private sectors.</li> </ul>
	Museum of Site	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The future Arts Development Council or Culture and Art Foundation should set up an “Advisory Committee on the Cultural District” to act and operate as a bridge among different sectors.</li> <li>• Cultural facilities should be operated under a “Managing Board System”, which enlists the participation of representatives from the cultural sector, and in the form of some relevant funds.</li> <li>• To establish a comprehensive supplementary system of public and private funds to monitor the operation of the cultural facilities in the cultural district in the long run.</li> </ul>

Subject	Organization	Concerns／Views
<b>(IX) Financial and operational arrangements</b>	Government Cultural Services Grades' Alliance	Huge amount of funding injection or participation of international organizations alone is not sufficient to ensure good management and operation of the cultural district.
	Hong Kong Arts Centre	Different facilities should be operated by different arts bodies as far as possible.
	The Association of Architectural Practices Ltd	May make use of the sale proceeds from the property development part of the project to cover the costs of cultural and arts development.
	The Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By asking the proponent to deliver these core facilities upfront, the Government will have a better control over the quality of the whole Development, but the problem is that the initial capital outlay will be substantially increased as a result.</li> <li>• Suggests the Government adopt a more flexible approach of allowing “progressive financing” of those less profitable facilities by the more profitable facilities, thereby minimizing the risk exposure of the project proponent.</li> </ul>
	Hong Kong Institute of Architects	Financial and operational arrangements must be approved by the Legislative Council.
	The Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Instead of seeking to subsidize the project with proceeds from land sales, the relevant funding proposals should be submitted to the Legislative Council for approval in accordance with the normal practice.</li> <li>• The core infrastructure should be provided by the Government through a genuine public-private partnership. The rest of the district can be put up for sale in the market by way of auction or through the tendering system.</li> </ul>

Subject	Organization	Concerns／Views
<b>(X) Facilities</b>	Government Cultural Services Grades' Alliance	Agrees that more sophisticated venues for cultural and arts events as well as museums of differing themes should be provided in Hong Kong.
	Hong Kong Curators Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Museums should be of differing themes and overlap of themes should be avoided.</li> <li>• Careful consideration should be given as to whether the sources and items of collection can really support the establishment of a new museum.</li> <li>• Museums should not be operated on commercial principles. Instead, the developer should provide a certain percentage of the proceeds from other development items in West Kowloon for the Government to allocate for the operating costs of the cluster of museums.</li> </ul>
	Zuni Icosahedron Ltd	The site cannot cope with the trend of sociocultural development.
	Museum of Site	What are the study basis and justifications for the proposal of four museums and three performance venues?
	Government Cultural Services Grades' Alliance	Will there be enough experts in recreational and cultural venue management to take care of so many new facilities?
	Hong Kong Curators Association	Should start training sufficient professional museum staff to take up the relevant responsibilities.
	Hong Kong Arts Centre Hong Kong Arts Development Council	An Academy of Visual Arts should be established.

Subject	Organization	Concerns／Views
<b>(X) Facilities</b> <i>(cont.)</i>	Hong Kong Arts Development Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In addition, suggest provision of:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➢ concert hall for staging world-class orchestral performances</li> <li>➢ small scale venue for chamber music performances</li> <li>➢ book city</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Should redevelop the famous historical buildings in Hong Kong.</li> </ul>
<b>(XI) Others</b>	Hong Kong Christian Service	Should enable the peripheral regions of WKCD to transform and develop in a direction more related to culture and arts.
	Hong Kong Institute of Planners	The Institute notes that the automatic people mover system is not a mandatory requirement. However, easy access to the site will help to ensure the success of the scheme. Moreover, the Government should take this opportunity to link up the site with other cultural and entertainment nodes in Tsim Sha Tsui.
	Zuni Icosahedron Ltd	International networks, as well as Chinese perspectives and networks should be established.

Subject	Organization	Concerns／Views
<b>(XI) Others (cont.)</b>	The Hong Kong Construction Association Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Priority employment opportunity should be given to the local construction industry.</li><li>• Should give due regard to the recommendations of the Construct for Excellence Report of the Construction Industry Review Committee.</li><li>• Other recommendations:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➢ The principal contractors of this project should be registered contractors in Hong Kong</li><li>➢ The subcontractors of the project should register with the Voluntary Subcontractor Registration Scheme</li><li>➢ The workers in this project should possess the trade testing certificate or other relevant certificates issued by the Construction Industry Training Authority</li><li>➢ The developer(s) should include a “pay-for-safety” scheme in the construction contracts, which should demand the principal contractors and their subcontractors to implement a safety management system</li></ul></li></ul>

**Submissions from various organizations**

<b>Organizations</b>	<b>File Number</b>
Government Cultural Services Grades' Alliance (GCSGA)	LC Paper No. CB(1) 329/03-04(01)
Hong Kong Arts Centre (HKAC)	LC Paper No. CB(1) 345/03-04(01)
Hong Kong Arts Development Council (HKADC)	LC Paper No. CB(1) 378/03-04
Hong Kong Christian Service (HKCS)	LC Paper No. CB(1) 345/03-04(02)
Hong Kong Curators Association (HKCA)	LC Paper No. CB(1) 329/03-04(02)
Hong Kong Institute of Archaeology	LC Paper No. CB(1) 345/03-04(03)
Zuni Icosahedron Ltd	LC Paper No. CB(1) 359/03-04(04)
Project Hong Kong	LC Paper No. CB(1) 359/03-04(01)
Hong Kong Institute of Real Estate Administration (HKIREA)	LC Paper No. CB(1) 322/03-04(01)
The Association of Architectural Practices Ltd (AAP)	LC Paper No. CB(1) 322/03-04(02)
Hong Kong Institute of Architects (HKIA)	LC Paper No. CB(1) 322/03-04(03)
The Hong Kong Institution of Engineers (HKIE)	LC Paper No. CB(1) 329/03-04(03)
Hong Kong Institute of Planners (HKIP)	LC Paper No. CB(1) 322/03-04(04)
The Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors (HKIS)	LC Paper No. CB(1) 345/03-04(04)
The Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong (REDAHK)	LC Paper No. CB(1) 359/03-04(05)
The Hong Kong Construction Association Ltd (HKCA Ltd)	LC Paper No. CB(1) 322/03-04(05)
Museum of Site	LC Paper No. CB(1) 359/03-04(03)
Urban Watch	LC Paper No. CB(1) 410/03-04(01)

## **Appendix II**

### **Motion on "West Kowloon Cultural District development project" passed at the Legislative Council meeting on 26 November 2003**

(Translation)

"That this Council urges the Government to comprehensively review the West Kowloon Cultural District development project, consider the 'software' contents before planning the cultural facilities, extend the deadline for submission of development proposals, openly and thoroughly consult the cultural sector, professional bodies, the real estate sector, the Legislative Council, the public and relevant organizations, and uphold the 'people-oriented', 'partnership' and 'community-driven' principles put forward by the Culture and Heritage Commission for the West Kowloon development in formulating a development and operation plan that is open, fair and proper; and in the process of development, the Government should also facilitate a partnership between developers and the cultural sector, so as to allow the latter to participate in the planning and future operation of the facilities in the district."

Council Business Division 1  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
29 November 2004

## Appendix II

### Panel on Planning, Lands and Works

#### West Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD)

#### Summary of concerns/views raised by various organizations (as at 3 February 2005)

Subject	Organization	Concerns／Views
<b>1. Interface with arts and cultural development</b>		
1.1 Formulation of Hong Kong's long-term and sustainable arts and cultural policies with the WKCD hardware facilities supporting the development of such policies	<i>Hong Kong Institute of Archaeology</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Cultural development should not be commercialized. Instead, the Government should formulate a clear cultural policy as the backbone of WKCD development taking into account the principles of "people-oriented" and "community driven" as highlighted in the "Culture and Heritage Commission Policy Recommendation Report" (the Report).</li></ul>
	<i>The People's Panel on West Kowloon</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● The present WKCD project is all about hardware in arts and cultural development. Without the Government having a clear vision and master plan on the future development of arts and culture in Hong Kong and the complimentary software, the effectiveness of the WKCD project <i>per se</i> in enhancing the cultural quality of the people of Hong Kong is doubtful.</li></ul>
	<i>Project Hong Kong</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● High quality cultural facilities should be built not just in the West Kowloon area but all over Hong Kong.</li></ul>

Subject	Organization	Concerns／Views
	<i>The International Association of Arts Critics (Hong Kong Chapter)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Government's present approach is reckless, irresponsible and does not follow the principles of "people-oriented" and "community driven" as highlighted in the Report.</li> <li>● The Government has failed to demonstrate to the public the relationship between the facilities to be provided in the WKCD and Hong Kong's long-term arts and cultural development.</li> </ul>
	<i>Cattle Depot Artist Village Committee</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The planning approach is wrong right from the beginning. The Government should formulate a master layout plan and then organize open design competitions for each component so that each component could become an icon by its own right.</li> </ul>
	<i>Hong Kong Chinese Orchestra</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Government should formulate a long-term arts and cultural policy with suitable funding arrangements made to support the development of flagship performing groups.</li> <li>● Hong Kong needs the WKCD to maintain its position as an international world city.</li> <li>● The requirement of having resident companies could help the development of flagship performing groups in Hong Kong as well as nurture local talents.</li> </ul>
	<i>The Hong Kong Academy for Performing Arts</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The first priority of the WKCD project should be to develop further arts and cultural engagement among Hong Kong residents. It is key to development of the creative industries.</li> </ul>

Subject	Organization	Concerns／Views
	<i>Hong Kong Repertory Theatre</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Theatre supports the whole concept of the WKCD development, in particular the requirement of having resident companies. This could help the development of flagship performing groups in Hong Kong.</li> <li>● The Government has the responsibility of investing in arts and cultural development. The future of Hong Kong's arts and cultural development would hinge on the Government's policy direction.</li> <li>● The Government should formulate a long-term arts and cultural policy with suitable funding arrangements made to support the development of flagship performing groups.</li> </ul>
	<i>Hong Kong Ballet</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Arts and cultural hardware and software should be developed simultaneously. The hardware should be able to spearhead and encourage the development of software as it will attract the best foreign and local cultural events and talents.</li> </ul>
	<i>Hong Kong Dance Company</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Company supports the WKCD development as it could provide more high-quality performing venues in Hong Kong. In the past, the development of performing groups has been seriously constrained by the lack of hardware facilities.</li> <li>● The Government should maintain its funding support for local arts and cultural development.</li> <li>● The Government should formulate a long-term arts and cultural policy with clear mission statement, mode of governance and funding arrangements for the WKCD as well as its relationship with the sustainable development of flagship performing groups in Hong Kong.</li> </ul>

Subject	Organization	Concerns／Views
	<i>The Ink Society</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Society supports the early implementation of the project as the WKCD represents a golden opportunity to enhance the arts and cultural development in Hong Kong.</li> <li>● With WKCD, Hong Kong can develop into a major arts market in the world.</li> </ul>
	<i>Jing Kun Theatre Ltd.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The WKCD development will contribute much to Hong Kong's future arts and culture development including the improvement of the cultural quality of the people, the nurturing of local talents, the cultivation of local interest in Chinese arts and culture, etc. This is a new exciting initiative from the Government.</li> </ul>
	<i>Fringe Club</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The WKCD project has a positive impact on Hong Kong's future arts and cultural development.</li> </ul>
	<i>Association of Engineering Professionals in Society</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Association welcomes the WKCD project as it would benefit the community as a whole and help promote Hong Kong's status as a cultural hub in the Asia Pacific region.</li> </ul>
1.2 Selection of arts and cultural facilities to be provided in the WKCD taking into account the future demand for and utilization of such facilities	<i>Hong Kong Curators Association</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The themes of the four proposed museums are quite similar and not diversified enough to sustain the interest of the visiting public. Moreover, the themes of the "modern art museum" and "water ink museum" might duplicate those of some existing museums.</li> <li>● There should be a key list of collection items to be handed over to the Government after the 30-year operation period.</li> </ul>

Subject	Organization	Concerns／Views
	<i>Zuni Icosahedron</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The relevant requirements in the Invitation for Proposals (IFP) are not well-thought out and do not have any professional input that are well-versed with Hong Kong's environment and cultural needs. The Government has not provided any justifications for the proposed arts and cultural facilities stated in the IFP both in terms of quantity and nature.</li> </ul>
	<i>Hong Kong Arts Centre</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Government should consider providing a visual art academy in the WKCD to reflect the importance of the creative industries.</li> </ul>
	<i>The Hong Kong Academy for Performing Arts</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The need for the mandatory performing venues has already been clearly established by consultancies into the utilization of existing venues.</li> </ul>
	<i>Hong Kong Chinese Orchestra</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Arts and cultural facilities of world-class standards should be provided in the WKCD.</li> </ul>
	<i>Spring-Time Group Ltd.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Group supports the WKCD development as Hong Kong is in an acute need of performing venues. The provision of arts and cultural facilities could provide much needed space for cultivating local talents and the viable operation of performing groups. It could help directly in promoting arts and cultural development in Hong Kong.</li> </ul>

Subject	Organization	Concerns／Views
	<i>Hong Kong Arts Administrators' Association</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The need for the mandatory performing venues has already been clearly established by consultancies into the utilization of existing venues.</li> <li>● Other non-core facilities such as arts educational facilities, permanent homes for the professional performing companies and affordable studio/exhibition space for local artists can also be easily justified on the basis of present needs.</li> <li>● The themes of the proposed museums are chosen because of previously expressed community expectations or based on popular culture. They should have no problem in attracting visitors.</li> </ul>
	<i>Fringe Club</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The WKCD project could provide much needed cultural and recreational facilities in Hong Kong. This could help spur the development of creative industries.</li> </ul>
	<i>Cattle Depot Artist Village Committee</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Two of the screened-in proposals do not measure up to the proposed museums required under the IFP. The Government should provide justifications as to why they were screened-in.</li> </ul>
1.3 Relationship between WKCD and the existing arts and cultural framework such as the Leisure and Cultural Services Department and the Arts Development Council	<i>Hong Kong Arts Centre</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Government should clarify future relationship between WKCD and the Leisure and Cultural Services Department and Arts Development Council to avoid overlapping of resources and unhealthy competition.</li> </ul>

Subject	Organization	Concerns／Views
	<i>Hong Kong Repertory Theatre</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Government should clearly specify its monitoring responsibilities and powers in respect of the operation and management of the WKCD.</li> <li>● The Government should adopt a clear stance in promoting the development of a partnership relationship between the successful proponent and local performing groups.</li> </ul>
<b>2. Land use and planning</b>		
2.1 Planning process of the WKCD development	<i>The People's Panel on West Kowloon</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Government should abort the existing approach of “selecting one out of three” and revisit the planning and development of the WKCD project in full consultation with the public.</li> </ul>
	<i>Hong Kong People's Council for Sustainable Development</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Government should abort the existing approach of “selecting one out of three” and revisit various aspects in the planning and development of WKCD in full consultation with the public.</li> </ul>
	<i>Project Hong Kong</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Government should abort the existing approach of “selecting one out of three” and revisit the whole WKCD project with full public participation.</li> </ul>

Subject	Organization	Concerns／Views
	<i>The Hong Kong Institute of Architects</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● An incremental approach as follows is suggested as the basis for the planning and phased-stage development process for public discussion. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— Establish the provisional WKCD development board;</li> <li>— Engage further public consultation on core issues;</li> <li>— Compile the planning brief;</li> <li>— Organize a tender for development including design competition and compile the master development proposal; and</li> <li>— Delineate strict development conditions and invite tender in phases.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
	<i>Hong Kong Ballet</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Hong Kong should capitalize on the resources that have already been put into the WKCD project by a whole host of world-class designers/architects/planners/developers, and put all the good elements into a great master plan.</li> </ul>
	<i>West Kowloon Cultural District Joint Conference</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Government has not yet organized a comprehensive debate on the form of city planning over the 40 ha of land in the form of a public forum. City planning is a phasing development plan which should be implemented on a process of public consultation and a “trial &amp; error” evaluation process.</li> </ul>
2.2 Formulation of key development parameters and/or master development plan	<i>Hong Kong Institute of Real Estate Administration</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Under a comprehensive Master Development Plan, development of the whole project could be carried out in phases without compromising the integrated design and operation of WKCD while reducing the risks associated with property market fluctuations.</li> </ul>

Subject	Organization	Concerns／Views
	<i>The Hong Kong Institute of Architects</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Government should invite the public to participate in and come to a consensus view on the formulation of a master planning blueprint for WKCD development. The blueprint should clearly specify the number and different kinds of cultural facilities as well as the development density of the WKCD so that the required land grant and actual construction work could take place in phases without compromising the integrity of the whole development</li> </ul>
	<i>Hong Kong Ballet</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● A major master plan, a major funding body and a major operating organization are needed in order to build a full-scale, world-class cultural infrastructure. This could not be executed in a piecemeal fashion. This is something that has to be worked out among the Government, the private sector and all cultural elements.</li> </ul>
	<i>The Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Government should draw up a master layout plan for the whole WKCD development site together with a revised scheme for arts and cultural facilities and services by “mix and match approach” based on previously submitted proposals. The revised scheme should be subject to a further round of public consultation. Once a publicly accepted scheme is finalized, this will then form a common basis for a second round of tender, involving the screened-in proponents and more proponents around the world.</li> </ul>
	<i>West Kowloon Cultural District Joint Conference</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Joint Conference strongly requests the Government to safeguard the interest of the public by developing the master plan of WKCD development into stages, with different periods of development, involvement and international competition.</li> </ul>

Subject	Organization	Concerns/VIEWS
2.3 Development mix of commercial components vs. arts and cultural components	<i>Hong Kong Christian Service</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Residential development in WKCD should not only be limited to luxury properties, public housing for the grassroots should also be built.</li> </ul>
	<i>The Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Bundling facilities of such a mammoth scale with property development could easily disrupt the operation of a free market.</li> <li>● With 490 000 square metres (<math>m^2</math>) intended for commercial and residential uses versus 230 000 <math>m^2</math> for cultural facilities, WKCD was without a shred of doubt a real estate development despite the Government's claim otherwise.</li> </ul>
	<i>The Hong Kong Institute of Architects</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● It would be very difficult to assess the merits of the three screened-in proposals without a fixed plot ratio.</li> </ul>
	<i>Association of Engineering Professionals in Society</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Association supports the principle of having property development subsidizing arts and cultural development. But the scope of property development should not be more than that of the arts and cultural components.</li> </ul>
	<i>The Hong Kong Institution of Engineers</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● A well balance between the cultural development and the property development should be maintained in line with the development intensity of the public consultations on "Hong Kong 2030: Planning Vision and Strategy".</li> <li>● The plot ratio set by the Government is only an indication. The plot ratio is likely to be reduced from what has been proposed and consequential reduction in financial offer from the successful proponent can be controversial and the current mechanism for assessment is not clear on this decisive issue.</li> </ul>

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Concerns／Views</b>
2.4 Development control throughout the development timeframe of the project which has a leasehold term of 50 years	<i>Hong Kong Institute of Real Estate Administration</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Irrespective of the mode of development, a transparent monitoring system with performance indicators should be established and agreed with the successful developer(s) before signing the relevant contract</li> </ul>
	<i>The Democratic Party</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The land use of the WKCD should change from “Other Specified Uses” to “Comprehensive Development Area” so that it would be subject to control by the Town Planning Board and the public.</li> </ul>
<b>3. Environmental considerations</b>		
3.1 Sustainable development of the WKCD project	<i>Hong Kong Christian Service</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● WKCD should be developed as a cultural point for all the people. The Government should plan for the WKCD development along the same principle of equality taking into account gender mainstreaming, age mainstreaming, racial mainstreaming, as well as the special needs of the mentally and physically handicapped people. Moreover, high culture as well as popular culture should be given the same emphasis. The facilities should be designed as barrier-free and cater for the needs of different age groups, races and genders.</li> </ul>
	<i>Association of Engineering Professionals in Society</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The design of the canopy should be subject to stringent sustainability assessment.</li> </ul>
<b>4. Financing implications and arrangements</b>		

Subject	Organization	Concerns／Views
4.1 Single-package development vs. Multiple-package development	<i>Hong Kong Institute of Real Estate Administration</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Single-package development is not the only solution and the Government should not preclude other options at this stage.</li> <li>● The difficulties cited by the Government in relation to the preparation of complicated but interlocking land grant documents under the multi-package arrangement could be overcome if new dimensions of legal framework for land administration were adopted, i.e. the definition of “land” should no longer be 2-dimensional. Using a 3-dimensional land administration approach, multiple ownership and multiple land grants including rights and obligations of individuals could still be effectively administered and operated.</li> </ul>
	<i>Project Hong Kong</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Government should review whether the single-package development was the best option to make the most out of this valuable piece of seafront land in Hong Kong for the public.</li> </ul>
	<i>Hong Kong Curators Association</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Development options other than the single-package development approach are also viable and should be given due consideration.</li> </ul>
	<i>The Hong Kong Institute of Architects</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● While the Institute is supportive of the idea of WKCD development, it is opposed to the Government’s single-package development approach, and calls on the Government to abort the existing process of “selecting one out of three”.</li> <li>● The development of WKCD in phases is feasible and indeed preferable. As the successful proponent has to assume substantially higher risks for the whole development under the single-development approach, this could directly weaken the Government’s bargaining position.</li> </ul>

Subject	Organization	Concerns／Views
	<i>The Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The single package approach renders a small number of proponents qualified for the development and will unlikely yield the highest return to public coffers.</li> <li>● The supporting infrastructure should be provided by the Government through a genuine public-private-partnership. The rest of the district can be parcelled up for sale through the Land Application List system. Proceeds from land sales can then put into a trust fund to finance the construction and ongoing operation of the arts and culture facilities.</li> </ul>
	<i>The Democratic Party</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● While supportive of arts and cultural development, it is opposed to the single-package development approach.</li> </ul>
	<i>The International Association of Arts Critics (Hong Kong Chapter)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● While supportive of the concept of WKCD development, it is opposed to the single-package development approach.</li> </ul>
	<i>Association of Engineering Professionals in Society</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Association has reservation about the single-package development approach as it will preclude the participation of small and medium-sized companies in the construction industry.</li> </ul>

Subject	Organization	Concerns／Views
	<i>The Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● The Institute strongly emphasizes the need for the Government to follow some best international best practices in implementing this public-private-partnership project by preparing its own “business case” comprising at least a public sector comparator, cost benefit analysis, risk analysis and detailed output specifications.</li><li>● The perception of favouritism has been a real cause for concern, which could not be dispelled unless the Government has assumed adequate control over the master layout plan of the scheme as well as its output specifications for various arts and cultural facilities and services.</li><li>● On these premises, the Institute objects to the single-package arrangement and proposes a multi-stage bidding process which would allow the Government to better structure its service and facility requirements and risks.</li></ul>
	<i>The Hong Kong Academy for Performing Arts</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● The Academy supports the WKCD development, in particular its integrated town planning approach. This should be separated from the contentious issue of having single or multiple developers.</li><li>● The suggestion of constructing the WKCD in phases would subject the already completed facilities to a succession of noisy, visually intrusive building sites some years after initial opening. Public amenity and enjoyment may be easily compromised.</li><li>● The involvement of multiple developers might lead to reduction of architectural values and overall quality of facilities.</li></ul>

Subject	Organization	Concerns/VIEWS
	<i>Hong Kong Arts Administrators' Association</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● As the WKCD development is in step with present needs, there is no compelling reason to construct it in several phases over time.</li> <li>● Connectivity and interfacing between separately developed facilities would be problematic.</li> <li>● Provided that there are sufficient safeguards built into the contractual relationship between the Government and the successful proponent, there does not seem to be any redeeming argument to justify the involvement of multiple developers in creating or operating the cultural facilities at WKCD.</li> </ul>
	<i>The Ink Society Ltd.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Public consultation on the WKCD project has been going on for years. The project should be allowed to proceed in its present approach with enhanced participation from the arts and cultural sector.</li> </ul>
	<i>Fringe Club</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Multiple-package development could give rise to interface problems and might undermine build and design quality.</li> </ul>
4.2 Funding and sustainable operation of future arts and cultural facilities	<i>Hong Kong Institute of Real Estate Administration</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Finance and funding should be separated to ensure that fluctuations of property prices would not affect cultural development for the 30 years and beyond.</li> </ul>

Subject	Organization	Concerns／Views
	<i>Hong Kong People's Council for Sustainable Development</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● In terms of maintaining a stable source of finance, property prices are susceptible to market fluctuations and hence, would affect the income of the developer. This would directly affect the successful proponent's financial commitment for the project. But arts and cultural development could only be nurtured under a sustainable environment in the community with long-term efforts and financial support.</li> <li>● In terms of governance and funding, the proponents have suggested more or less the same approach by setting up independent or non-profit making governing boards or trust funds to manage, operate and provide funding for the core arts and cultural facilities (CACF). In case of mis-management by the governing boards or trust funds resulting in recurrent losses, the successful proponent might be required to inject capital constantly to maintain the operation of the CACF. This would result in many disputes and conflicts in the next 30 years.</li> </ul>
	<i>Hong Kong Curators Association</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Association's major concern is how to maintain and operate the proposed museums in a professional manner bringing about benefits to the community. However, the relevant requirements on the provision of museums do not form part of the mandatory requirements in the IFP and hence, do not have any binding effect on the successful proponent. Coupled with the fact that Hong Kong does not have a museum law as other advanced countries, concern is expressed about the Government's power and ability to monitor compliance by the successful proponent</li> </ul>

Subject	Organization	Concerns／Views
	<i>Spring-Time Group Ltd.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Proceeds from commercial development should be used to support arts and cultural development.</li> </ul>
<b>5 Other related matters</b>		
5.1 Mandatory requirements in the Invitation for Proposals such as canopy	<i>Hong Kong People's Council for Sustainable Development</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The cost of \$4 to \$6 billion for the canopy could be more meaningfully spent if the funds were used to buy back the 973 hectares of private land in the 12 priority sites identified for enhanced conservation under the Government's new nature conservation policy published recently.</li> </ul>
	<i>Project Hong Kong</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Government should dispense with the canopy.</li> </ul>
	<i>The Hong Kong Institution of Engineers</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Further details on the maintenance costs to be borne by the Government after the 30-year operation period should be provided to facilitate an objective and rational discussion on the proposals.</li> <li>● Due consideration should be given to the necessary contingency measures for maintenance.</li> <li>● The possible energy savings by the canopy design as well as the adverse impact of possible green house effect should be properly and scientifically addressed.</li> <li>● Landmark is not necessarily restricted to the canopy option.</li> <li>● The professional engineers in Hong Kong are capable of making a feasible technical solution so that the signature design feature could be put in place by local expertise.</li> </ul>
	<i>The Hong Kong Institute of Architects</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The development of WKCD including the construction of the canopy in phases is feasible and indeed preferable.</li> </ul>

Subject	Organization	Concerns/VIEWS
	<i>The Democratic Party</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The provision of the canopy and any arts and cultural facilities in the WKCD should not form part of the mandatory requirements. A final decision should only be made in full consultation with the public.</li> </ul>
	<i>The International Association of Arts Critics (Hong Kong Chapter)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The canopy lacks character and could not become an iconic landmark in Hong Kong. It is irresponsible of the Government to spend large sums of public moneys on the canopy at times of budget deficit.</li> <li>● The requirements in the IFP are drawn up in an unprofessional and haphazard manner without any detailed research and public consultation.</li> </ul>
	<i>Association of Engineering Professionals in Society</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The decision of constructing the canopy should only be made after careful consideration of all relevant factors including its financial implications, technical feasibility and sustainability.</li> </ul>
	<i>Hong Kong Ballet</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The canopy is oversized.</li> </ul>
	<i>Cattle Depot Artist Village Committee</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The design of the canopy does not have any relevance to Hong Kong's history or culture. It is doubtful whether this can become Hong Kong's new icon. More discussions amongst the public is required before the canopy should be given the go-ahead.</li> </ul>
	<i>Hong Kong Arts Administrators' Association</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● There is no denying the iconic value of the canopy. If the canopy can migrate temperature extremes and offer year-round enjoyment and utility of the open spaces under it, then it makes sense from a public amenity point of view, and that makes sense for the cultural district.</li> </ul>

Subject	Organization	Concerns/VIEWS
	<i>Fringe Club</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The canopy is a central theme of Foster's design. Hence, public discussion should focus on how to perfect the canopy design so that it becomes Hong Kong's new icon.</li> </ul>
	<i>The Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The IFP only provides some broadly defined requirements in respect of various arts and cultural facilities and services. The required outputs are vague, ambiguous and uncertain.</li> </ul>
5.2 Selection and assessment criteria and process such as weighting of public opinion collected during public consultation	<i>Hong Kong People's Council for Sustainable Development</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● In terms of public participation, the Government's approach of treating WKCD as a property development project has effectively excluded public participation in the selection process. The ultimate decision would only be made by a small handful of government officials. The project should also be assessed from an arts and cultural development point of view with a wide degree of participation from all the stakeholders in the community taking into account their views and expectations on arts and cultural development in future.</li> </ul>
	<i>Zuni Icosahedron</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● More emphasis should be given to the views expressed by the arts and cultural sector as well as the professionals.</li> </ul>
	<i>The People's Panel on West Kowloon</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● It is unclear as to how public views collected during the present public consultation exercise would be incorporated into the Government's assessment on the three screened-in proposals</li> </ul>

Subject	Organization	Concerns／Views
	<i>Hong Kong Christian Service</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Public participation, particularly in respect of the people's aspiration on arts and cultural development, is essential to the success of the WKCD project in enhancing the cultural quality of the people. Instead of adopting a top-down approach by allowing the public the only choice of "one out of three", the Government should adopt a bottom-up approach to carefully consider all the views expressed by members of the public on other alternative proposals during consultation.</li></ul>
	<i>Hong Kong Curators Association</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● The Government should disclose more information in relation to the operation of the proposed museums including the source of funding, staffing requirements and mode of governance. More importantly, it should clearly specify the collection policy, budget and timeframe for the proposed museums so that the public and the professionals could make a fair comparison among the screened-in proposals.</li></ul>
	<i>The Association of Architectural Practices Ltd.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● The Association would adopt an open attitude in considering the proposals put forward by the three screened-in proponents.</li></ul>
	<i>The Hong Kong Institute of Architects</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● The Institute considers that the requirements under the Government's IFP were not well-thought out and without the public's support. Given the generality of the requirements, it would be quite impossible to conduct a fair comparison on the pros and cons of the three screened-in proposals.</li></ul>

Subject	Organization	Concerns／Views
	<i>The Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Government largely relies on a set of published marking scheme to assess the relative merits of different proposals. It is not scientific at all as an “apple” can never be able compare with an “orange”. In the absence of a public sector comparator for benchmarking the screened-in proposals for value-for-money, it is inevitable that the public conclude their interests being damaged.</li> </ul>
	<i>The Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The assessment criteria are unclear.</li> </ul>
	<i>The Democratic Party</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The public consultation period should be extended to six months.</li> <li>● The Government should make public the financial information of the three screened-in proponents to allow for fair and open assessment.</li> </ul>
	<i>The Ink Society Ltd.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● More financial information should be made available.</li> </ul>
5.3 Mode of governance of the WKCD development	<i>Hong Kong Institute of Real Estate Administration</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Operation of real estate developments and cultural facilities must be put under two distinct administrations. An independent Authority comprising multi-disciplinary parties including local and internationally renowned cultural experts, professionals and stakeholders including the Government should be established to operate the cultural facilities.</li> </ul>

Subject	Organization	Concerns／Views
	<i>Hong Kong Curators Association</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● In terms of monitoring, a three-prong approach should be adopted by enacting the relevant museum legislation, clearly delineating the relationship between the museums and the successful proponent, and formulating a framework for monitoring by both the Government and the public. Performance indicators should be formulated for the proposed museums</li> </ul>
	<i>Project Hong Kong</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Government should, as a matter of priority, set up a statutory body with executive powers to formulate a master plan on the future development of arts and culture in Hong Kong, and review how the WKCD should be planned and developed to contribute towards achieving this ultimate goal</li> </ul>
	<i>The Hong Kong Institute of Architects</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Government should set up a development board comprising members from professional bodies, the arts and cultural sector, Legislative Council Members, local community leaders and international experts to co-ordinate and monitor the WKCD development according to the master planning blueprint.</li> </ul>
	<i>Hong Kong Arts Centre</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● A governing board with representatives from culture sector should be formed to monitor the operation in the district.</li> <li>● When considering the operation of facilities, the Government should give priority to local arts organizations.</li> </ul>
	<i>The Democratic Party</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● A statutory development board should be established to take charge of the development and management of the WKCD.</li> </ul>

Subject	Organization	Concerns/VIEWS
	<i>Hong Kong Chinese Orchestra</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Government should provide more information on the governance and operation of the WKCD so that the whole project could stay focused on supporting local arts and cultural development.</li> </ul>
	<i>The Hong Kong Academy for Performing Arts</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Mode of governance proposed by the screened-in proponents appears to follow good governance practice in that they include independent, autonomous board structures comprising arts professionals to oversee management of facilities.</li> </ul>
	<i>Hong Kong Arts Administrators' Association</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Mode of governance proposed by the screened-in proponents generally follows world's best practice.</li> </ul>
	<i>The Ink Society Ltd.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● An independent mode of governance should be adopted with further details to be worked out through consultation.</li> </ul>
	<i>Fringe Club</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● There should be further discussion on which mode of governance is the best way forward for the WKCD project. At the same time, Hong Kong needs to nurture the necessary human resources to take up the management responsibilities.</li> </ul>
5.4 Impact on local construction industries and related professions	<i>The Hong Kong Institution of Engineers</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Administration should increase the extent of participation of local engineering companies in the development of WKCD and to expedite its execution for the benefit of the community as a whole.</li> </ul>
	<i>Association of Engineering Professionals in Society</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● More opportunities should be given to small and medium-sized local companies to participate in the WKCD project.</li> </ul>

Subject	Organization	Concerns／Views
	<i>Hong Kong Construction Industry Employees General Union</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● The Union supports the early implementation of the WKCD project to increase employment opportunities of the local construction industry.</li></ul>
	<i>The Hong Kong Institution of Engineers</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● The implementation of the WKCD project should be expedited whether under single or multiple developments as it would help to alleviate the employment situation of the construction industry.</li></ul>

Council Business Division 1  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
3 February 2005

## **Appendix III**

**Motion on "West Kowloon Cultural District"  
passed at the meeting of the Panel on Planning, Lands and Works  
held on 27 April 2004**

(Translation)

"That this Panel opposes the land and financial arrangements proposed by the Administration for the West Kowloon Cultural District ."

Council Business Division 1  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
29 November 2004

## **Appendix IV**

### **Chronology of events relating to West Kowloon Cultural Development**

- October 1998                   The Chief Executive (CE) announced in his policy address that the Administration was planning for a new, state-of-the-art performance venue on the West Kowloon Reclamation (WKR)
- 23 September 1998           The Public Works Subcommittee (PWSC) recommended the upgrading to Category A of part of 332CL, entitled "West Kowloon Reclamation - southern area, phase 4 and remaining roadworks stage 2" at an estimated cost of \$914 million in money-of-day prices
- 16 October 1998           The Finance Committee approved the funding of part of 332CL as recommended by PWSC
- October 1999                   The CE announced in his policy address the plan of the Administration to develop a major performance venue in the WKR and to hold an open competition to enlist the help of local and overseas professionals
- 16 November 1999           The CE in Council ordered that the use of the southern portion of the WKR should be fundamentally reviewed to facilitate the development of a world class integrated arts, cultural and entertainment district
- 18 November 1999           The Administration explained to the Panel on Planning, Lands and Works (PLW Panel) the decision to review the land uses of the southern portion of WKR for the development of a world class integrated arts, cultural and entertainment district and to delete part of an existing road and infrastructure works contract
- 13 December 1999           The Administration briefed the Panel on Home Affairs on the planning of a performance venue on WKR

- 20 December 1999      The Administration issued a note to the Finance Committee to explain its decision to review the land uses of the southern portion of WKR and the deletion of part of a road and infrastructure works contract
- 9 March 2000      The Administration briefed the PLW Panel on the holding of an open competition for WKR
- 6 April 2001      The launch of WKR Concept Plan Competition
- 28 February 2002      Announcement of the winning entries of the WKR Concept Plan Competition
- 19 April 2002      The Administration provided an information note to PLW Panel to report the outcome of the WKR Concept Plan Competition
- September 2002      A Steering Committee for Development of the West Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD) was established
- 4 July 2003      The Administration briefed PLW Panel on its intention to issue an Invitation For Proposals for the Development of WKCD
- 5 September 2003      The Administration launched an Invitation For Proposals for the Development of the WKCD
- 18 November 2003      Joint meeting of the PLW Panel and HA Panel received deputations and discussed with the Administration on the IFP
- 25 November 2003      Joint meeting of the PLW Panel and HA Panel received deputations and discussed with the Administration on the IFP

26 November 2003	Motion debate on WKCD development at Council meeting  Announcement of extended deadline for submission of proposals
27 April 2004	PLW Panel meeting discussed financial arrangement and received the latest progress report on WKCD development
19 June 2004	Deadline for submission of proposals. Five proposals were received.
14 July 2004	PLW Panel discussed the response to the IFP and the assessment process

Council Business Division 1  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
29 November 2004

## **Appendix V**

### **West Kowloon Cultural District**

#### **List of relevant papers**

<b>Council/Committee</b>	<b>Date of meeting</b>	<b>Paper</b>
Public Works Subcommittee (PWSC)	23 September 1998	PWSC(98-99)17 ( <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr98-99/english/fc/pwsc/papers/pw230917.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr98-99/english/fc/pwsc/papers/pw230917.pdf</a> )  LC Paper No. PWSC26/98-99 ( <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr98-99/english/fc/pwsc/minutes/pw230998.htm">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr98-99/english/fc/pwsc/minutes/pw230998.htm</a> )
Finance Committee (FC)	16 October 1998	FCR(98-99)33 ( <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr98-99/english/fc/fc/minutes/fcmn1610.htm">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr98-99/english/fc/fc/minutes/fcmn1610.htm</a> )
Planning, Lands and Works (PLW) Panel	18 November 1999	LC Paper No. CB(1)1065/99-00 ( <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr99-00/english/panels/plw/minutes/pl181199.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr99-00/english/panels/plw/minutes/pl181199.pdf</a> )
FC	--	FCRI(1999-2000)18 ( <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr98-99/english/fc/fc/papers/fi99-18e.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr98-99/english/fc/fc/papers/fi99-18e.pdf</a> )
Home Affairs (HA) Panel	13 December 1999	LC Paper No. CB(2)587/99-00(01) ( <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr99-00/english/panels/ha/papers/587e01.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr99-00/english/panels/ha/papers/587e01.pdf</a> )  LC Paper No. CB(2)1456/99-00 ( <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr99-00/english/panels/ha/minutes/ha131299.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr99-00/english/panels/ha/minutes/ha131299.pdf</a> )

Council/Committee	Date of meeting	Paper
PLW Panel	9 March 2000	<p>LC Paper No. CB(1)1103/99-00(03) (<a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr99-00/english/panels/plw/papers/a1103c03.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr99-00/english/panels/plw/papers/a1103c03.pdf</a>)</p> <p>LC Paper No. CB(1)1187/99-00 (Presentation Printout)</p> <p>LC Paper No. CB(1)1822/99-00 (<a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr99-00/english/panels/plw/papers/letter0903.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr99-00/english/panels/plw/papers/letter0903.pdf</a>)</p> <p>LC Paper No. CB(1)1595/99-00 (<a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr99-00/english/panels/plw/minutes/pl090300.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr99-00/english/panels/plw/minutes/pl090300.pdf</a>)</p>
PLW Panel	8 May 2002	<p>LC Paper No. CB(1)1616/01-02 (<a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr99-00/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0309cb1-1616-e.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr99-00/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0309cb1-1616-e.pdf</a>)</p>
PLW Panel	4 July 2003	<p>LC Paper No. CB(1)2104/02-03(03) (<a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr02-03/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0704cb1-2104-3e.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr02-03/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0704cb1-2104-3e.pdf</a>)</p> <p>LC Paper No. CB(1)2351/02-03 (<a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr02-03/english/panels/plw/minutes/pl030704.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr02-03/english/panels/plw/minutes/pl030704.pdf</a>)</p>
Council meeting	12 November 2003	<p>Hansard (<a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/english/counmtg/hansard/cm1112ti-translate-e.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/english/counmtg/hansard/cm1112ti-translate-e.pdf</a>)</p>
PLW and HA Panels	18 November 2003	<p>LC Paper No. CB(1)322/03-04(06) (<a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/english/panels/plw/papers/haplw1118cb1-322-6e.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/english/panels/plw/papers/haplw1118cb1-322-6e.pdf</a>)</p> <p>LC Paper No. CB(1)817/03-04 (<a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/english/panels/plw/minutes/hapl1118.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/english/panels/plw/minutes/hapl1118.pdf</a>)</p>

Council/Committee	Date of meeting	Paper
Council meeting	19 November 2003	Hansard ( <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/english/counmtg/hansard/cm1119ti-translate-e.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/english/counmtg/hansard/cm1119ti-translate-e.pdf</a> )
PLW and HA Panels	25 November 2003	LC Paper No. CB(1)448/03-04(01) ( <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/english/panels/plw/papers/haplw1125cb1-448-1e.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/english/panels/plw/papers/haplw1125cb1-448-1e.pdf</a> )  LC Paper No. CB(1)819/03-04 ( <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/english/panels/plw/minutes/hapl1125.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/english/panels/plw/minutes/hapl1125.pdf</a> )
Council meeting	26 November 2003	Hansard ( <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/english/counmtg/hansard/cm1126ti-translate-e.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/english/counmtg/hansard/cm1126ti-translate-e.pdf</a> )
PLW Panel	27 April 2004	LC Paper No. CB(1)1353/03-04(01) ( <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/english/panels/plw/papers/haplw1125cb1-1353-1e.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/english/panels/plw/papers/haplw1125cb1-1353-1e.pdf</a> )  LC Paper No. LS47/03-04 ( <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/english/panels/plw/papers/haplw1125ls-47-e.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/english/panels/plw/papers/haplw1125ls-47-e.pdf</a> )  LC Paper No. CB(1) 2211/03-04 ( <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/english/panels/plw/minutes/pl040427.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/english/panels/plw/minutes/pl040427.pdf</a> )
Council meeting	12 May 2004	Hansard ( <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/chinese/counmtg/floor/cm0512ti-confirm-c.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/chinese/counmtg/floor/cm0512ti-confirm-c.pdf</a> )
Council meeting	19 May 2004	Hansard ( <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/chinese/counmtg/floor/cm0519ti-confirm-c.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/chinese/counmtg/floor/cm0519ti-confirm-c.pdf</a> )

Council/Committee	Date of meeting	Paper
Council meeting	23 June 2004	Hansard ( <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/english/counmtg/hansard/cm0623ti-translate-e.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/english/counmtg/hansard/cm0623ti-translate-e.pdf</a> )
PLW Panel	14 July 2004	LC Paper No. CB(1)2231/03-04(01) ( <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/english/panels/plw/papers/plwcb1-2231-1e.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/english/panels/plw/papers/plwcb1-2231-1e.pdf</a> )  LC Paper No. CB(1) 2464/03-04(01) ( <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0714cb1-2464-1e.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/english/panels/plw/papers/plw0714cb1-2464-1e.pdf</a> )  LC Paper No. CB(1) 2497/03-04 ( <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/english/panels/plw/minutes/pl040714.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/english/panels/plw/minutes/pl040714.pdf</a> )
Council meeting	10 November 2004	Press release from the Administration on the statement on West Kowloon Cultural District project at the Council meeting ( <a href="http://www.info.gov.hk/gia/general/200411/10/1110252.htm">http://www.info.gov.hk/gia/general/200411/10/1110252.htm</a> )

Council Business Division 1  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
29 November 2004

### **Appendix III**

#### **West Kowloon Cultural District Comparison of plot ratios and development schedules of the three screened-in proposals**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Dynamic Star International Limited</b>	<b>Sunny Development Limited</b>	<b>World City Culture Park Limited</b>
Plot ratio	3.28	4.327	2.5
Core arts and culture (m <sup>2</sup> )	278 700	379 538	252 378
Other arts and culture (m <sup>2</sup> )	37 160	34 392	48 000
Government, institution or community (m <sup>2</sup> )	20 000	21 339	20 000
Retail/ entertainment/ commercial (m <sup>2</sup> )	232 255 (including offices)	203 964	300 000
Residential (m <sup>2</sup> )	671 580	829 530	272 800
Office (m <sup>2</sup> )	<i>Separate figure not available</i>	138 458	60 000
Hotel / Conference Centre (m <sup>2</sup> )	74 420	127 650	50 100
<b>Total (m<sup>2</sup>)</b>	<b>1 314 115</b>	<b>1 734 871</b>	<b>1 003 278</b>

Source: Information pamphlets of the three screened-in proponents and the homepage of the West Kowloon Cultural District:  
<http://www.hplb.gov.hk/wkcd/>

## **Appendix IV**

### **Motions on "West Kowloon Cultural District" passed by the Panel on Planning, Lands and Works at the meeting held on 30 November 2004**

(Translation)

#### **Motion 1**

"That this Panel requests the Government to comprehensively review the appropriateness of adopting the single package approach in the delivery of the West Kowloon Cultural District Project."

#### **Motion 2**

"That this Panel urges the Government to extend the consultation period for the proposals for the development of the West Kowloon Cultural District from three months to six months, and to re-consult the public on the West Kowloon Cultural District Project."

#### **Motion 3**

"That, with regard to the West Kowloon Cultural District Project, this Panel urges the Government to make open the information on the financial arrangements of the three screened-in proposals, so that the public can comment on such proposals on the basis of concrete information."

### **Motion on "West Kowloon Cultural District development project" passed by the Legislative Council at the meeting of 5 January 2005**

(Translation)

"That, as the Administration has decided to award the development of the 40-hectare West Kowloon Cultural District ("the WKCD development") to a single consortium in one go and allows the public only 15 weeks to comment on the three proposals selected in the first stage, such course of action has failed to ensure the optimal use of precious land resources in Hong Kong and safeguard public interests while nurturing arts and culture, this Council strongly asks the Administration to:

- (a) extend the consultation period to six months to allow sufficient time for public participation;
- (b) make public all the proposals submitted to the Government by persons interested in participating in the WKCD development, including information on financial arrangements, so as to enable the public to fully grasp the details of the development proposals during the consultation period;
- (c) remove the requirement that the canopy, which requires huge funds to construct, be a mandatory component of the WKCD development;
- (d) withdraw the decision to award the entire piece of land together with the WKCD development by way of one single tender, and break the lot into smaller pieces of land for public tender or auction in the market by batches so that small and medium developers in Hong Kong can participate in the development, with a view to maximizing the proceeds from the land sale;
- (e) formulate long-term and sustainable policies on Hong Kong's arts and culture, use part of the proceeds from the sale of the 40 hectares of land to support and promote the related policies and, in drawing up the specific details and implementing the policies, allow institutionalized participation of the civil society and, in particular, solicit and adopt the views of the local art and cultural sectors; and
- (f) set up a West Kowloon Cultural District development authority, which should be a statutory body comprising members from various sectors, to take up the planning, development and management of the West Kowloon Cultural District."

## **Appendix VI**

### **West Kowloon Cultural District**

#### **List of relevant papers**

<b>Council/Committee</b>	<b>Date of meeting</b>	<b>Paper</b>
Planning, Lands and Works (PLW) Panel	30 November 2004	LC Paper No. CB(1)318/04-05(01) ( <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/english/panels/plw/papers/plw1130cb1-318-1e.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/english/panels/plw/papers/plw1130cb1-318-1e.pdf</a> )  LC Paper No. CB(1)318/04-05(03) ( <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/english/panels/plw/papers/plw1130cb1-318-3e.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/english/panels/plw/papers/plw1130cb1-318-3e.pdf</a> )  LC Paper No. CB(1)318/04-05(04) ( <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/english/panels/plw/papers/plw1130cb1-318-4e.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/english/panels/plw/papers/plw1130cb1-318-4e.pdf</a> )
House Committee	10 December 2004	LC Paper No. CB(2)372/04-05(02) ( <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/chinese/hc/papers/hc1210cb2-372-2c.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/chinese/hc/papers/hc1210cb2-372-2c.pdf</a> )  LC Paper No. CB(2)427/04-05 ( <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/english/hc/minutes/hc041210.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/english/hc/minutes/hc041210.pdf</a> )
PLW Panel	16 December 2004	LC Paper No. CB(1)824/04-05(01) <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/english/panels/plw/papers/plwcb1-824-1e.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/english/panels/plw/papers/plwcb1-824-1e.pdf</a>
House Committee	21 January 2005	LC Paper No. CB(2)705/04-05(02) <a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/chinese/hc/papers/hc0121cb2-705-2c.pdf">http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/chinese/hc/papers/hc0121cb2-705-2c.pdf</a>