

Executive Summary

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In February 2005, the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region Government commissioned the Public Policy Research Institute (PPRI) of The Hong Kong Polytechnic University to carry out a consultancy on public opinions on the West Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD) project. This Executive Summary presents the key findings of the study.

BACKGROUND OF THE WEST KOWLOON CULTURAL DISTRICT

In November 1999, the Chief Executive-in-Council ordered that the use of the southern part of the West Kowloon Reclamation be reviewed to facilitate the development of a world-class integrated arts, cultural and entertainment district. In April 2001, Government launched the West Kowloon Reclamation Concept Plan Competition and subsequently in February 2002, it was announced that a team led by Foster and Partners, whose design featured a Canopy, was awarded the first prize.

In September 2003, Government announced the Invitation for Proposals (IFP) for the development of the WKCD, and invited development proposals from the private sector, with the intention that the Successful Proponent would be awarded a Land Grant for a term of 50 years. Within the term of the Land Grant, the Successful Proponent would be required to operate, maintain and manage the Core Arts and Cultural Facilities for 30 years. Mandatory requirements included the provision of Core Arts and Cultural Facilities such as a Theatre Complex, a Performance Venue, a Museum Cluster, an Art Exhibition Centre, a Water Amphitheatre, four Piazza Areas, and a Canopy covering at least 55% of the Development Area.

By the submission deadline in June 2004, Government had received five proposals. In November 2004, Government announced that three out of the five proposals met all the mandatory requirements of the IFP and were screened in for further assessment. The three screened-in proposals were from:

- Dynamic Star International Limited
- Sunny Development Limited and
- World City Culture Park Limited .

A public consultation exercise on the development of West Kowloon Cultural District was launched in mid-December 2004 and lasted until the end of June 2005.

During the consultation period, free admission exhibitions on the screened-in proposals were held at Hong Kong Science Museum in Tsim Sha Tsui, Hong Kong City Hall in Central and Hong Kong Heritage Museum in Sha Tin, respectively. Relevant information on the screened-in Proposals and the WKCD were accessible from Government's WKCD website. The public was invited to provide feedback by filling in Comment Cards. Government also organized a number of discussion forums with presentation by the screened-in Proponents. The public could participate and made comments instantly at the discussion forums. The public could also make written submissions to Government.

Executive Summary

Discussions on the WKCD took place and motions were passed in both the Legislative Council and the District Councils. A Subcommittee on West Kowloon Cultural District Development under the House Committee of the Legislative Council released a Report on its Phase I Study on 6 July 2005.

THIS CONSULTANCY

Under this Consultancy, the PPRI was required to:

- (a) conduct three Telephone Polls for the purpose of gauging and triangulating public views; and
- (b) conduct an analysis of public views obtained from (i) Comment Cards during the public consultation exercise, (ii) records of the eight discussion forums conducted by Government, (iii) records of relevant deliberations and reports of advisory/statutory bodies including the Legislative Council and District Councils, (iv) written submissions, letters, faxes and emails sent to Government during the consultation period and (v) the three Telephone Polls.

The PPRI operates with total academic independence and is not connected with any other academic unit in The Hong Kong Polytechnic University. The analyses, findings, and interpretation of the findings contained in this Report reflect the views of the PPRI and do not necessarily reflect those of the University or Government.

COMMENT CARDS

Government organized a series of exhibitions on the three screened-in proposals. Comment Cards were distributed at these venues and visitors to the exhibitions could complete and drop them into collection boxes before leaving the exhibition venue. Alternatively, they could submit the form (via the Internet either at the exhibition site or elsewhere), or by fax or post. Information on the three screened-in proposals was also available on Government's WKCD website, where members of the public could complete the Comment Card online after viewing. A total of 33,416 Comment Cards were received by 30 June 2005.

There were seven questions in the Comment Card. The first six questions contained both a close-ended (multiple choice) part and an open-ended part on various aspects of the screened-in proposals. Question 7 was an open-ended question inviting any other comments. Each Comment Card had a section towards the end in which the respondent was requested to supply, on an optional basis, his/her name, Hong Kong Identity Card number, signature, and a declaration whether he/she and/or family members worked for a property developer. A total of 49.2% of the Comment Cards contained one or more of the above information. 1.5% of the respondents indicated that they had property developer affiliations.

The PPRI had been alerted to the fact that a number of Comment Cards received used an identical envelope/ mailing label, and that their answers to the questions were very similar. These Comment Cards have been flagged and the results are presented with and without these flagged Cards for Question 6 - *Which Proposal Should be Taken*

Executive Summary

Forward to the Next Phase? A total of 4,176 Cards of this nature were detected – 12.5% of the total Cards received.

CLOSE-ENDED QUESTIONS*

Below is the summary of the answers to the six close-ended questions.

Question 1: Integrated Development/Balanced Development Mix

1. 77.9% of Comment Cards responded to Questions 1. Among them:
 - 49.5% of the respondents (excluding missing or invalid responses) indicated the proposal from Z as their preference;
 - 34.4% of the respondents (excluding missing or invalid responses) indicated the proposal from X as their preference; and
 - 16.1% of the respondents (excluding missing or invalid responses) indicated the proposal from Y as their preference.
2. The remaining 22.1% of the responses were missing or invalid.

Question 2: Design and Physical Layout

1. 73.8% of Comment Cards responded to Question 2. Among them:
 - 51.7% of the respondents (excluding missing or invalid responses) indicated Z's proposal as their preference;
 - 32.2% of the respondents (excluding missing or invalid responses) indicated X's proposal as their preference; and
 - 16.2% of the respondents (excluding missing or invalid responses) indicated Y's proposal as their preference.
2. The remaining 26.2% of the responses were missing or invalid.

Question 3: Design for the Canopy

1. 72.1% of the Comment Cards responded to Question 3. Among them:
 - 52.7% of the respondents (excluding missing or invalid responses) indicated Z's proposal as their preference;
 - 30.8% of the respondents (excluding missing or invalid responses) indicated X's proposal as their preference; and
 - 16.5% of the respondents (excluding missing or invalid responses) indicated Y's proposal as their preference.
2. The remaining 27.9% of the responses were missing or invalid.

*The percentages shown for questions 1 to 5 may not add up to 100% due to rounding of figures. For question 6, respondents were allowed to choose more than one proposal. The total, therefore, does not equal to 100%.

*Executive Summary****Question 4: Operating the Arts and Cultural Facilities***

1. 67.6% of the Comment Cards responded to Question 4. Among them:
 - 57.4% of the respondents (excluding missing or invalid responses) indicated Z's proposal as their preference;
 - 27.8% of the respondents (excluding missing or invalid responses) indicated X's proposal as their preference; and
 - 14.7% of the respondents (excluding missing or invalid responses) indicated Y's proposal as their preference.
2. The remaining 32.4% of the responses were missing or invalid.

Question 5: Governing the Arts and Cultural Facilities

1. 63.8% of the Comment Cards responded to Question 5. Among them:
 - 57.1% of the respondents (excluding missing or invalid responses) indicated Z's proposal as their preference;
 - 27.6% of the respondents (excluding missing or invalid responses) indicated X's proposal as their preference; and
 - 15.3% of the respondents (excluding missing or invalid responses) indicated Y's proposal as their preference.
2. The remaining 36.2% of the responses were missing or invalid.

Question 6: Which Proposal to Take Forward to the Next Phase?

1. 72.7% of the Comment Cards responded to Question 6. Among them:
 - 42.6% of the respondents (excluding missing or invalid responses) indicated Z's proposal should go forward; and altogether 54.7% of the respondents (excluding missing or invalid responses) chose Z's only or together with other proposals;
 - 22.3% of the respondents (excluding missing or invalid responses) indicated X's proposal should go forward; and altogether 33.8% of the respondents (excluding missing or invalid responses) chose X's only or together with other proposals;
 - 11.8% of the respondents (excluding missing or invalid responses) indicated Y's proposal should go forward; and altogether 18.2% of the respondents (excluding missing or invalid responses) chose Y's only or together with other proposals;
 - 2.2% of the respondents (excluding missing or invalid responses) indicated all three proposals should go forward; and
 - 9.4% of the respondents (excluding missing or invalid responses) indicated none of the three proposals should go forward.
2. The remaining 27.3% of the responses were missing or invalid.

Executive Summary

To summarize, the rank order in terms of the percentage of respondents favouring a particular proposal is: Z, X and Y. This pattern is consistent regarding different aspects of WKCD and for the most part, over time.

Regarding which proposal(s) should be taken forward to the next phase (Question 6), 54.7% of the respondents preferred Z (together with other proposals), 33.8% preferred X (together with other proposals), and 18.2% preferred Y (together with other proposals). 9.4% thought that none of the proposals should be taken forward.

For Question 6, the rank order for the three proposals does not change with the flagged cases excluded. However, the gap between Z and X becomes narrower with these cases excluded. The percentage favouring Z drops from 54.7% to 47.8% while the percentage favouring X increases from 33.8% to 39.9% for Question 6.

Multivariate Analysis

Multiple Discriminant Analysis was performed to determine which factors, identified in the Comment Cards (i.e. Integrated Development/Balanced Development Mix, Design and Physical Layout, Design for the Canopy, Operating the Arts & Cultural Facilities, and Governing the Arts & Cultural Facilities), were significant in explaining the respondents' final choice of proposal (as shown in Question 6 of the Comment Card). The results from the Multiple Discriminant Analysis suggest that all of the factors contained in the Comment Cards are significant in explaining the final choice of proposal. The results also suggest that the Comment Card responses are internally consistent.

OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

In each Comment Card, respondents could provide written comments in the form of suggested areas for improvement for the three proposals under each of the five questions. They could also provide other comments under Question 7. For Question 6, space was provided for respondents to give reasons to explain why none of the three proposals should be taken forward by Government.

Of the 33,416 Comment Cards received by 30 June 2005, 12,825 Cards contained at least one unit of written comment. The written comments under each question were transcribed into electronic format. All transcribed comments were content-analysed and coded for computer-assisted analysis.

Based on frequency and content analyses, the views expressed under each question are summarized below:

Integrated Development/Balanced Development Mix (Q1): The results suggest that there should be less residential and commercial buildings and more arts and cultural facilities and related training facilities. More open and green areas, as well as more sports, recreational, and entertainment facilities were also suggested. Respondents generally felt that there was room for improvements in all three proposals in terms of adopting environmentally friendly measures.

Design and Physical Layout (Q2): The respondents thought that the present plot ratios and building heights proposed in the three proposals were too high. Residential

Executive Summary

and commercial buildings should be aggregated in one area and should be away from the waterfront and the arts and cultural areas. Better modes of transport and transport links should be further considered in all three proposals.

Design for the Canopy (Q3): The majority of the comments on the Canopy were concerns and suggestions for improvements. Respondents were most concerned about maintenance and the maintenance costs, and many were not satisfied with the Canopy's appearance and size.

Operating the Arts and Cultural Facilities (Q4): Respondents would like to see more opportunities and financial support being given to local arts and cultural groups, and more emphasis being given to Chinese and local culture. They would also like to see more partnerships with local and overseas arts and cultural bodies and more efforts on training and education and on promoting arts and culture.

Governing the Arts and Cultural Facilities (Q5): Respondents preferred that arts and cultural facilities be managed by arts and cultural organizations with greater Government support and supervision. Many also stressed the importance of transparency and channels for public input. Concerns were also raised over the financial sustainability of the arts and cultural venues.

Going Forward (Q6): For those who thought that none of the three proposals should be taken forward, the main reasons were related to the mode of development, the Canopy, hardware, land use, physical layout, design and the plot ratio.

Other Comments (Q7): The major comments under this question included whether there should be a Canopy or not, tighter planning and supervision by Government, the Single-package Development approach, and the overall WKCD concept.

WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS, RECORDS OF MEETINGS AND FORUMS

Many organizations and individuals made their views known in the form of written submissions or through participation in relevant forums or meetings during the public consultation period. The PPRI analysed the views expressed in the following documents:

- transcripts of the eight discussion forums conducted by Government held between 20 December 2004 and 10 January 2005;
- 623 written submissions from organizations and individuals received by Government up to the end of July 2005;
- records of relevant deliberations and reports from the Legislative Council and District Councils; and
- submissions/records of meetings and briefing sessions where the proponents made presentations to statutory/advisory bodies/committees.

The PPRI received the Report on the Phase I Study of the Legislative Council Subcommittee on West Kowloon Cultural District Development after the consultation

Executive Summary

period. The views in this Report are summarized and presented separately. Among the written submissions, there were six public opinion surveys conducted by different organizations. The summarized findings of these surveys are also presented separately.

A number of identical (or partially identical) submissions were received. Some were photocopies of an identical letter. These submissions were treated in the same manner as any other submissions, but were noted in the analysis and flagged when reporting results. A total of 118 submissions fell under this category.

The PPRI adopted the Grounded Theory approach in the construction of the analytical framework for the organization of the raw data. The analytical framework, comprising themes, categories and sub-categories, was derived from the information contained in the various forms of submissions and other above-listed documents. The organization of the text data was aided by the use of NUDIST (Non-numerical Unstructured Data Indexing Searching and Theorizing), a qualitative, data-analysis computer software.

Indicative views in each of the themes, categories and subcategories are summarized below.

THE WKCD DEVELOPMENT

Overall WKCD Concept

There was overwhelming support from the public for the concept of building a world-class cultural district in West Kowloon. As for the Legislative Council, the majority view also supported the concept, although some views held that the project should not be launched before proper preparations were made.

Mode of Development

As regards involving the private sector as the mode of development, views from both the public and the Legislative Council were divided. Those who supported involving the private sector thought that revenue from the residential/commercial sector could support cultural development, whereas those against it feared that it would just turn into another property development project.

“Government-business Collusion”/“Transfer of Interests”

Many viewed the Single-package Development approach as benefiting developers, suggesting “government-business collusion” and “transfer of interests”. The Legislative Council maintained that bypassing the Legislative Council was unacceptable and was tantamount to “government-business collusion”.

Single-package Development Approach

There was a strong voice against this approach from the public. For the Legislative Council, a majority view held that this approach might cause a great loss in revenues to Government and could be viewed as transferring interests to the property developer. Other modes of development were suggested, including auctioning the WKCD site, split-tendering, and multi-stage development. The Legislative Council suggestions included a public sector-led strategy, public auction and a development mode similar to the Abandoibarra Project in Spain.

Concerns of Small and Medium-sized Enterprises

There were views from both the public and the Legislative Council which urged Government to increase the extent of local participation, and expressed concern over the limited opportunities for small and medium-sized enterprises in the project.

HARDWARE AND LAND USE**The Canopy**

Over half of the written submissions were against the Canopy. A majority view from the Legislative Council expressed concern over the unacceptable construction and maintenance costs and safety issues.

Plot Ratio

Many expressed concern over the proponents' lack of compliance with Government's Baseline. Views expressed in the Legislative Council held that the plot ratio should not be allowed to change and should be monitored by Government or the Town Planning Board.

GOVERNANCE/PLANNING/MANAGEMENT**Financial Matters**

Many urged Government to disclose more information on financial matters, and suggested setting up a trust fund to operate the WKCD. This view was echoed by the Legislative Council. Others expressed worry about financial sustainability and the price of admission tickets for the arts and cultural events.

Planning and Supervision

Some members of the public suggested that a statutory body should supervise the project, whereas some views from the Legislative Council considered that planning for the project should be under the Town Planning Board and public supervision.

Some members of the public and some Legislative Council Members considered that the existing zoning for the WKCD site should be re-zoned from "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Arts, Cultural, Commercial and Entertainment Uses" to "Comprehensive Development Area" for tighter planning control.

Governance/Management/Operation

A majority view urged Government to set up an independent governance body to oversee the project and expressed worry that the operation of cultural facilities would not be guaranteed if the project was operated by a developer. A majority Legislative Council view considered that there should be a new body set up for overseeing the WKCD.

Transportation and Pedestrian Flow

Public views held that accessibility was important and that there was a need for KCR and MTR connections to the WKCD.

ARTS AND CULTURAL ISSUES

Types of Culture

Both the public and the Legislative Council considered that local arts and culture should be emphasized and that importing foreign cultural events should not be at the expense of developing local arts and culture. Others maintained that there should be a balance among local, Chinese and Western culture.

Cultural Software

Both the public and the Legislative Council expressed concern over the sources of exhibits and the possible lack of high quality exhibits to be put into the museums. A majority view expressed concern over arts and cultural education as well as the nurturing of, and funding for, cultural development.

Sustainability and Cultural Policy

Many views considered that arts education and long-term cultural policy could raise the public's appreciation of arts and culture, and questioned whether there was a sufficient audience for arts and cultural activities. Both the Legislative Council and District Councils held that adopting a long-term cultural policy would help sustain cultural development, but questioned the demand for performances and exhibitions.

EXTERNALITIES

Concerns of Nearby Residents

There were views that the construction of WKCD would bring noise pollution and traffic congestion, and would block residents' views.

Environmental Issues

Many were concerned about the insufficient green space, and held that environmental protection should be emphasized during construction.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS

Legal Issues

Some urged Government to adopt appropriate legal measures to prevent the recurrence of the Link Real Estate Investment Trust (the Link) legal saga.

Overall Comments on the Proposals

On the proposals, concerns were raised over the distribution of land for residential/commercial area vs the arts and cultural area, the plot ratio, and the Canopy. The Legislative Council questioned why Government did not disqualify the proponents, as they did not follow Government's Baseline on plot ratio.

Consultations

Many urged Government to intensify consultation work before putting forward the project, pointing out that there were too many unresolved issues.

*Executive Summary***Invitation for Proposals**

Both the public and the Legislative Council questioned the preparation and structure of IFP, including the setting of the mandatory requirements. The Legislative Council also recommended the setting up of value-for-money studies.

THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL SUBCOMMITTEE

Over and above the indicative views expressed by the Legislative Council through various channels, the Legislative Council Subcommittee on West Kowloon Cultural District Development released its Phase I Study Report which contained seven recommendations related to the WKCD, namely:

- abandon the Single-package Development approach;
- conduct extensive consultation with the public and relevant sectors on the mode of development and implementation strategy;
- ensure transparency and accountability in the decision-making process;
- re-examine the extent of private partnership for the WKCD based on objective value-for-money analysis and financial viability studies;
- undertake studies to affirm the needs and technical requirements for each of the core facilities to be provided in the WKCD;
- set up an overseeing authority for the development of the WKCD; and
- follow-up action for the Legislative Council.

SURVEYS BY OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

Six opinion surveys/studies conducted by various organizations were received. The results of these surveys, in general, suggested that the majority supported building a cultural district in West Kowloon, and that they favoured an independent body with community participation to manage the arts and cultural facilities in the WKCD. The results also showed that the majority did not support the Single-package Development approach, and that opinions on the Canopy were divided.

TELEPHONE POLLS

An important component of this Consultancy was to collect views from Hong Kong residents on the WKCD through three Telephone Polls, conducted from 28 February to 3 March 2005, 18 April to 21 April 2005 and 27 June to 30 June 2005.

The objectives of the Telephone Polls were:

- to assess public opinion on the general concept of the WKCD;
- to triangulate the results of the Comment Cards received regarding the three screened-in proposals; and
- to assess public opinion on specific issues relating to the WKCD not covered in the Comment Cards.

Executive Summary

The Telephone Poll Questionnaire contained questions on the respondents'

- demographical characteristics;
- knowledge about the WKCD;
- views on the general WKCD concept and its impact;
- preference regarding the three proposals, as well as various aspects of the proposals;
- views regarding the mode of development, planning, governance, management and operations of the WKCD project;
- views on the Canopy;
- views on issues relating to development intensity and physical layout; and
- views on consultation, cultural policy discussions, and the timing of implementation.

The results of the three Telephone Polls of 4,553 randomly-selected respondents* indicate the following:

Knowledge about the WKCD

69% of the respondents claimed that they knew that there was a public consultation exercise on the WKCD project. However, only 22.7% correctly answered the question regarding the number of screened-in proposals.

General Views on the WKCD

The majority of the respondents thought that the WKCD was good for Hong Kong, and supported the early implementation of the project. A large majority felt that the project would be beneficial for the developing arts and culture in Hong Kong (74.7%), improving Hong Kong's employment (72.6%), and promoting tourism (78.4%).

*Each telephone poll randomly selected and successfully interviewed around 1,500 respondents. Most of the questions were identical with a small number of the questions being asked in one or two of the polls only.

Triangulation with Results from Comment Cards: The Preferred Proposal

Statistical analyses suggest that the percentages of respondents favouring a certain proposal manifested in the collected Comment Cards are, for the most part, not corroborated by the three Telephone Polls. In general, the percentages from Comment Cards were much higher than those from the Telephone Polls, as a large majority of the Poll respondents gave no opinion or refused to answer.

It should, however, be noted that the rank order of the proposals for each of the three selected questions on the Comment Cards is the same as that from the Telephone Polls (for both the entire sample as well as the sample of those who had seen the exhibition, website or been to the forum) –Z, X and Y, in that order.

Mode of Development

The three most-cited reasons for not favouring Government pursuing any of the screened-in proposals were: the project was led by property developers, the Single-package Development approach and problems associated with the Canopy.

50.8 % expressed disapproval of the Single-package Development approach, while 26.1% expressed approval.

Planning

47.7% favoured an independent body to oversee the planning of the project, while 25% were not in favour.

Around 75% of the respondents supported more discussions on the cultural blueprint.

52.1% of the respondents favoured having an advisory body to advise Government on the development of WKCD, with 30.8% against.

Development Intensity

Differences in the amount of commercial/residential floor area in the respective proposals were perceived to be a problem by some respondents (39%), while 30.3% did not think so.

Governance, Management and Operations

49.8% of the respondents favoured having a non-profit organization to govern the facilities after completion of the project. The participation of cultural and related professional bodies in such a body was most preferred (75.7%).

The Canopy

Around 51% of the respondents liked the Canopy as a landmark and around 17% of the respondents disliked it. 71% of those who disliked the Canopy favoured abandoning it even if the whole project had to start all over again. For those who liked the Canopy and those who were neutral about it, 65.7% would like to see the Canopy built if the cost was within 20% of the WKCD total cost.

ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES

This section highlights prominent key issues about which great concerns were expressed. These are discussed with the associated evidence.

The WKCD Concept

The three Telephone Polls show that the majority of the respondents support the idea of having a cultural district at the West Kowloon waterfront. A large majority feel that the project would be beneficial for developing arts and culture in Hong Kong, improving Hong Kong's employment, and promoting tourism.

This is corroborated by high percentages and relatively high frequency counts of such opinions from written submissions, records from public forums, minutes of relevant Legislative Council meetings, minutes of relevant District Council meetings, and written comments from Comment Cards, as well as from the results of surveys by other organizations.

This shows that both the general public and other stakeholders tend to support having a WKCD. The Telephone Polls also show that a majority are in favour of an early implementation of the project.

The Three Proposals

From the close-ended questions of the Comment Cards (using the entire data set) the rank order of the proposals, in terms of the percentage of respondents favouring a particular proposal, is: Z, X and Y. This pattern is consistent regarding different aspects of the project. Roughly speaking, around 50% of the respondents preferred Z, around 35% prefer X, and around 15% prefer Y. This rank order is, in the main, also consistent over time. This rank order is also corroborated by the three Telephone Polls.

However, if flagged cases are excluded, the percentages favouring Z and X are closer. The percentage favouring Z drops from 54.7% to 47.8%, and the percentage favouring X increases from 33.8% to 39.9% (Question 6).

Not Taking Any Proposals Forward

Results from the Comment Cards show that of the 72.7% of the respondents who answer the question (Q6), only a small minority (9.4%) think that none of the proposals should be taken forward. This is corroborated by the percentage from the three Telephone Polls, which is even lower (4.4%).

The Telephone Polls also indicate that for those who do not favour Government taking any of the proposals forward, "property developer-led" is cited as the number one reason. The Single-package Development approach and problems associated with the Canopy are cited as the number two and three reasons. This is corroborated by the written comments via Comment Cards (under Q6).

The Canopy

The three Telephone Polls show that around 51% of the respondents like the idea of having the Canopy as the landmark for Hong Kong, with around 17% of the

Executive Summary

respondents expressing dislike for the idea. Of those who like the Canopy and those who are neutral about it, 65.7% would like to see the Canopy built if the cost is within 20% of the WKCD total cost.

From the close-ended part of the Comment Cards, only 28% indicate that they do not like any of the three proposals regarding the Canopy (Q3), and 72% pick one of the three proposals.

However, from the open-ended part, more than half of the written comments on the Canopy are negative comments; only around 14% are in favour; and 28% are suggestions and concerns.

As for written submissions, while there are both positive and negative comments, the percentage of negative comments is much higher than the positive ones.

Problems associated with the Canopy are cited as the number three reason why Telephone Poll respondents do not favour any of the proposals.

Results from surveys conducted by other organizations indicate that opinions tend to be divided.

Evidence from the above sources does not converge. Whereas the Telephone Polls show that the majority like the Canopy as a landmark, written comments from the Comment Cards, submissions, the Legislative Council, and District Councils records are mainly negative. The findings can best be described as inconclusive.

The Single-package Development Approach

The three Telephone Polls show that around 51% of the respondents are not in favour of the Single-package Development approach with only 26.1% expressing approval. This is also the number two reason why respondents do not favour taking any of the proposals forward.

With the exception of the views recorded in the open forums, the percentage of views against the approach expressed in the open-ended questions on the Comment Cards, written submissions by individuals and organizations, records of meetings of the Legislative Council and District Councils is higher than that in favour of the approach. Surveys by other organizations show similar results.

Taking into account all those who express a view through various sources, it can be concluded that the majority are not in favour of the Single-package Development approach.

Development Intensity and Development Mix

Most written comments from Comment Cards and written submissions indicate that it would be desirable to have fewer commercial and residential buildings, lower plot ratios, and more open and green areas in the cultural district. Some express concern over the proposal's lack of compliance with Government's Baseline. The Telephone Polls show that opinions tend to be divided on whether or not the plot ratio should be the same for all proposals.

Planning

In the written submissions and forum/meeting records, many express the need for tighter planning control of the project. The Legislative Council, in particular, is of the view that Government did not conduct sufficient consultations and studies before launching the Invitation for Proposals for the development of WKCD.

The Telephone Polls also show that around 48% of the respondents are for having an independent body instead of the Town Planning Board to monitor the project, with only 25% against. Around 52% also favour establishing an advisory body to advise Government on the development of the WKCD. 75% favour more in-depth discussions on Hong Kong's cultural blueprint before deciding on the details of WKCD.

While the Telephone Polls show that around 65% of the respondents support the early implementation of the project, the above paragraphs incorporating views based on written submissions and records of forums/meetings suggest that many are still suspicious of "government-business collusion", and would like to have more monitoring measures put in place. Nevertheless, these views do not necessarily go against the majority's wish to support early implementation of the project.

Governance, Management and Operations

In the written submissions and forum/meeting records, many suggest setting up an independent body, with participation from arts and cultural bodies, to oversee the project. Some suggest that Government should play a greater role in supervision. This is consistent with the Telephone Poll results, which also show that a non-profit organization to govern the arts and cultural facilities is most preferred, and that cultural and related professional bodies' participation in the governance is also preferred. Surveys by other organizations also produce similar results.

Arts and Cultural Issues

The Telephone Polls show that 75% of the respondents indicate that there should be more discussion on Hong Kong's cultural policy before proceeding with the development of the WKCD. Of those who think that there should be more discussion, 59.8% would maintain their position even if this delays the project. This view is supported by a number of written submissions that raise concern about the lack of a cultural blueprint for Hong Kong, and about the danger that cultural software might lag behind hardware development. This concern is shared by the Legislative Council which is of the view that the need for the development of arts and cultural facilities in Hong Kong has not been properly identified.

Most Important Factors in Selecting a Preferred Proposal

Multiple Discriminant Analysis was performed to determine which factors, identified in the Comment Cards (i.e. Integrated Development Mix, Design and Physical Layout, the Canopy Design, Operations of the Arts & Cultural Facilities, and the Governance of the Arts & Cultural Facilities), were significant in explaining the respondents' final choice of proposal (as shown in Question 6 of the Comment Card). The results suggest that all of the five factors are significant.

Views of The Legislative Council and the General Public

The Legislative Council's major concerns include the preparation and the structure of the IFP, the Single-package Development approach and its impact on the real estate market, the lack of a clear Government cultural policy to underpin the mandatory requirements on the Core Arts and Cultural Facilities, the Canopy, the planning and governance of WKCD, and the lack of financial information on the WKCD. These concerns are also found in the written submissions from professional organizations and some individuals as well as in the written comments on Comment Cards from members of the public.

CONCLUSIONS**WKCD**

It is clear from the findings of this Consultancy that the majority of the public support the idea of having a cultural district on the West Kowloon waterfront. A large majority feel that the project would be beneficial to Hong Kong in terms of the development of arts and culture, improving employment, and promoting tourism.

Establishment of a new body

Many advocate the establishment of a new body to oversee planning, design, development and operation of WKCD.

Arts and Cultural Issues

The study shows that there is concern over the danger that cultural software might lag behind the hardware development, and that the public supports further discussion on Hong Kong's cultural policy before proceeding with the development of the WKCD, even if this delays the project. Many express concern about the sustainability of arts and cultural facilities over the 30-year operation period.

Public Participation, Monitoring Mechanisms, and Implementation Time

While the majority support early implementation of the project, it is also clear that a majority would like to have more discussion on the issue and more monitoring on planning and governance, with greater participation by the public and arts and cultural organizations being put in place, including the establishment of a new independent body.

Single-package Development Approach

Among those who express an opinion on the issue of the Single-package Development approach, the majority are against it.

The Canopy

Findings on public opinion on the Canopy are inconclusive. The majority like the Canopy as a landmark. Nevertheless, there exists a considerable body of negative opinions on the Canopy, as manifested in the written submissions and relevant meeting records, and results of surveys by other organizations.

Executive Summary

The Three Screened-in Proposals

Regarding the three screened-in proposals, the rank order of the proposals, in terms of the percentage of respondents favouring a particular proposal, is: Z, X and Y. However, if flagged cases are excluded, the percentages favouring Z and X are closer.

Results show that the public prefer to have fewer commercial and residential buildings, lower plot ratios, and more open and green areas in all three proposals.

Results also show that only a small minority think that none of the proposals should be taken forward.