

Translation

Minutes of the Third Meeting of the Kowloon City District Urban Renewal Forum

Date: 9 November 2011 (Wednesday)

Time: 2:30p.m.

Venue: The Hall, 4/F, S.K.H. Holy Carpenter Church Community Centre, No.1 Dyer Avenue, Hung Hom, Kowloon

Present:

Chairman: Dr Greg Wong Chak-yan

Members: Mr James Mathew Fong

Ms May Fung Mei-wah

Mr Ho Hin-ming

Rev Hor Yiu-man

Ms Christine Kwok Mun-yee

Dr Lawrence Poon Wing-cheung

Ms Peggy Poon Wing-yin

Ms Siu Yuen-sheung

Dr Tang Bo-sin

Mr Wen Choy-bon

Mr Wong Kam-sing

Ms Connie Wong Wai-ching

Ms Iris Tam Siu-ying

Executive Director
(Planning and Project
Control), Urban Renewal
Authority

Mr Thomas Chan Chi-ching

Senior Liaison Officer,
Kowloon City District
Office (Building
Management)
(Representing Ms Winky
So Yuen-ling, District
Officer (Kowloon City) to
attend the meeting)

Mr Eric Yue Chi-kin	District Planning Officer / Kowloon, Planning Department
Mr Lee Wai-bun	Chief Traffic Engineer / Kowloon, Transport Department
Ms Winnie So Chui-ying	Principal Assistant Secretary (Planning and Lands), Development Bureau

Secretary: Ms Lily Yam Ya-may	Chief Town Planner / District Urban Renewal Forum, Planning Department
-------------------------------	---

Absent:

Members: Mr Daniel Lau King-shing
Mr Timothy Ma Kam-wah

In attendance: Mr Chan Bing-woon	Chairman, Joint Mediation Helpline Office Limited
Mr Yip Wing-san Roy Bowie	Mediation Consultant, Joint Mediation Helpline Office Limited
Ms Ng Tsui-shan	Scheme Officer, Joint Mediation Helpline Office Limited
Ms Lee Suk-ling	Project Leader, Senior Citizen Home Safety Association
Mr Ng Ka-ho	Social Worker, Senior Citizen Home Safety Association

The Chairman welcomed all Members, Mr Chan Bing-woon, Chairman, Mr Yip Wing-san Roy Bowie, Mediation Consultant and Ms Ng Tsui-shan, Scheme Officer of Joint Mediation Helpline Office Limited, and Ms Lee Suk-ling, Project Leader and Mr Ng Ka-ho, Social Worker of Senior Citizen Home Safety Association to the meeting.

Agenda Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of Second Meeting

2. **The Chairman** said that requests had been received from two Members for amendment to the draft minutes of the second meeting of the Kowloon City District Urban Renewal Forum (“DURF”). The revised minutes of meeting were forwarded to Members by email. No other amendments were received afterwards. As agreed by Members, the Chairman announced that the minutes of meeting were confirmed.

Agenda Item 2 Matters Arising

3. **The Chairman** indicated that matters arising from the work plan and work items of DURF mentioned in the last meeting would be discussed under Agenda Item 4.

Agenda Item 3 Provision of Support to Minority Owners Affected by Private Acquisition or Compulsory Sale (Discussion Paper No.: DURF KC/07/2011)

4. **The Chairman** invited Ms Winnie So Chui-ying and the representatives of the Joint Mediation Helpline Office Limited (“JMHO”) and Senior Citizen Home Safety Association (“SCHSA”) to introduce the content of the Paper to Members.

5. **Ms Winnie So Chui-ying** briefed Members on the background and implementation of the Land (Compulsory Sale for Redevelopment) Ordinance (“Ordinance”), the Estate Agents Authority’s existing regulation of estate agents and Guidelines issued by the Lands Tribunal on mediation. She also briefed Members on the support services

provided to minority owners by the Development Bureau (“DEVB”), which includes the commission of the Hong Kong Housing Society (“HKHS”) and the Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors to provide free information services to the public, the launching of the Pilot Mediation Scheme and the Pilot Scheme on Outreach Support Service for Elderly Owners on 27 January 2011, and the relevant public education and publicity activities.

6. **Mr Chan Bing-woon** introduced the composition and service coverage of the JMHO to Members and elaborated the concept and merits of mediation. Mr Yip Wing-san Roy Bowie briefed Members on the Pilot Mediation Scheme launched under the Ordinance, including the background and purpose of the scheme, target group, process, fees of mediators and venue support, fee assistance for senior citizens and case statistics.

7. **Ms Lee Suk-ling** introduced the service coverage of the “Pilot Scheme on Outreach Support Service for Elderly Owners” provided by the SCHSA, including outreaching service, advisory service, casework service and community education. She also furnished Members with the statistics of the scheme.

8. **The Chairman** invited Members to put forth opinions on the above support service and pilot schemes.

9. **Ms Siu Yuen-sheung** considered that wider publicity should be given to the Pilot Mediation Scheme, clearly indicating the relevant services would help more old buildings’ owners and senior citizens on problems of compulsory sale of buildings. She also hoped that the DEVB or Urban Renewal Authority (“URA”) could render more financial assistance to the owners so that they would be more willing to use the relevant services.

10. **Ms Connie Wong Wai-ching** opined that the mediation service could help facilitate the revitalisation of Kowloon City District. She agreed that in comparison with litigation, mediation could save both money and time. Moreover, apropos opinions could be offered to help the senior citizens and minority owners to face the acquisition from the

private developers. She proposed to give wider publicity, for example, distribution of publicity leaflets to the buildings aged 40 years or above. Furthermore, she asked if the target group of the Pilot Mediation Scheme included the majority owners and whether there would be misunderstanding that the Government showed favoritism to the developers. She also wanted to know under the Scheme, whether restrictions were imposed on the identity and background of the majority owners requested for mediation.

11. **Ms Winnie So Chui-ying** indicated that the DEVB had all along given publicity to the scheme, including broadcasting publicity video and holding public talks; for instance, the talk held in Kowloon City District on invitation from the District Office in September 2011 and publicity was also given at Commercial Radio by the JMHOL in October. She mentioned that in future, more talks and publicity activities would be organized with the relevant service organisations having regard to the requests from different districts. In this connection, she welcomed Members to give suggestions. In addition, she pointed out that the Pilot Mediation Scheme aimed to facilitate parties involved in compulsory sale to identify suitable mediators for both sides through the JMHOL to offer mediation with independent and unbiased professional assistance. Under the Pilot Scheme, financial assistance was not provided to the majority owners to cover the fees of mediators. Only those elderly owners who could meet the age and asset requirements were provided with financial assistance to cover the fees of mediators. In addition, she stressed that the purpose of mediation was to help both sides to enter into settlement through the assistance of the mediators, and the responsibility of the mediators was not to persuade the minority owners to accept the acquisition offer of the majority owners.

12. She also reiterated to Members on the background of mediation as an alternative dispute resolution and indicated that the President of the Lands Tribunal had promulgated a Direction pursuant to the Lands Tribunal Ordinance. With effect from 15 February 2011, parties involved in compulsory sale cases were requested to attempt mediation as soon as practicable prior to the hearing of the cases before the Tribunal.

13. **Mr Chan Bing-woon** expressed that litigation was not the only way to settle the dispute. By comparison, offering mediation as soon as practicable was more cost-effective. He understood that at present the citizens did not have a good understanding of mediation. They would continue to co-operate with the local community of various districts to promote the concept.

14. In response, **Mr Yip Wing-san Roy Bowie** pointed out that the JMHOL would provide assistance equally and fairly to both majority owners and minority owners. The main responsibility of the mediators was to assist both sides to understand the problem instead of providing opinions during the process of mediation. He also remarked that apart from solving the pecuniary problem, mediation could help solve other problems faced by the owners, thus facilitating both sides to reach a settlement agreement.

15. **Rev Hor Yiu-man** asked after both sides had come to preliminary settlement agreement, whether there would be a cooling-off period for both sides to consider the relevant decision or amend the agreement, and whether mechanisms would be developed to protect the disadvantaged owners in case there was a change in economic or other conditions.

16. **Mr Chan Bing-woon** added that should the mediators came across any unfair situations in the process of mediation, they should solve the relevant problems first before continuing to offer mediation. If the problems could not be resolved, mediation would be terminated. He indicated that during the process of mediation, joint meetings and individual meetings would be held. In individual meetings, the mediators would judge whether both sides needed more time for consideration before continuing to offer mediation, and the documents signed after mediation would become legally binding. Given that mediation was offered through mutual agreement, if there was any dissatisfaction during the process, mediation can be terminated at any time. Hence it is unlikely that there would be dissatisfaction with the final agreement after mediation and there would not be any appeal mechanism.

17. **Ms Christine Kwok Mun-ye** supported the service provided by the Pilot Scheme on Outreach Support Service for Elderly Owners. She considered that the service should be continued and should be extended to the minority owners of different districts. In addition, she asked why only one mediation case was successfully conducted with settlement agreement reached during the 9-month period of the Pilot Mediation Scheme.

18. **Mr Yip Wing-san Roy Bowie** pointed out that among the 15 cases resolved by the parties themselves, the majority was handled by the same law firm representing the same developer, and it was also the same law firm of the case in which mediation was successfully conducted. He believed that the reason why the relevant cases could be resolved by the parties themselves were mainly because the law firm had gained experiences in the case which mediation was successfully conducted, thus reaching agreement with other minority owners became easier through negotiation. He also stated that both sides could hold private negotiations before attempting mediation. If the problem could be solved through negotiations, there would be no need to choose mediation or litigation method. Negotiation, mediation and litigation were ways of settling the disputes. Further, he said that the information in the Paper only indicates the statistics as at the end of October. Currently the new cases and cases under processing had increased. As the cases involved were in different situations and faced different difficulties, they would take time to handle.

19. **Ms Winnie So Chui-ying** indicated that the DEVB had decided to extend the Pilot Scheme on Outreach Support Service for Elderly Owners for one year and would call for tenders to identify service provider with regard to the service in the coming year. She also indicated that the current service would be expanded to two teams next year. In reply to the query of a Member on why there was only one successful case during the 9-month period of Pilot Mediation Scheme, she mentioned that among the 119 applications for compulsory sale since the Ordinance came into operation in 1999, the 49 adjourned or withdrawn cases were cases that the majority owners and minority owners settled their differences through negotiation. Thus it could be seen that the majority owners had all along negotiated with the minority

owners themselves, and the Pilot Mediation Scheme was not the only way to reach agreement. However, the Pilot Mediation Scheme had a certain promotion effect in terms of mediation as alternative dispute resolution.

20. **Mr Chan Bing-woon** said that if the owner of a flat was successful in solving the problem through mediation, the owners in the same district would make reference to the relevant result and choose to solve the problem by negotiation.

21. **Mr James Mathew Fong** recognised that mediation was the prevailing trend in the society. He asked whether the legal representative was allowed to be present to provide assistance during the process of mediation, and whether class action of individual owners was allowed to mediate with the developer. He took the view that the government should not provide support to the minority owners only after the compulsory auction procedure started. Instead, the government should give publicity and support to minority owners when the developer gathered titles.

22. In response, **Mr Chan Bing-woon** clarified that the legal representative was allowed to be present in the process of mediation. However, as mediation and litigation patterns were different, offering advices from the legal point of view on mediation and adopting litigation approach might not be helpful. Under a mutually agreed situation, the owners could bring other people to participate in mediation. They even encouraged the owners to be accompanied by persons they could trust so that the owners could have confidence to express their opinions. Besides, he supported the provision of assistance other than legal services to the minority owners before the compulsory auction procedure started, but presently there was a lack of experts to provide the relevant service.

23. **Ms LI Shuk-ling** indicated that in many current cases the owners only sought assistance when encountering problems during property acquisition, including having no knowledge of legal documents and clauses. For this reason there were lawyer and surveyor consultants in their team to propound opinions for relevant cases, and the signing of the agreements was left to the discretion of the elderly owners. On

holding education talks, the SCHSA would remind the owners on the matters needing attention when facing with the acquisition offer of the developers, including the agreement terms and removal date.

24. **Ms Siu Yuen-sheung** expressed that the citizens would seek assistance from district council members when facing with acquisition offers. She would advise the citizens not to sign the agreements before having a clear understanding about the details of the provisions. If there was something they did not understand they should take the initiative to seek legal aid.

25. **Dr Tang Po-sin** asked whether the DEVB would incorporate provisions in the future tendering contract to strengthen the services in Kowloon City District.

26. **Ms Winnie So Chui-ying** stated that for the time being the DEVB was unsure about the number of cases in Kowloon City District. The existing scheme was mainly to set up elderly owners support teams in Hong Kong Island and Kowloon District. The DEVB would pay attention to newspaper coverage and browse the webpage of the Judiciary from time to time to obtain information about compulsory auction and pass such information to the two service providers. If there was a series of coverage of compulsory sale in a particular district, the SCHSA would proactively visit the concerned buildings in the district. In fact, similar action was taken in Kowloon City District in the past. She therefore opined that even provisions had not been incorporated in the tendering contract specifying the enhancement of service in Kowloon City District, the future service providers would still handle the cases in Kowloon City District flexibly and would provide services to the elderly owners in the district.

27. **The Chairman** stated that during the site visits conducted earlier on, he noted that a good few of the titles in the eight “Wan Streets” had been acquired by the private developer. He asked whether help-seeking cases from the area had been received.

28. In response, **Ms LI Shuk-ling** indicated that a good few of the titles in the eight “Wan Streets” had been acquired and the team had

proactively visited the flats that had not yet been acquired. In the meantime, they planned to proactively visit the flat owners of the remaining four streets in the next month and offer suitable assistance.

29. **The Chairman** considered that the relevant discussion could have publicity effect, enabling the citizens to be aware of the pilot schemes which rendered assistance to the minority owners. He hoped that after DURF had formulated the Urban Renewal Plan, the concerned organisations could attend the DURF meeting again to have more in-depth discussion. He thanked the DEVB for submitting the Discussion Paper and the service providers of the two Pilot Schemes for attending the meeting.

**Agenda Item 4 Study on Urban Renewal Plan for Kowloon City and Social Impact Assessment of Urban Renewal Plan in Kowloon City
(Discussion Paper No.: DURF KC/08/2011)**

30. **The Chairman** invited the Secretary to introduce the content of the Discussion Paper to Members.

31. **The Secretary** briefed Members in detail on the scope, consultant steering work and consultant selection arrangements of the Study on Urban Renewal Plan for Kowloon City (“the Planning Study”) and the Social Impact Assessment of Urban Renewal Plan in Kowloon City (“SIA”).

32. **The Chairman** indicated that the tendering procedure would be undertaken in accordance with the government’s practice. Members could decide on their participation in the Steering Group of the two studies within one week and elect its convener. As regards the Consultant Selection Board, the main tasks would include endorsing the technical assessment results submitted by the Assessment Panel (“AP”), opening the fee proposals submitted by the bidders, and determining the award of contracts according to the combined scores on the basis of the agreed technical / fee weightings.

33. **Mr James Mathew Fong** asked whether the Planning Study and SIA were supervised by the same Study Steering Group or each Study had its own Study Steering Group.

34. **The Chairman** clarified that the preliminary idea was each study had its own Study Steering Group. The group, comprised of about seven members, would report the progress regularly to DURF.

35. **Mr James Mathew Fong** asked whether the structure of the Study Working Group and Study Steering Group could be simplified so that Members could directly participate in the Study Working Group to put forth opinions to the Consultants. In this regard, it was unnecessary to set up Study Steering Group.

36. **The Chairman** explained that the Study Working Group would comprise of relevant government departments with the main task of co-ordinating various government departments opinions. **The Secretary** added that apart from its main task of co-ordinating the government department's opinion, the Study Working Group would also give opinions to the Consultants on the professional and technical aspects of the study, monitor the study progress and examine the content of the study report, and then submit the result to the Study Steering Group. On the other hand, the Study Steering Group would provide guidance to the Consultants on the study directions and the major works, and would recommend to DURF the acceptance of the study reports and major milestone/study results.

37. **Mr LEE Wai-bun** expressed that the structure of the Study Steering Group and Study Working Group proposed by the Secretariat was in line with government projects. The Study Consultants would conduct the study in the light of the directions of the Steering Group. When the Consultants encountered professional and technical problems in the process of study or the ways of solving technical problems, the case would be referred to the Study Working Group comprised of government departments to provide professional advice and guidance on the technical aspects. When the Consultants had problems on the study directions, the Study Steering Group would make a decision.

38. **Mr James Mathew Fong** was of the view that DURF Members should play the guidance role in the two studies and agreed that the technical problems should be solved by government departments.

39. **Ms Iris Tam Siu-ying** asked whether the URA could participate in the Steering Groups of the two studies. **The Chairman** pointed out that as the URA had a close relationship with the two studies, it could send representatives to participate in the Steering Groups of the two studies.

40. **Dr Tang Bo-sin** remarked that the establishment of the Study Steering Group and Study Working Group was the usual practice of the government and had his support. Since there was a close relationship between the two studies, he opined that it might not be necessary to set up Study Steering Group for each study. Thus repeated reporting procedures could be streamlined and the different opinions between the two Study Steering Groups could be avoided. He suggested that whether establishing two Study Steering Groups could be decided after appointing the Consultants.

41. **The Chairman** said that the Study Steering Group meetings would be much frequent than the DURF meetings and Members could listen to the progress reports of the two studies at the DURF meetings. If most DURF Members participated in the same Study Steering Group, there would be overlapping of structures.

42. **Ms Connie Wong Wai-ching** supported the establishment of Study Steering Group for each study and stated that the nature of the two studies was different. As the Study Steering Group meetings would be held more frequent than the DURF meetings, she proposed that Members' participation in the two Study Steering Groups should be on a voluntary basis. In this way the progress of each study could be fully discussed whereas interested Members could participate in both Study Steering Groups to understand the correlation between the two studies.

43. **The Chairman** suggested that whether establishing Study Steering Group for each study should be decided based on the enrolment situation of Members.

44. **Mr Winnie So chui-ying** proposed that consideration could be given to amend the terms of reference of the Study Steering Group and Study Working Group as shown in Annex 5 and Annex 6 of the Discussion Paper so as to precisely reflect that the Study Working Group only provided assistance to the Study Steering Group, and they were of primary and secondary nature respectively, that is, the work of the Study Working Group was only to provide assistance on the technical aspects.

45. **Ms Connie Wong Wai-ching** said that Annex 6 of the Discussion Paper had clearly stated the terms of reference of the Study Working Group, including taking forward the study directions and recommendations of the Study Steering Group and advising the Study Steering Group to endorse the study reports and working papers submitted by the Consultants. The Study Working Group's nature of providing assistance to the Study Steering Group had been sufficiently reflected.

46. **The Chairman** added that the Study Steering Group was mainly to provide guidance on the study directions while the Study Working Group was mainly responsible to solve technical and feasibility problems.

47. **Dr Lawrence Poon Wing-cheung** supported the establishment of Study Steering Group. With a relatively small membership, the Study Steering Group could be more focused to discuss the related problems in detail. When DURF discussed the relevant documents, the discussion could be enhanced since the Study Steering Group had discussed the related problems in detail. On the other hand, if DURF and the Steering Group held different opinions, the case could be referred to the Steering Group for discussion again to strengthen the study findings.

48. **Ms Iris Tam Siu-ying** indicated that as for the studies conducted by the government, all members of APs were government department representatives. However, since the two studies to be conducted by DURF were not funded by the government, she suggested that consideration could be given to let DURF Members join the AP. **The Chairman** remarked that the AP members had to be responsible to

assist in scoring the technical proposals submitted by the bidders, including the curriculum vitae of the key personnel in the consultant team and the past performance of the consultant company. To mark the score, the AP members should have a certain professional knowledge.

49. In the opinion of **Ms Winnie So Chui-ying**, the URA had considerable experiences in the selection and appointment of the Planning and SIA Consultants. She suggested that the URA should be invited as an AP member. **The Chairman** expressed that according to the Discussion Paper, the AP members would be professional representatives from the Planning Department, the relevant Government bureaux/departments and organisations. He welcomed professional representative from the URA to participate in the panel.

50. **Dr Lawrence Poon Wing-cheung** proposed that DURF Members could act as observers in the AP so as to have greater transparency in consultant selection.

51. **Mr Wong Kam-sing** mentioned that he had taken part in some tendering exercises in the past. In addition to inviting observers, AP members and observers would be arranged to hold an interview with the bidders. After the interview, the AP members would listen to the observers' opinions, and then score the technical proposals submitted by the bidders. In his view such experience could be used for reference.

52. **The Chairman** stated that Members would be invited to act as observers in the AP on a voluntary basis. Furthermore, the Secretariat would carry out the tendering exercises for the studies and the related consultant selection arrangement and consultant steering work taking into account the result of Members' discussion.

**Agenda Item 5 Proposal of Undertaking Revitalization Initiatives
With Non-Government Organisations
(Discussion Paper No.: DURF KC/09/2011)**

53. **The Chairman** invited the Secretary to introduce the content of the Discussion Paper to Members.

54. **The Secretary** briefed Members on the background of the Discussion Paper, the implementation framework of proposed revitalisation initiatives and the conditions for the selection of collaborating parties. **The Chairman** expressed that DURF intended to work with non-government organisations (“NGOs”) and the relevant task would be in tandem with DURF’s area of work in terms of offering proposals for revitalisation initiatives and implementing public education programmes for the Kowloon City District. DURF would publicise the above proposal and wish to have responses from NGOs. DURF would then negotiate the details with the organisations concerned with a view to implementing the relevant plan.

55. **Mr Wong Kam-sing** asked whether the target group of the plan included professional institutions or universities. **The Chairman** clarified that apart from local organisations or art groups, local universities were also included.

56. **Ms May Fung Mei-wah** proposed mobilising local organisations such as the tenants of Cattle Depot Artist Village and other local organizations / schools to take part. However, organisers of the relevant activities must have certain abilities. Her opinion was that participation in revitalisation initiatives should not be restricted to NGOs in Kowloon City District. Yet the revitalisation initiatives should be in tandem with the local characters.

57. **Ms Connie Wong Wai-ching** supported the proposal of the Paper and indicated that apart from formulating the Urban Renewal Plan for Kowloon City District, DURF could meet the short-term and long-term targets by organising short-term and medium-term urban revitalisation activities. She suggested working with some experienced NGOs, or even more than one NGO, to undertake a series of revitalisation initiatives during the current term of office of DURF. She mentioned that the Kowloon Federation of Associations organised the East Kowloon Culture and Art Seeding Programme last year. On top of arts promotion, cultural heritage conservation and tourism development were also facilitated. It was her opinion that the idea could be disseminated to Kowloon City district, for example, the scenic places such as Kowloon

Walled City Park and Cattle Depot.

58. **Ms Christine Kwok Mun-yee** was concerned that the proposed revitalisation initiatives of DURF might overlap with the relevant initiatives undertaken by the Government. She considered that DURF should concentrate on urban renewal issues in the district, including the revitalisation initiatives proposed under the Urban Renewal Plan.

59. **Rev Hor Yiu-man** said that community revitalisation should be a comprehensive idea. The whole community should be covered instead of just concentrating on individual streets or places.

60. **Mr Ho Hin-ming** supported the proposal and considered that attention should be given to the selection of NGOs, and then the concerned parties would offer proposals for the implementation of revitalisation initiatives. He suggested expanding the conditions in the Discussion Paper that the concerned NGOs shall have an extensive district network in Kowloon City District, thus allowing NGOs outside the Kowloon City District to take part.

61. In response, **the Secretary** clarified that with regard to the four conditions mentioned in the Discussion Paper, the concerned NGOs only had to fulfill one or more conditions, instead of fulfilling all conditions.

62. **Ms Iris Tam Siu-ying** indicated that the Urban Renewal Fund (“URF”) mentioned in the Discussion Paper was one of the funding sources of the revitalisation initiatives. Although DURF would not directly participate in the implementation of the revitalisation initiatives, if DURF thought that the revitalisation initiatives proposed by the concerned NGOs were of contribution to the Kowloon City District as a whole, DURF could endorse the relevant proposals so that the URF would be aware of the support given by DURF when considering the concerned NGOs’ applications for funds.

63. **The Chairman** recognised that the main task of DURF was to formulate the Urban Renewal Plan for Kowloon City District. However, it could also have due attention to the implementation of some short-term

and medium-term revitalisation initiatives. He concluded that the Secretariat would identify suitable parties based on Members' discussion and submit the proposed revitalisation plans for Members' consideration.

Agenda Item 6 Proposed Criteria on and Arrangements for Handling Public Requests for Personal Attendance at Meetings to Make Representations on Urban Renewal
(Discussion Paper No.: DURF KC/10/2011)

64. **The Chairman** invited the Secretary to introduce the content of the Discussion Paper to Members.

65. **The Secretary** briefed Members on the content of the Discussion Paper, including the proposed criteria for making representations and handling arrangements.

66. **Mr James Mathew Fong** asked whether the proposals had notable differences with the public engagement activities conducted by the Planning Study and SIA Study Consultants. He was in support of public engagement. Nevertheless, the Study Consultants would also conduct the public engagement activities such as workshops. He was worried that the proposals would overlap with the channels or procedures for public engagement within the studies.

67. **Ms May Fung Mei-wah** agreed that representations made by the citizens could be referred to Study Consultants for follow-up action. She asked whether the Study Consultants were required to consider the representations.

68. In response, **the Chairman** indicated that members of the public wanted to attend the DURF meetings personally to make representations instead of offering opinions to Study Consultants. The purpose of the Discussion Paper was to lay down criteria for handling representations to facilitate the Secretariat in handling relevant requests. If the representations were related to the Urban Renewal Plans for Kowloon City, DURF could refer the proposals to the Study Consultants

for follow-up action after listening to the representations.

69. **Mr Ho Hin-ming** took the view that if the representations were within the study scope of the Consultants, the proposals could be referred to the Consultants for consideration. With regard to the other representations outside the study scope, DURF had to impose conditions for the consideration of representations. He supported the proposals of the Discussion Paper.

70. **Mr Wen Choy-bon** spoke in favour of the proposals of the Discussion Paper. He opined that DURF should listen to the citizens' opinions and suggestions through different channels. Appointment of Consultants was also in the hope of listening to public views via the Consultants. The Discussion Paper had clearly stated the criteria, he believed that DURF could consolidate the opinions of citizens and Consultants.

71. **Mr James Mathew Fong** agreed that the matters within the scope of the two studies could be referred to the Study Consultants for handling and follow-up action. For matters outside the study scope, representations could be presented at the DURF meeting.

72. **Mr Tang Bo-sin** suggested that the time of each representation should be restricted in the interest of fairness.

73. **Ms May Fung Mei-wah** proposed that during the period of conducting the two studies, the representations could be referred to the Study Consultants for follow-up action. After finishing the studies, members of the public should be allowed to attend the DURF meetings personally to make representations on urban renewal.

74. **Ms Siu Yuen-sheung** supported allowing members of the public to attend the DURF meetings personally to make representations, but considered that the time of each representation should be restricted.

75. **Ms Iris Tam Siu-ying** indicated that some members of the public might expect that DURF could help them to solve individual problems. She suggested that DURF should manage the expectations

from the public. If the representation fell within the scope of the Planning Study, the subject could be suitably referred to the Study Consultants for follow-up action.

76. **The Secretary** pointed out that the decision of the meeting would be uploaded to the DURF's website for public information.

77. **The Chairman** concluded the discussion that all Members supported public engagement, but their opinions on the criteria for making representations were different. He proposed that the time of representation could be restricted to 20 minutes. The amended criteria and handling arrangements would be circulated to Members and uploaded onto the DURF's website.

Agenda Item 7 Any Other Business

78. There being no other matters for discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Secretariat

Kowloon City District Urban Renewal Forum

November 2011