

立法會

Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(2)1725/06-07

(These minutes have been
seen by the Administration)

Ref : CB2/PL/HA

Panel on Home Affairs

Minutes of meeting held on Friday, 9 March 2007, at 10:45 am in the Chamber of the Legislative Council Building

Members present	: Hon CHOY So-yuk, JP (Chairman) Hon Albert HO Chun-yan (Deputy Chairman) Hon James TIEN Pei-chun, GBS, JP Hon CHEUNG Man-kwong Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip Hon LI Kwok-ying, MH, JP Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung Hon WONG Ting-kwong, BBS Prof Hon Patrick LAU Sau-shing, SBS, JP Hon TAM Heung-man
Members attending	: Hon CHAN Yuen-han, JP Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP Hon LEE Wing-tat Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
Members absent	: Hon James TO Kun-sun Dr Hon Philip WONG Yu-hong, GBS Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBM, GBS, JP Hon Andrew CHENG Kar-foo Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, GBS, JP Dr Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long, JP Hon Daniel LAM Wai-keung, SBS, JP Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming, SBS, JP

Public Officers : Item III

Ms Esther LEUNG
Deputy Secretary for Home Affairs (3)

Ms Polly KWOK
Principal Assistant Secretary for
Home Affairs (Culture) 2

Dr Louis NG
Assistant Director (Heritage and Museums)
Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Item V

Mr Gary YEUNG
Deputy Director of Home Affairs (1)
Home Affairs Department

Ms Rhonda LO
Assistant Director (Operations) 3
Food and Environmental Hygiene Department

Mr Simon YU
Assistant Director (Estate Management)
Lands Department

Clerk in attendance : Miss Flora TAI
Chief Council Secretary (2)2

Staff in attendance : Ms Joanne MAK
Senior Council Secretary (2)2

Ms Anna CHEUNG
Legislative Assistant (2)2

Mr Watson CHAN
Head (Research & Library Services) }
Mr Michael YU } For
Research Officer 7 } Item IV
} only

Action

Election of Acting Chairman

As the Chairman would be late for the meeting and the Deputy Chairman was not available, members elected Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong to be the Acting Chairman.

I. Information paper(s) issued since the last meeting

2. Members noted that the Administration had provided an information paper on estate beneficiaries support services [LC Paper No. CB(2)1230/06-07(01)]. At Ms Emily LAU's suggestion, members agreed that the Panel should discuss the paper.

II. Items for discussion at the next meeting

[Appendices I and II to LC Paper No. CB(2)1215/06-07]

Regular meeting in April 2007

3. Members agreed to discuss the following items at the next regular meeting scheduled for Friday, 13 April 2007, at 10:45 am -

- (a) proposed amendments to the Attachment of Income Order Legislation; and
- (b) estate beneficiaries support services.

4. Miss TAM Heung-man and Ms Emily LAU expressed concern that for most of the items on the List of Outstanding Items, the Administration had not indicated the appropriate timing for discussion. They also expressed dissatisfaction that many items on the List of Follow-up Actions were long overdue and the Administration had yet to provide responses, e.g. information on the implementation of the recommendations made in the Report of Inquiry on the Incidents Relating to the Equal Opportunities Commission (item 6 on the list) had been awaited since January 2006.

Clerk

5. At the suggestion of the Acting Chairman, members agreed that the Clerk should request the Administration to propose as far as possible the timing for discussion for each item on the List of Outstanding Items, and to provide responses, or if not possible, brief progress reports, to the items on the List of Follow-up Actions for members' consideration and reference.

Special meeting on built heritage conservation

6. Members agreed to schedule a special meeting for Friday, 20 April 2007, at 10:45 am to receive public views on built heritage conservation, and to invite members of the Panel on Planning, Lands and Works (PLW Panel) to

Action
Clerk

attend that meeting. Members also agreed that a notice for invitation of public views should be put on the website of the Legislative Council (LegCo).

III. Built heritage conservation

Briefing by the Administration

7. Deputy Secretary for Home Affairs (3) (DSHA(3)) highlighted the salient points of the Administration's paper, including the response to the current round of public discussion on built heritage conservation as set out in paragraph 10 of the Administration's paper [LC Paper No. CB(2)1215/06-07(01)]. Assistant Director (Heritage and Museums) (AD(H&M)) gave a Powerpoint presentation on the current built heritage policy and measures as set out in the Administration's paper.

8. Members noted that the LegCo Secretariat had prepared a background brief on "Review of Built Heritage Conservation Policy" [LC Paper No. CB(2)1215/06-07(02)].

(The Chairman took over to chair the meeting at this juncture.)

Discussion

Conservation of monuments and historic buildings

9. Miss TAM Heung-man asked about the measures taken by the Administration to prevent non-government graded historic buildings from dilapidation due to the lack of incentives of owners concerned to repair and maintain these buildings. She further asked about the actions taken to preserve Mei Ho House in Shek Kip Mei which had been classified as a Grade I historic building but was reportedly to have been left to dilapidation.

10. AD(H&M) responded that it had been the government's established policy on built heritage conservation that the Administration would conserve but not take over ownership with due regard being given to private property rights. He explained that the Administration had all along assisted private owners in need to repair and maintain historic buildings in their ownership. A mechanism was in place for private owners of declared monuments to apply to the Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO) for restoration and maintenance for their properties provided that these buildings were open for public access. However, should the owner refuse any assistance or financial support from the government and insist on leaving the historic building in his ownership to dilapidation or demolishing it, depending on the heritage value of the historic building concerned, the Administration might declare the building to be a statutory monument without the consent of the owner concerned. In that case, the owner concerned could claim compensation for financial loss under the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance (the Ordinance).

Action

11. AD(H&M) said that there were some 200 non-government graded historic buildings in Hong Kong and the cost of conservation of them could be high. The Administration was of the view that more incentives should be offered to encourage owners in the long-term to take the initiative to restore and maintain such buildings in their ownership.

12. DSHA(3) pointed out that one of the key policy issues concerning built heritage conservation was to strike a balance between conservation needs and economic cost, and the policy review would come up with concrete proposals to address this issue.

13. AD(H&M) informed members that the Leisure and Cultural Services Department was exploring in collaboration with the Housing Department feasible options of preserving Mei Ho House, which had some structural constraints limiting its development. He added that an open ideas competition on future development of Mei Ho House might be launched.

Application for Hong Kong's built heritage to be inscribed on the World Heritage List

14. Miss TAM Heung-man asked whether the Administration would follow the example of Macau and apply to have some valuable heritage in Hong Kong to be inscribed on the World Heritage List of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), and to launch wide publicity on such heritage items to attract tourists and visitors.

15. AD(H&M) explained that world heritage sites were selected on the basis of very stringent criteria which must have outstanding heritage value. He said that it had to be further assessed as to whether Hong Kong's cultural heritage could meet the selection criteria. Meanwhile, the Administration would make sustained efforts in heritage conservation and collaborate with the Hong Kong Tourism Board to promote local built heritage to tourists and visitors.

16. Professor Patrick LAU declared that he was a member of the current Antiquities Advisory Board (AAB). He considered that some built heritage in Hong Kong, e.g. walled villages in the New Territories, was unique and had very high cultural value, and was well worth consideration for inscription on the World Heritage List. AD(H&M) said that the Administration would, in the course of heritage conservation, closely monitor and carefully assess the cultural value of heritage sites to see whether any of them warranted nomination as a World Heritage Site.

Survey on built heritage

17. Dr KWOK Ka-ki said that, in his Policy Address in 1999, the Chief Executive had already pledged that the Administration would review the

Action

heritage policy for better protection of historic buildings. He asked about the Administration's work in this respect since the conduct of the public consultation in 2004. He also asked about the Administration's plan to preserve the 1 440 selected buildings constructed before 1950. Referring to the Report of the delegation of the PLW Panel on its duty visit in September 2002 [LC Paper No. CB(2)1215/06-07(03)], Dr KWOK noted that Singapore in 2002 had already carried out restoration of some two-thirds of over 5 600 pre-war buildings gazetted for conservation.

18. DSHA(3) said that after conducting the public consultation exercise in 2004, the Administration had reviewed and developed a new set of criteria for assessing the heritage value of historic buildings. From March 2005, an expert panel under AAB had been conducting a heritage assessment of 1 440 historic buildings selected from around 8 800 buildings with more than 50 years of age in Hong Kong recorded from a territory-wide survey. The assessment results of the panel would be considered by AAB with a view to selecting buildings for declaration or grading. This would also provide a basis for AAB to consider whether and how the current assessment and grading mechanism would need to be reformed.

19. In response to Mr LEE Wing-tat's comments, AD(H&M) said that the Planning Department, the Buildings Department and other relevant bureaux/departments had already been notified of the 1 440 historic buildings which might be considered by AAB for declaration or grading. A mechanism was in place under which AMO would be notified when there was any development plan involving any of the 1 440 buildings so that AMO would, if necessary, persuade the private owner concerned not to demolish the historic building concerned.

Slow progress of the policy review and comments on the way forward

20. Dr Fernando CHEUNG said that the key issues regarding built heritage conservation covered by the current round of public consultation had already been raised during the public consultation exercise conducted in 2004, and similar views received in this round of public discussion had also been expressed by the public in the previous consultation exercise. He further pointed out that the suggestions of improvements received in this round of public discussion had already been set out in the documents [LC Paper No. CB(2)1264/06-07(01)] forwarded by Designing Hong Kong Harbour District for this meeting, including the paper published by Civic Exchange in 2002, the report and position paper of the Conservancy Association, and changes to the Town Planning Ordinance proposed by the then Planning, Environment and Lands Branch in 1991 as set out in the relevant executive summary. He considered it a waste of time for the Administration to invite the public to give views all over again on the same issues which had already been covered in the public consultation exercise in 2004. He requested the Administration to provide a summary of the major concerns and suggestions made in the

Action

aforementioned four documents as well as those received during the public consultation exercise in 2004, and to explain how the Administration was going to follow up those concerns and suggestions.

21. DSHA(3) pointed out that in the public consultation in 2004, the views received had mainly come from experts, academics and concern groups. The Administration, however, noted that in the incident of the reprovisioning of the Star Ferry Pier, members of the general public who were not experts of heritage conservation were also keen to understand more about the current policy, including the grading criteria for historic buildings which had not been covered during the public consultation exercise in 2004. The Administration had therefore organised a series of public forums in January and February 2007 to provide the community with an opportunity to understand the current policy and measures. She said that from late March onwards, the Secretary for Home Affairs (SHA) would attend the meetings of the 18 District Councils (DCs) to discuss the subject with DC members. She informed members that the Administration was in the process of formulating the proposed improvement measures for built heritage conservation, taking into account the results of this round of public discussion. Subject to the results, the Administration would be able to announce concrete policy proposals and measures on built heritage conservation in the latter half of 2007.

22. Dr Fernando CHEUNG said that he did not object to consulting DCs or the public. However, the Administration should not keep on conducting public consultation over the same issues. He said that the public had clearly expressed their views on various issues, e.g. inadequacies of the existing heritage conservation legislation, the need for formulation of financial options to support built heritage conservation initiatives, and buildings with collective memories should be considered for conservation.

Admin

23. Ms Emily LAU requested the Administration to provide the summary of the views and suggestions as requested by Dr Fernando CHEUNG for discussion at the special meeting scheduled for 20 April 2007. She further suggested that, to facilitate the discussion, the summary should include any concrete legislative, funding or administrative proposals, as well as any key issues over which consensus or divided views had been expressed by the public. She added that it should be provided well in advance before the special meeting so that members and deputations could discuss the relevant concrete proposals. DSHA(3) agreed to provide such a summary covering views and suggestions received from the public up to April 2007. Ms LAU further suggested that the Secretariat should forward as far as possible any relevant information or submissions received by the Panel to the Administration for consolidation.

Clerk

24. Mr LEE Wing-tat and Professor Patrick LAU expressed disappointment at the Administration's failure to formulate any proposal regarding the offer of economic incentives to encourage private owners to conserve their built heritage, given that the community seemed to have a consensus on the matter.

Action

They considered that while the offer of financial incentives which might involve transfer of plot ratio and transfer of the right to development would be controversial, the Administration had to work out implementation proposals in this regard for discussion.

25. DSHA(3) said that the improvement proposals and measures to be announced in the latter half of 2007 would include concrete proposals, e.g. options of proposed financial incentives, proposed legislative amendments (if any), and corresponding support from the town planning mechanism in an effort to conserve built heritage.

26. Mr LEE Wing-tat suggested that when the Administration launched public consultation exercise on the improvement proposals and measures in the latter half of 2007, it was necessary to have the involvement of the Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau (HPLB) as these proposals and measures would be closely related to issues about land use and development. Dr Fernando CHEUNG considered that the issue of built heritage conservation clearly involved policy issues which straddled different policy bureaux, e.g. land use, urban redevelopment, town planning and finance. He suggested that the Administration should set up an inter-departmental working group to take forward the current policy review. He further suggested that representatives of HPLB, the Financial Services and Treasury Bureau, the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) and the Town Planning Board should be invited to attend the special meeting scheduled for 20 April 2007.

Inter-departmental collaboration, public participation and heritage trust fund

27. Dr KWOK Ka-ki raised the following questions -

- (a) how URA had achieved the aim of built heritage conservation in implementing its urban renewal projects and why heritage conservation had not been given high priority in implementing redevelopment projects;
- (b) what would be the proposed amount of the heritage trust fund, if established, and its sources of funding; and
- (c) whether the Administration would seek to enhance public participation in built heritage conservation work having regard to the general criticisms of the poor design of the development project of the former Tsim Sha Tsui Marine Police Headquarters which had little public participation.

28. DSHA(3) said that under the existing legislative framework, except for built heritage that had been declared as a monument under the Ordinance, historic buildings that had been classified into Grade I, II and III were not provided with statutory protection. However, these graded historic buildings, if

Action

warranted, could be conserved by imposition of land use restrictions in the planning process.

29. DSHA(3) further said that, in order to estimate the required amount for the heritage trust fund, the first task would be for the expert panel under AAB to assess the heritage value of the 1 440 selected buildings on the basis of the new assessment criteria so that AAB could consider the forms of conservation to be adopted for each of these buildings. The Administration would then be able to estimate the amount required for the heritage trust fund.

30. Professor Patrick LAU expressed concern that in taking forward heritage conservation work, it was necessary to co-ordinate with various policy bureaux or departments, particularly in respect of town planning and land use. He considered that conservation of monuments and cultural heritage should be a priority consideration in overall town planning and that the Administration had to take this into consideration in formulating a holistic approach for built heritage conservation.

Incidents of lack of coordination between policy bureaux and lack of due regard given to heritage conservation in other policy areas

31. Miss CHAN Yuen-han asked what the Administration would do with buildings which fell outside the list of the graded historic buildings but were regarded by the public to have high conservation value, such as the Nga Tsin Wai village.

32. DSHA(3) responded that the Administration adopted an open attitude in preserving these buildings and the public was welcome to give any suggestions to the Administration or AAB. As regards the Nga Tsin Wai village, AD(H&M) said that AAB had discussed the matter many times as to whether the village should be declared as a monument based on the established criteria. However, owing to the fact that large-scale alteration works had been carried out in recent years, the Nga Tsin Wai village did not meet the requirements for statutory protection under the existing legislation. Miss CHAN criticised the Home Affairs Bureau (HAB) for turning a blind eye to the work done by URA which caused damage or even destruction to buildings and sites with high conservation value. She considered that HAB should immediately request URA to put on hold any project which might result in the destruction of the Nga Tsin Wai village.

33. Mr Albert CHAN considered that since URA was a government-owned body, he could not see why the Administration at the highest policy level could not instruct URA to stop proceeding with the redevelopment projects in Nga Tsin Wai village and Sai Yee Street, as both were considered by the public to have high conservation value. He said that if the Government could not even do so, he would doubt very much whether the Administration was really committed to protection of historic buildings and sites or whether it would do

Action

anything to protect the 1 440 selected buildings. He also urged the Administration to provide information on any progress made in handling the Dragon Garden which was classified as a Grade II historic building.

34. DSHA(3) responded that the redevelopment of Nga Tsin Wai village and Sai Yee Street were the URA projects which involved considerations other than heritage conservation, such as the need to improve living environment of residents. She noted that URA was collecting views from the public on all feasible options for the projects. AD(H&M) said that the Administration was closely following up the Dragon Garden project with the owner concerned. He explained that there were many technical problems to be resolved in converting a private garden to be a public leisure facility.

35. The Chairman said that since the Administration had failed to take on board LegCo Members' views in preserving buildings or sites with high conservation value or local characteristics, such as the Nga Tsin Wai village project, the Sai Yee Street project, the Dragon Garden and the Lee Tung Street project, etc, she sought members' views on how LegCo should pursue the matter. Mr Albert CHAN and Miss CHAN Yuen-han proposed to set up a subcommittee to follow up the matter with the Administration. Mr LEE Wing-tat, however, considered that HPLB was the leading policy bureau in handling these redevelopment projects (with the exception of the Dragon Garden) and, in line with the rules, the PLW Panel would be the corresponding LegCo Panel to take up the matter. At his suggestion, members agreed that the PLW Panel should be consulted on how to pursue the matter. The Chairman said that she would consult the Chairman of the PLW Panel in this regard.

(As the Chairman had to leave the meeting for other urgent commitments, the Deputy Chairman took over to chair the meeting.)

IV. Proposed research outline on built heritage conservation policy in selected places

[LC Paper No. CB(2)1215/06-07(04)]

36. At the invitation of the Deputy Chairman, the Head (Research & Library Services) (H(RL)) briefed members on the salient points of the proposed research outline, e.g. the reasons for selecting the United Kingdom, Singapore and Macao for study.

37. Professor Patrick LAU, Miss TAM Heung-man and Miss CHAN Yuen-han suggested that Panel might consider conducting an overseas duty visit to places where had made good achievements in heritage conservation so as to learn from their experiences. The Deputy Chairman suggested that since the research report would be available around May or June 2007, members could further consider the matter after the research report was available. Members agreed.

Action

38. Members raised no further questions. The proposed research outline was endorsed by the Panel.

V. Role of the Home Affairs Department in co-ordinating control over on-street promotion activities

39. Deputy Director of Home Affairs (1) (DDHA(1)) briefed members on the salient points of the Administration's paper [LC Paper No. CB(2)1215/06-07(05)], including the existing control measures against on-street promotion and advertising activities.

Discussion

Enforcement

40. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong said that while he agreed that a total ban on on-street promotion and advertising activities might affect the livelihood of many people especially the lower-skilled, he considered that the Administration should take enforcement actions if the extent of obstruction caused by such activities was so serious that nuisances had been created to pedestrians, or if such activities had posed a great problem to the cityscape. He cited the examples of serious situations that he had come across, such as commercial organisations putting up mobile stands all along the street for promotion, a driving school parking over a dozen of vans along the street to do promotion, and the posting of advertisements of vice establishments all over the external walls of commercial buildings.

41. Mr CHEUNG suggested that FEHD staff should be deployed to the main pedestrianised zones to check whether any on-street promotion and advertising activities there had caused serious obstruction, and if such was found, the FEHD staff should persuade the operators concerned to remove the publicity materials causing obstruction. However, if no improvements were made, FEHD staff should take appropriate action under section 4A of the Summary Offences Ordinance (Cap. 228).

42. DDHA(1) explained that the Administration's aims in taking enforcement action against on-street promotion and advertising activities were mainly to ensure smooth pedestrian flow and environmental hygiene. Assistant Director (Operations) 3 (AD(O)3) of the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD) said that if on-street promotion and advertising activities gave rise to complaints and caused serious obstruction, FEHD and the Police would, having regard to individual circumstances, consider appropriate action, including issue of verbal warning for the removal of the obstructing article. If the warning went unheeded, the Police and FEHD would take prosecution action under Cap. 228. AD(O)3 added that FEHD could also take

Action

enforcement action under the Public Health and Municipal Services Ordinance (Cap. 132) if the on-street promotion activity constituted hawking offence.

43. AD(O)3 pointed out that the issue of on-street promotion and advertising activities involved a number of departments. FEHD dealt with activities associated with unlicensed hawking, or obstruction to scavenging operations. She said that in the past year, FEHD had taken some 500 prosecutions against on-street promotion and advertising activities. DDHA(1) said that serious on-street promotion and advertising problems would be discussed at the relevant District Management Committees or DCs which would decide whether inter-departmental operations should be arranged.

44. Mr CHEUNG further asked whether prosecution could be taken under Cap. 132 against the display of unauthorised bills or posters on the external walls of commercial buildings.

45. AD(O)3 responded that while the existing legislation required the private owners to initiate actions against display of unauthorised bill or poster on their buildings' external walls, they could also lodge complaints with FEHD for actions. AD(O)3 said that where there was sufficient evidence, FEHD would take prosecution action against the persons who would benefit from the display of such publicity materials. She further said that any person who displayed commercial bills or posters without permission would be liable to a fixed penalty. She also undertook that FEHD would step up efforts to control rampant unauthorised display of bills and posters on external walls of private buildings in particular in business districts.

Admin

46. In response to Mr CHEUNG's request for the number of prosecutions taken against display of unauthorised commercial bills or posters on the walls of private buildings, AD(O)3 explained that FEHD had only kept the total number but not a breakdown by types of buildings.

47. Miss TAM Heung-man expressed dissatisfaction with the ineffective enforcement action taken by FEHD to control on-street promotion and advertising activities as well as night-time hawking at the open area in Lung Poon Court in Diamond Hill. She said that despite numerous complaints made to FEHD, not much improvement had been made to the control of these activities. She pointed out that every evening, when FEHD staff were off duty, hawkers and promoters quickly gathered there and did not leave until late at night. The stacking up of promotional items as well as hawking activities had not only caused obstruction to pedestrian movement but had also posed serious problems to environmental hygiene.

Admin

48. AD(O)3 noted Miss TAM's comments and undertook to review FEHD's enforcement action taken in Lung Poon Court with a view to identifying areas for improvements.

Action

49. Referring to paragraph 7 of the Administration's paper, Professor Patrick LAU requested the Administration to explain the control measures taken to regulate the on-street promotional activities in the pedestrianised areas in Mongkok during public holidays.

50. DDHA(1) explained that as pedestrianised areas were government land, organisers of on-street promotional activities which took place in these areas were required to seek prior permission from Government. When considering such applications, concerned departments (e.g. Lands Department, Transport Department, the Police, as appropriate) would take into consideration relevant factors such as the scale of the activities, duration and impact on pedestrian flow, etc.

Definition of hawking

51. Referring to paragraph 5 of the Administration's paper, Dr Fernando CHEUNG asked whether cases in which operators promoting services, e.g. internet service or skimming schemes, required members of the public who subscribed the services to sign contracts or pay by credit card on the spot would be regarded as a kind of sale activities.

52. AD(O)3 explained that what constituted unlicensed hawking had been defined under Cap. 132. Activities which did not involve actual sale of goods or merchandise were not considered as hawking. She added that FEHD had sought legal advice and it was affirmed that activities involving only the receiving of cash as deposit but no actual sale of goods was found on the spot were not regarded as hawking under Cap. 132.

53. The Deputy Chairman asked whether it constituted hawking under Cap. 132 if the promoter received cash payment from a member of the public for purchase of services from the promoter. AD(O)3 responded that the situation that cash transaction took place during the offering for hire of personal service, e.g. shoe polishing, it would be regarded as hawking under Cap. 132.

54. The Deputy Chairman further asked whether it constituted hawking under Cap. 132 if the promoter received cash payment from a member of the public for, e.g. subscribing to internet services. AD(O)3 responded that such activity did not constitute hawking under Cap. 132. The Deputy Chairman requested AD(O)3 to provide members with relevant legal advice for reference. AD(O)3 agreed to provide relevant information in writing.

55. Dr Fernando CHEUNG queried that there might be inconsistency in policy as the Administration, on the one hand, allowed on-street promotion and advertising activities to continue and, on the other hand, banned hawking, which might also affect the livelihood of many people. DDHA(1) explained that due to resource constraints, enforcement departments had to set priorities in taking enforcement action with reference to the extent of nuisances caused.

Action

On-street performances

56. Ms Audrey EU said that she had attended the LegCo Members' meeting with Wan Chai DC (WCDC) members on the previous day and noted that WCDC members had expressed interest in developing on-street performances in Wan Chai District. She said that on-street performances were popular in overseas countries and attractive to tourists. She considered that there were suitable tourist spots in Hong Kong (e.g. the Golden Bauhinia Square) for giving such performances which would also be conducive to the development of local cultural industry. She asked whether the Administration would support the development of on-street performances by designating an area in each suitable tourist spot for giving these performances. She also asked whether consideration would be given to imposing control on these performances, e.g. working out some criteria for screening performers who would be allowed to perform at the designated areas.

Admin 57. DDHA(1) responded that the Home Affairs Department would adopt an open attitude on the matter. As performances in public places would have implications on the pedestrian flow and law and order of the locations concerned, WCDC could further discuss with WC District Office on its proposal and the relevant departments would be consulted as appropriate.

Clerk 58. Ms Audrey EU suggested that the relevant minutes of meeting on this issue should be copied to the Chairman of WCDC for reference. The Deputy Chairman requested the Clerk to follow-up.

59. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 12:55 pm.

Council Business Division 2
Legislative Council Secretariat
9 May 2007