

Family Council

Progress of Work of the Sub-committees under the Family Council

PURPOSE

This paper invites Members to note the progress of work of the Sub-committees under the Family Council (the Council).

SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE PROMOTION OF FAMILY CORE VALUES AND FAMILY EDUCATION

2. Following the reconstitution of the Sub-committees vide Paper FC 6/2013, the Sub-committee on the Promotion of Family Core Values and Family Education held its first meeting on 4 July 2013. With unanimous support, Ms Shirley LOO and Mr LEE Luen-fai were elected as the Convenor and Deputy Convenor of the Sub-committee respectively. Members discussed and monitored the progress of the “2013/14 Family-Friendly Employers Award Scheme” (the Award Scheme). Besides, Members also deliberated on how to take forward the promotion of family education.

“2013/14 Family-Friendly Employers Award Scheme”
(「2013/14 家庭友善僱主獎勵計劃」)

3. The Sub-committee noted the good progress of the Award Scheme. A total of 30 organisations have agreed to join the Organising Committee (OC). The membership list of OC is at **Annex A**. Besides, the meeting also discussed the implementation details and the publicity strategies of the Award Scheme. Amongst others, Announcements in the Public Interest (APIs) will be broadcast as part of the publicity campaign. With a view to sustaining corporate image, the Sub-committee agreed to retain the family friendly employment practices featured in the four APIs (i.e. “Chinese

Medicine Shop” (中藥店篇), “Work from Home” (在家工作篇), “Flexible Working Hours” (彈性上班篇) and “Call for Action” (號召篇)) produced for the last Award Scheme, with the new appeal by the Chairman of the Council and Mr CHEUNG Chi-lam (張智霖)¹. The launching ceremony cum press briefing of the Award Scheme would be held on 18 September 2013 at the Conference Hall of the Central Government Offices at Tamar.

Promotion of Family Education

4. Members were briefed on the promotion work on family education through the introduction of a series of family education packages (“18 Handy Tips for Parents” and “Family Therapy Package” in 2011 and “Marital Relationship” in 2012). All these family education packages had been uploaded onto the “Happy Info Hub”² with very positive response. In late 2013/early 2014, new family education packages were planned to be launched, with special focus on addressing the needs of different types of families, including young families, underprivileged families and cross-border families. The Secretariat would present the proposal for deliberation by the Sub-committee at its next meeting.

SUB-COMMITTEE ON FAMILY SUPPORT

5. The Sub-committee on Family Support held a meeting on 14 June 2013. With unanimous support, Mrs Patricia CHU and Prof. LAM Tai-hing were elected as the Convenor and Deputy Convenor of the Sub-committee respectively. Members discussed and monitored the progress of “Family Survey 2013”. The Sub-committee also gave its advice on the application of family perspectives involved on “Reclamation Outside the Victoria Harbour and Rock Cavern/Underground Space Development” and preparation of statutory town plans.

¹ At the meeting of the Sub-committee on the Promotion of Family Core Values and Family Education held on 4 July 2013, Members proposed that a celebrity be featured in the APIs as an ambassador to the Award Scheme to enhance the publicity effect.

² The “Happy Family Info Hub” is an online platform of the Council to share family-related materials. Since the launch of the online family education packages, they have been well-received with 150,000 cumulative hits.

Family Survey 2013

6. The Sub-committee was briefed on the objectives, methodology, scope and timeframe of the Family Survey 2013 (the Survey). Members noted that the field work of the Survey has commenced in May and will be completed in July 2013. It is expected that the draft report on the preliminary findings of the Survey will be ready by October 2013.

Application of Family Perspectives in Policy Formulation

7. The Development Bureau and Planning Department consulted the Sub-committee on the family implications involved on “Reclamation Outside the Victoria Harbour and Rock Cavern/Underground Space Development” and preparation of statutory town plans respectively. The salient points made during the consultation process were set out at **Annex B**.

WAY FORWARD

8. The Sub-committees will continue to oversee their respective programmes and activities. Members are welcome to convey their comments and suggestions to the Secretariat.

**Family Council Secretariat
August 2013**

2013/14 Family-Friendly Employers Award Scheme
Membership of the Organising Committee

Convenor

Prof Shek Tan-lei, Daniel, SBS, JP
Chairman of the Family Council

Deputy Convenor

Ms Loo Shirley Marie Therese, MH, JP
Family Council Member
Convenor, Sub-committee on the Promotion of Family Core Values and
Family Education

Committee members

Mr Eric Ling
Senior Manager, Training & Development Human Resources &
Administration
Airport Authority

Mr William Mak
Chairman
Association of Chartered Certified Accountants Hong Kong

Ms Lilian Law, JP
Executive Director
The Boys' & Girls' Clubs Association of Hong Kong

Mrs Wong Chow Kuen-kuen, MH
Committee Member
The Chinese General Chamber of Commerce

Mrs Cheung Wu Wing-kui, Shirley
Executive Committee Member
The Chinese Manufacturers' Association of Hong Kong

Mr Kwan Tak-wah
Member of Committee on Promoting Corporate Social Responsibility
Federation of Hong Kong Industries

2013/14 Family-Friendly Employers Award Scheme
Membership of the Organising Committee

Dr Ng Yin Kwok
Hon Secretary
The Federation of Medical Societies of Hong Kong

Ms Wendy Wong
Executive Committee Member
Hong Kong Association for Customer Service Excellence

Ir Dr Paul Tsui
Chairman
Hong Kong Association of Freight Forwarding and Logistics

Ms Samantha Suen
Council Member
Hong Kong Coalition of Professional Services

Ms Christina Maisenne Lee
Executive Director
The Hong Kong Chinese Importers' and Exporters' Association

Mr Cliff Choi
Business Director, Public Engagement and Partnership
The Hong Kong Council of Social Service

Mr Vincent Ma
Vice Chairman
The Hong Kong Exporters' Association

Dr Chan Shou-ming
Chairman
Hong Kong Federation of Restaurants & Related Trades

Ms Shirley Yuen
Chief Executive Officer
Hong Kong General Chamber of Commerce

2013/14 Family-Friendly Employers Award Scheme
Membership of the Organising Committee

Mrs Alison Wong
Council Member
The Hong Kong Institute of Directors

Prof Randy Chiu, MH
Executive Council Member
Hong Kong Institute of Human Resource Management

Dr Tse Hung-hing
President
The Hong Kong Medical Association

Ms Ruth Yu
Executive Director
Hong Kong Retail Management Association

Dr Stephen Kwok
President
Hong Kong Small and Medium Enterprises Association

Ms Angela WY Lee
Head of Human Resources
Hong Kong Trade Development Council

Dr Katherine Yau
Executive Director of Moral Education Concern Group
Hong Kong Women Professional & Entrepreneurs Association

Ms Ivy Chen
Senior Manager (Staff Wellbeing) of Human Resources Division
Hospital Authority

Ms Sylvia Siu, JP
Council Member
The Law Society of Hong Kong

2013/14 Family-Friendly Employers Award Scheme
Membership of the Organising Committee

Mr James Chan
Chief Executive Officer
Po Leung Kuk

Mr Low Chen-yang
District Co-ordinator (Shamshuipo/Wong Tai Sin)
Tung Wah Group of Hospitals

Ms Rita Ching
Associate Director
The Women's Foundation

Mr Leung Cheong-ming, Raymond, MH
Chairman
Yan Chai Hospital

Ms Chan Cheng Yuk-yee, Connie
Chairman
Yan Oi Tong

Mr Aldrin Leung
General Secretary
YMCA of Hong Kong

2013/14 Family-Friendly Employers Award Scheme
Membership of the Organising Committee

Official Representative

Mr Charles PK Hui
Assistant Commissioner (Labour Relations)
Labour Department

Mrs Lydia Leung
Chief School Development Officer (Home School Cooperation)
Education Bureau

Secretary

Ms Aubrey Fung
Principal Assistant Secretary (Civic Affairs)²
Home Affairs Bureau

**Extract of Notes of the 11th meeting of the Family Council
Sub-committee on Family Support on 14 June 2013**

Item 2 – Reclamation Outside the Victoria Harbour and Rock Cavern/Underground Space Development

3. Prof. Terry AU, whose sister had served in the Planning Department of HKSAR Government, declared interest.

4. Upon the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Robin Lee, Deputy Head of Civil Engineering Office (Port & Land), introduced the paper with the aid of a powerpoint and invited members to express views on the land supply initiatives from the family perspective. He presented the background, objectives and methods of building land reserve. He also informed Members of the land supply options, views collected through the stage 1 public engagement and the initial site selection criteria for reclamation outside Victoria Harbour and rock cavern development. He further briefed Members on the stage 2 public engagement, including the five proposed near shore reclamation sites (viz. Lung Kwu Tan, Siu Ho Wan, Sunny Bay, Tsing Yi Southwest and Ma Liu Shui), the feasibility studies of constructing the artificial islands in Central Waters and the three proposed rock cavern development sites (namely Diamond Hill Fresh Water and Salt Water Service Reservoir, Sai Kung Sewage Treatment Works and Sham Tseng Sewage Treatment Works).

5. Members expressed the following views –

- (a) the land requirements for the development of a wide range of community facilities (e.g. elderly/child care centres, schools, etc.) should be carefully assessed and catered for in order to achieve a better built, balanced and self-supporting sustainable living environment for families;
- (b) the planning and development of community facilities should be evidence-based. The profiles and population characteristics as reflected in the population projections and the demographic trend should be carefully studied with a view to planning and developing adequate and appropriate supporting services and community facilities, such as

transportation services, educational facilities and social welfare facilities, in a holistic manner;

- (c) availability of external transport links was important in facilitating connection amongst family members not living in close proximity to each other;
- (d) flexibility in planning should be built to cater for unexpected demand arising from demographic changes or changing community and family needs;
- (e) there should be a balanced proportion of public and private housing to achieve a balanced and self-supporting community with job opportunities available;
- (f) availability of job opportunities would be conducive to preventing/alleviating social problems. Proximity to workplaces would have the merit of saving the travelling time required, thus enabling family members/parents to better balance work, family and commitment necessary for raising children; and
- (g) apart from using “household” as the basis in the planning process, the concept of “family” should also be taken into account. As “family” could be made up of many “households”, the terms “household” and “family” would not be synonymous. Since nuclear families have now become the major form of households and extended family members might choose to live in the neighbourhood of each other to facilitate communication/networking and enable mutual care of family members, including older/younger members and those with special needs, the concept of “family” should also be applied in the planning process as appropriate.

6. In response, representatives from the Civil Engineering and Development Department and the Planning Department informed Members that –

- (a) selection of suitable reclamation sites for building land reserve was important for comprehensive town planning and

development;

- (b) the reservation of land for community facilities was guided by “Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines” which provided guidance on the scale, locations and site requirements of various land uses and facilities and the adequacy of facilities to serve a planning area;
- (c) in planning for the community facilities to be provided, the Planning Department would work closely with relevant bureaux and departments, such as the Education Bureau and the Social Welfare Department to work out the number and types of community facilities needed to meet the requirements of the local community having regard to the specific circumstances of the area concerned, e.g. demographic profile; and
- (d) the town planning process was open and transparent. The public would be consulted and engaged at various stages in the process where appropriate in order to help achieve a better built community that could cater for the needs of families and various sectors of the community.

7. The Chairman concluded that the Council supported in principle the proposal to build up land reserve and increase land supply to meet housing needs which would help improve the living environment of families. This notwithstanding, comprehensive, evidence-based town planning and development with adequate and appropriate supporting services and community facilities, external transport links, as well as availability of job opportunities would be conducive to foster a pro-family environment. He requested the Secretariat to re-circulate the proposal to other Council Members for their further comments on the proposal, if any. The Chairman invited the Development Bureau, the Civil Engineering and Development Department, and the Planning Department to take into consideration Members’ comments in taking forward the proposal.

[Post-meeting notes: The proposal was re-circulated to other Council Members for their comments. No further comments were received by the deadline on 19 June 2013.]

(Action: DEVB, CEDD, and PLAND)

Item 3 – Family Perspective in the Preparation of Statutory Town Plans

8. Mr Edward LO, Acting Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board 1, introduced the paper which outlined the relationship of family implications and the preparation of statutory town plans. He briefed members and welcomed Members' views on the assessment of family implications in respect of the four major categories of the current plan-making work of the Town Planning Board (TPB).

9. Members offered the following comments –

- (a) the TPB should appoint members who were advocates of family to include family perspective as a factor in the plan-making work;
- (b) stakeholders should be engaged/consulted early in the town planning process such that input from family perspective could be incorporated at an early stage;
- (c) the standard of provision for community/supporting facilities should be formulated in the light of demographic projections and population characteristics envisaged for a given area to ensure that the facilities would be “family-friendly” and suit the needs of the users. For example, pavement built with generous space standards would not necessarily be “family-friendly” to some users, especially the elderly and children, as it would inevitably increase the pedestrian’s commuting distance between home and community/transport facilities to which users might require daily access. It would also be “family-friendly” if the residential district could be served with good communications so as to make it relatively accessible to encourage/strengthen connection to the wider kin and community/neighbourhood networks;
- (d) there should be a balanced proportion of public and private housing within a comprehensive housing development in order to be self-supporting in the provision of job opportunities;

- (e) apart from using “household” as the basis in the planning process, the concept of “family” should also be taken into account. As “family” could be made up of many “households”, the terms “household” and “family” would not be synonymous. Since nuclear families have now become the major form of households, and extended family members might choose to live in the neighbourhood of each other to facilitate communication/networking and enable mutual care of family members, including older/younger members and those with special needs, therefore, the concept of “family” should also be applied in the planning process as appropriate; and
- (f) effective implementation and monitoring were equally important to ensure appropriate supporting facilities were planned and provided to cater for the needs of families and the community.

10. In response, Mr. Lo thanked Members’ suggestions and informed Members that –

- (a) the non-official membership of the TPB represented a wide range of professions, expertise and community interests from different sectors of the community, including the social services sector. With their wealth of experience and expertise, they would provide the needed knowledge and valuable advice to the TPB;
- (b) the views of relevant bureaux and departments including the Home Affairs Bureau and Social Welfare Department would be sought in the plan-making process as appropriate and there were provisions under the Town Planning Ordinance for public consultation to ensure the openness and transparency of the statutory planning process;
- (c) Planning Department would consult and welcome views from the public and stakeholders in the planning process both at district and territorial planning levels;
- (d) the “Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines” provided guidance on the standards of provision for the

necessary supporting facilitates in meeting the needs of a community as well as on the location and site requirements of various facilities in the preparation of town plans; and

- (e) planning was a dynamic process in response to the changing community aspirations and development needs.

11. After deliberation, the Chairman concluded that the Planning Department's assessment on family implications regarding (a) rezoning of sites for residential, Government, institutional and community as well as other uses in addressing the increasing housing demand; (b) new development or reclamation areas; (c) incorporation of development parameters; and (d) new statutory plans or amendment to plans to cover rural areas of high conservation and preservation value were supported. He thanked the Planning Department for their presentation and invited the Planning Department to take into consideration Members' comments. He advanced further by inviting the Planning Department to consult the Family Council in future to gauge Members' views from family perspective when preparing statutory town plans for the layout of a particular area/district of Hong Kong.

(Action: PLAND)