

Ref: AM6/01/20/6

**Consultation meeting to discuss matters relating to
the new Legislative Council Complex**

**held on Friday, 1 June 2007 at 10:45 am
in Conference Room A of the Legislative Council Building**

Present : Hon Mrs Rita FAN HSU Lai-tai, GBS, JP (Convenor)
Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai, SBS, S.B.St.J., JP
Hon Fred LI Wah-ming, JP
Hon Margaret NG
Hon Mrs Selina CHOW LIANG Shuk-yee, GBS, JP
Hon CHEUNG Man-kwong
Hon CHAN Yuen-han, JP
Hon SIN Chung-kai, JP
Dr Hon YEUNG Sum
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, JP
Hon WONG Kwok-hing, MH
Hon LEE Wing-tat
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
Hon WONG Ting-kwong, BBS
Hon Ronny TONG Ka-wah, SC
Prof Hon Patrick LAU Sau-shing, SBS, JP
Hon Albert Jinghan CHENG
Hon TAM Heung-man

Staff in Attendance : Mr Ricky FUNG, JP Secretary General
Ms Pauline NG Assistant Secretary General 1
Mrs Anna LO Principal Council Secretary (Administration)
Ms Anita SIT Chief Council Secretary (1)4
Mr Matthew LOO Senior Council Secretary (Administration)2

Convenor's opening remarks

The Convenor welcomed Members to the consultation meeting which was convened in accordance with a decision of The Legislative Council Commission (the Commission) in response to the request of the Subcommittee to Review the Planning for the Central Waterfront (including the Tamar Site). The Commission had authorized her to conduct this meeting, not as a meeting of the Commission, but a consultation meeting.

2. The Convenor reminded Members that the consultation meeting was not covered by the Legislative Council (Powers and Privileges) Ordinance.

3. The Convenor advised that the Administration had written to explain why they were not able to attend the meeting. A copy of the Director of Administration's (DoA's) letter dated 18 May 2007 had been circularized to Members vide LC Paper No. LCC 78/06-07. However, the Administration was prepared to respond to written questions, provided that such questions would not be prejudicing or perceived as prejudicing the fairness and integrity of the tender process. For the purpose of this consultation meeting, she had asked Principal Council Secretary (Administration) (PCS(A)) to record any questions raised by Members on the Tamar Development Project (the Project), including issues relating to the recent public consultation exercise. Such questions would be referred to DoA. Assistant Secretary General 1 (ASG1) would record Members' views on the new LegCo Complex, and the views would be forwarded to the Special Selection Board (SSB) for consideration. ASG1 would respond to any enquiries in relation to the design requirements of the new LegCo Complex already incorporated in the tender document.

Declaration of interests

4. Ir Dr Raymond HO, being an Independent Non-Executive Director of one of the tenderers for the Project, declared interest. Professor Patrick LAU, being the design consultant to one of the tenderers, also declared interest. Mr Abraham SHEK declared that all the tenderers were his constituents.

Matters relating to the new Legislative Council Complex

5. The Convenor said that to facilitate discussion on the new LegCo Complex, the Secretariat had forwarded to Members some documents extracted from the tender document of the Project (issued to Members vide LC Paper No. LCC 83/06-07 dated 30 May 2007). The enlarged plans of the four design proposals downloaded from the website on the Project were also tabled for Members' reference. The Convenor also asked Members to note Mr LEE Wing-tat's list of 21 questions, which was tabled for Members' information.

6. Miss TAM Heung-man said that whilst she personally preferred Design Proposal A, she noted from a press report in Hong Kong Economic Journal that the design seemed to have been copied from another design. She asked the Convenor to relay her enquiry on how the Administration or SSB would deal with the issue of

infringement of intellectual property rights by tenderers in their designs. The Convenor noted Miss Tam's request.

7. Dr KWOK Ka-ki expressed grave disappointment at the Administration's refusal to attend the consultation meeting. He could not comment on the design proposals due to the lack of adequate information. He considered the public viewing exercise incomprehensive, as the public was only consulted on the key design and aesthetic aspects of the design proposals. More factual information should be released to enhance public understanding of the Project. For instance, he wished to seek information on: (a) the availability of a viewing gallery in the Central Government Complex (CGC) for the public to enjoy the harbour view; (b) the environmental protection aspects and the construction and maintenance costs of various building elements in the design proposals; and (c) the design features, such as water features, used for the purpose of segregating CGC from the public. Dr KWOK criticized that it was unfair to ask the public to give views on the design proposals on the basis of the very limited information released to them. It was not clear how the views collected in the public consultation exercise would be dealt with. All in all, it was not a genuine public consultation exercise. He further stated that Members had been given to understand by DoA earlier on that their views on the Project could be reflected to SSB through the President and Chairman of the House Committee of the Legislative Council, who were LegCo's representatives on SSB. However, DoA had subsequently confirmed that Mrs Rita FAN and Ms Miriam LAU had in fact been appointed to SSB in their personal capacity. He hoped that Mrs FAN and Ms LAU would reflect Members' views on the Project expressed at the consultation meeting to SSB.

8. The Convenor noted Dr Kwok's disappointment and concern. She assured Members that the purpose of the consultation meeting was to collect Members' views which would be forwarded to SSB for consideration. Being a member of SSB, she was not in a position to release details of the design proposals to avoid prejudicing or being perceived to be prejudicing the fairness and integrity of the tender process. She added that the tender submissions would be assessed in accordance with a marking scheme set out in the tender document. Environmental aspects and future maintenance costs would be taken into account in the tender evaluation.

9. Mr LEE Wing-tat stated that, for the reason of confidentiality, DoA had rejected his request for factual information about the design proposals, such as the electricity consumption rate per square metre in each design proposal. He did not agree that the disclosure of factual information about the design proposals would prejudice the fairness of the tender process, as the public had the right to know. He had put in 21 written questions for the Administration to reply as soon as possible prior to the tender evaluation, so that he could give his views in time for SSB's consideration.

10. Mr LEE Wing-tat considered that there should be public access to the "Viewing Tower" in CGC to go in line with the statement made by the Chief Executive that the new CGC would be people's government headquarters. The Chief

Secretary for Administration had also undertaken to consider opening the multi-purpose function hall in CGC to the public as a viewing gallery when it was not in use. He hoped that the Convenor would follow up this matter in SSB.

11. Mr LEE Wing-tat expressed concern about the conformity with the specified environmental requirements in the tender document. He was particularly concerned about the design features to enhance air ventilation and to reduce peak demand of electrical load. In response, ASG1 advised that it was specified in the tender document that the window systems in the design proposals should comply with the statutory requirements for openable windows/venting for the purpose of natural ventilation or making up air of 1/16 of floor area of each floor. Each peripheral cellular room should also be provided with at least one openable window. Energy saving should be an important consideration when designing the in-flow of cool/warm air and the exhaust of stale air. Clean air might come from the floor. Individual control of air-conditioning supply should be available at each seat. Mr LEE further commented that more openable windows should be provided to allow more fresh air intake and reduce energy consumption.

12. Mr LEE Wing-tat enquired about the actual amount of open space with amenities that would be dedicated for public use, and whether the open space was easily accessible to the general public.

13. In reply to Mr LEE Wing-tat's enquiry on how far changes could be made to the design and other aspects of the Project before and after the award of contract, the Convenor advised that after the contract was awarded, the successful tenderer would consult users on the detailed interior design of facilities. Modifications were inevitable, but excessive variations might incur additional costs.

14. Mr WONG Kwok-hing considered the Administration's refusal to attend the consultation meeting disrespectful to Members. The public viewing exercise was merely a public relations exercise. Not only was the information available to the public inadequate, the publicity materials failed to clearly convey the nature and major components of the Project. He criticized that while the public was invited to give views on the design proposals, the Administration had never stated how these views would be assessed. While a lot of open space with amenities was shown in the drawings and models on the four design proposals, it was unclear as to which part of the open space would be included in the Project. As such, the public might have given their views on the design proposals on the basis of an incorrect understanding of the Project.

15. Mr WONG Kwok-hing asked whether the Administration had any plan to relocate the "Monument in Commemoration of the Return of Hong Kong to China" to the Tamar site.

16. On behalf of Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Mr WONG Kwok-hing pointed out that CGC and the new LegCo Complex should be easily accessible by the public. He was concerned about the availability of pedestrian access, in particular barrier-free access for the disabled, to the future facilities at the Tamar site. He also enquired

what facilities would be provided at the future Civic Place at the Tamar site to facilitate expression of opinions by the public. The Convenor noted Mr WONG's concern and invited ASG1 to explain how a barrier-free design for the disabled was made a fundamental requirement in the mandatory requirements submitted by the Commission. ASG1 said that some facilities of the new LegCo Complex, including the Main Entrance Foyer, Education Gallery, Complaints Office and Library, were open to all users with no security checking procedure. It was specified in the tender document that public facilities in the new LegCo Complex and access roads in the boundary should be designed to suit users of all ages, including the elderly, children and persons with physical disabilities.

17. Mr WONG Kwok-hing remarked that special attention should be paid to the ergonomic design of the chair in the Chamber of the new LegCo Complex. The design of the existing ones was unsatisfactory and harmful to the back. The new chairs in Conference Rooms B and C were much better. ASG1 assured Members that in the acquisition of furniture for the Conference Rooms, special attention would be given to the chairs which should be ergonomically designed and comfortable. The Convenor undertook to follow up Mr WONG's comment on the existing chairs in the Chamber.

18. Mr WONG Kwok-hing said that he was personally in favour of Design Proposal A.

19. Mr SIN Chung-kai was of the view that there should be separate facilities and circulation arrangements for the public to observe LegCo proceedings and to tour the new LegCo Complex. ASG1 confirmed that the new LegCo Complex would be designed to allow the public to observe meetings held in the Chamber from an Education Gallery without interrupting LegCo proceedings. Guided tours would be conducted during the day, and members of the public would be able to visit the Chamber when no meeting was being held. As natural light would largely be used for the Chamber, only minimum illumination would be required, and that would be a major saving of energy. Mr SIN suggested that, other than employing staff to conduct guided tours, the use of some aids, such as those used in museums, could be considered for the tours. With the advancement of technology, visitors should be able to use their own mobile phones to tune in for LegCo's own internal broadcasting channels. He also considered that there should be adequate dining facilities in the new LegCo Complex.

20. Mr SIN Chung-kai suggested that adequate audio-visual facilities should be provided in the new LegCo Complex. All open meetings should be webcast. Wireless Fidelity (or commonly known as "Wi-Fi") should be provided for the use of Members and the public visiting the new LegCo Complex. The acquisition of such facilities should be timely, but not too early, so as to keep pace with the advancement of technology and upgrading of standards. The Convenor pointed out that the Commission had already agreed that such facilities should be provided in the new LegCo Complex. ASG1 added that remote control movable cameras would be installed in the Chamber and other major conference rooms for filming the proceedings. To ensure quality TV shooting and photo-taking of any Member,

government officer or person speaking during meetings, a lighting device, which would be triggered on once the person started to speak, would be installed to provide supplementary lighting. This was another measure to save energy. For the present tender exercise, the contractor was only required to provide the information technology infrastructure. The procurement of specialized systems would take place at a later stage in order to keep up with the rapid development of information technology.

21. Regarding Mr SIN Chung-kai's concern that there should be adequate space and proper arrangements to facilitate demonstrations and petitioning of views to Members and government officers within the future LegCo precincts, ASG1 said that while no specific arrangement had been stated in the tender document for petitions by the public, it was a mandatory requirement that open space should be provided on three sides of the new LegCo Complex. The Convenor explained that this arrangement was to allow tenderers more design creativity, and to ensure sufficient space around the new LegCo Complex for the public to express their views.

22. Ir Dr Raymond HO said that he would not comment on individual design proposals. He would like to seek the following information:

- (a) the percentage of the "building-free zone" below the ridgeline in the four design proposals; this information would facilitate his consideration of the implications of the design on air ventilation, 'wall effect' etc.;
- (b) the amount of open space and green areas in the design proposals and the boundary of the project site;
- (c) how far would the factor of sustainable development be taken into account in the tender selection process, in terms of design, building materials, cost of maintenance etc.; and
- (d) the special requirements specified in the tender document on the inter-relationship among the major components in the Project, i.e. the new LegCo Complex, Chief Executive's Office and CGC.

23. The Convenor stated that, to her knowledge, the area of the Tamar site was 4.2 hectares, within which there should be no less than 2 hectares of open space. In view of the need to allow tenderers maximum design creativity, allowance had been made for them to consider the best mix of no less than 2-hectares of open space and building developments within the 4.2-hectare site for the Tamar development. It was explained in the tender document that, if after evaluation in accordance with the terms of the tender, the Employer intended to award the contract to a tenderer whose design required planning permission from the Town Planning Board, i.e. the building developments of the Tamar project falling within the "Open Space" zone on the Outline Zoning Plan, the Employer should issue a non-binding letter of intent to such a tenderer. The tenderer named in the said letter of intent should obtain the necessary planning permission as soon as possible within seven months from the date of the letter of intent. Subject to all the relevant provisions set out in the tender

document, the contract should be awarded to a tenderer holding a letter of intent and who had secured the necessary planning permission.

24. The Convenor noted Members' concern about the inclusion of the waterfront promenade in some of the designs which made them much more presentable than others. She pointed out that the waterfront promenade was not part of the Project. SSB would certainly take this into account when evaluating the design proposals.

25. Mr Abraham SHEK considered that, for the purpose of ensuring the integrity of the tender process, it was appropriate that the Administration did not take part in LegCo's discussion on the Project. While he would not comment on any of the design proposals, he expressed the following views:

- (a) The standard of building materials and various electrical and mechanical elements adopted in the design proposals far exceeded the normal standards used for commercial buildings, e.g. the thickness of glass, the need for some backup systems in plant rooms, the large number of lifts etc. It was questionable whether the adoption of such high standards was necessary and cost-effective; and
- (b) The Ante-Chamber in the new LegCo Complex in all design proposals was too small. Being an important facility for Members' use and bearing in mind the increased number of Members in future, the Ante-Chamber should be more spacious.

26. Mr Ronny TONG was disappointed that the emphasis of the public viewing exercise was only on the design and aesthetic aspects of the design proposals. Nevertheless, he did not find all four design proposals satisfactory. He was of the view that, as in many overseas countries, the parliament building should be reminiscent of the historical and cultural context in which the legislature performed its functions. He would like to have a comparison table on the facilities of the new LegCo Complex in the four design proposals, such as the size of the Chamber, location of the petition area, LegCo Library, Complaints Office, Members' offices etc. He considered that supporting facilities, such as the LegCo Library, should be well equipped and easily accessible to Members. The petition area should be an open and spacious area close to the main entrance of the new LegCo Complex. He suggested that a working group should be established to facilitate exchange of views with the Administration in the course of implementing the Project.

27. ASG1 explained that the detailed design and functional requirements for the new LegCo Complex were set out clearly in the tender document. These included the overall design objectives, the schedule of accommodation and the comprehensive arrangements for the facilities and office establishments in the new LegCo buildings. In accordance with the requirements endorsed by the Commission, specific requirements such as the functions, image, design, location, access, area requirements, lighting, audio-visual and IT provisions of all the facilities were clearly stipulated. The tender document also provided for the IT/telecommunications, building services,

security, and other related specifications peculiar to the new LegCo Complex. For the Chamber, the Net Operating Floor Area was 1,574 m², which allowed for future expansion of Members' seating to 120. There would be more and bigger Conference Rooms with peripheral facilities, such as press gallery, public gallery, deputations' waiting room, technical room, simultaneous interpreters' room, photographers' room, etc. The Convenor added that all Members' offices would be in the same building in the new LegCo Complex. There would be a sizable conference room on each floor for Members' offices. It was a mandatory requirement that the total horizontal travel distance between the furthest entrances of the Chamber and any Members' offices should not exceed 140 metres (i.e. within three-minutes walking distance). The detailed user requirements would be reviewed after the appointment of the selected tenderer. Users of the new LegCo Complex, including Members and their assistants, members of the press and Secretariat staff would be consulted at that stage.

28. Ms Margaret NG remarked that the Administration should be thankful for Members' views on the Project. She reiterated her regret that the new LegCo Complex had to be tied together with the development of CGC. She considered that the design and outlook of the buildings in the Project were very important because they were the most important public buildings in Hong Kong. They should reflect the image and value ascribed by the community to the organizations to be accommodated there. Being a statutory body elected by the people of Hong Kong, the design of the new LegCo Complex should suitably reflect its close relationship with the various walks of life in the community. It should therefore be 'approachable'. In this connection, there should be adequate facilities, such as meeting rooms, cafeteria etc, for Members to meet and chat with the public. The LegCo Library played an important role in archiving documents relevant to Hong Kong's constitutional development. It was the most appropriate depository for all constitutional documents. Sufficient facilities and resources should be provided for the Library to ensure that it would perform fully its role. It should also be easily accessible and its collections conveniently available to the public. With regard to the petition area, it was a misconception that the area for the public to express views was regarded as a "demonstration zone". Confining the demonstrators in a fenced area was not a respectful way of treating public views. All these elements should be reflected in the design of the new LegCo Complex.

29. Mrs Selina CHOW appreciated the efforts of the LegCo Secretariat and Administration in the Project. She asked whether any of the design proposals deviated from the requirements specified in the tender document. She also enquired whether action would be taken against the tenderer in the event of infringement of intellectual property rights in its design proposals. In her view, the new LegCo Complex should have an iconic design. Originality in design was essential. She stressed the importance of interface of the new LegCo Complex and CGC, particularly the former, with the public. The new LegCo Complex belonged to the people of Hong Kong and their participation was pivotal in LegCo's performance of its functions. As such, the design of the new LegCo Complex should consider and accommodate, as far as possible, the needs of the public.

30. The Convenor stated that the Commission had for a long time asked for a site where the LegCo building could be self-standing and unique, and for this purpose, a number of suggestions for sites had been put to the Administration. However, all such requests had been turned down. Like all Members of the Legislative Council, she was for interface with the public. She pointed out that according to the marking scheme in the tender document, a maximum of 45 marks were given to the design and aesthetic aspects, which included "user-friendliness of the building and the open space". While the marking scheme did not accord a specific score to public views, SSB would be required to "have regard to the public views and impressions collated and analyzed by the consultant and would exercise independent and impartial judgment in assessing the tenders". She and Ms Miriam Lau, as members of SSB, would ensure the inclusion of all the mandatory requirements for the new LegCo Complex in the tender document. She envisaged that SSB would consider the issue of infringement of intellectual property rights by tenderers, if any, with the assistance of government counsels.

31. Professor Patrick LAU pointed out that, with careful study, the information requested by Members could in fact be found in the tender document and the exhibition materials. However, it would not be easy for Members to understand the information without explanation. He therefore regretted that no government architect was present at the consultation meeting. He commented that the Administration should explain to the public that tender prices were confidential information and would only be revealed to SSB after all the non-price aspects of the tenders had been assessed.

32. The Convenor briefly explained the marking scheme for the evaluation of the design proposals. The technical submission (quality aspect: weighting 60%) and tender price (price aspect: weighting 40%) would be assessed in parallel by two assessment teams. The Technical Committee would assess the technical submission of a tender against the quality aspect of the marking scheme, and make recommendation to SSB accordingly. SSB would take into account the assessments made by the Technical Committee, and the public viewing analysis made by the consultant, prior to making assessment of the tender submissions against the marking scheme. After this is completed, then the Pricing for the Project would be considered by SSB.

33. The Convenor thanked Members for their views and questions, which would be forwarded to SSB and DoA respectively.

34. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 12:27 pm.

* * * * *

Legislative Council Secretariat
June 2007

**Consultative meeting to discuss matters relating to the
Legislative Council Complex held on 1 June 2007**

Summary of views expressed by Members

A. Public viewing exercise	
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki	It is unfair to the public to ask them to give views on the design proposals based on the very limited information released to them. It is also not clear how the views given by the public will be dealt with. This is not a genuine public consultation exercise.
Hon WONG Kwok-hing	<p>The amount of information released to the public during the public viewing period is inadequate and the publicity materials failed to clearly convey the nature and major components of the project. The whole exercise is more a public relations tactic than a genuine public engagement exercise.</p> <p>The drawings and models on the design proposals displayed for public viewing show a large amount of open space with amenities, but it is unclear which part of the open space will be implemented under the project and which part will not. As such, the public may have given their comments on the design proposals based on an incorrect understanding of the scope of the project that would be implemented under the four design proposals.</p>
B. Tender assessment	
Prof Hon Patrick LAU	The Administration should explain to the public that tender prices are confidential information and will only be revealed to the Special Selection Board (SSB) after all the non-price aspects of the tenders have been assessed.
C. Facility provision	
Hon Margaret NG	<p>There is a misconception that area for public to express views should be regarded as a "demonstrations zone". Confining the demonstrating public to a fenced area is not a respectful way of treating public views.</p> <p>The library of the Legislative Council (LegCo)</p>

	<p>plays an important role in archiving the documents relevant to Hong Kong's constitutional development. Sufficient facilities and resources should be provided to ensure that this role can be successfully performed. The library should also be easily accessible to the public and its collections conveniently available to the public.</p>
Hon LEE Wing-tat	<p>There should be public access to the "Viewing Tower" in the Central Government Complex. The multi-purpose function hall should also be open to use by the public.</p>
Hon Abraham SHEK	<p>It appears that the standards adopted for the building materials and various electrical and mechanical elements of the project in the proposals are very much above the normal standards. This would result in higher costs. It is questionable whether the adoption of such high standards is necessary and cost-effective.</p> <p>The Ante-Chamber of the new LegCo Complex (LCC) should be more spacious.</p>
Hon SIN Chung-kai	<p>There should be free and undisrupted use of wireless Internet access by Members and the public within the new LCC. The acquisition of facilities for wireless Internet access, such as Wireless Fidelity (or commonly known as "Wi-Fi") should be timely but not too early so as to keep in pace with the advancement of technology and upgrading of standards,</p> <p>There should be adequate space and proper arrangements to facilitate demonstrations and petitioning of views to Members and Government officials within the future LegCo precincts.</p> <p>There should be adequate dining facilities and services in the new LCC.</p>
Hon Ronny TONG	<p>Facilities such as LegCo's library which provide important support to Members' work should be easily accessible to Members and well equipped.</p> <p>There should be an area dedicated for</p>

	demonstrations and petitioning of views by the public near the main entrance of the new LCC.
D. Design aspects	
Hon Mrs Selina CHOW	The new LCC belongs to Hong Kong people and their participation is pivotal in LegCo's performance of its functions. As such, the design for the complex should take into consideration and accommodate as far as possible the needs of the public, both in their using and touring the facilities of the complex.
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki	Members of the public are concerned about the environmental protection measures included under the design proposals, and how far the design of the facilities can help achieve the saving of energy and other environmental objectives. Such information is not available in the current public consultation exercise.
Hon Margaret NG	The outlook of the buildings under the Tamar project is very important, as this reflects the image and value ascribed by the community to the organizations to be accommodated thereat. The design of the LCC should suitably reflect the fact that LegCo Members are representatives of Hong Kong people, and the close relationship between LegCo Members and the people.
Hon LEE Wing-tat	More openable windows should be provided on top of the statutory requirement to allow more fresh air intake and to reduce energy consumption.
Hon SIN Chung-kai	There should be separate facilities and circulation arrangements for observation of the proceedings of LegCo and for touring around the new LCC by the public.
Hon Ronny TONG	The new LCC should be reminiscent of the historical and cultural context in which the legislature performs its functions. The four design proposals are disappointing in this respect.
Hon WONG Kwok-hing	Special attention should be given to ergonomics in

	designing or purchasing the chairs for use by Members at the LCC.
Hon Abraham SHEK	There appears to be too many lifts which may result in excessive use of electricity.
E. Others	
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki	<p>On certain past occasions, the Director of Administration advised LegCo Members that as Hon Rita Fan and Hon Miriam LAU were sitting on SSB, they could reflect LegCo Members' views on the project in the tender selection process. It was subsequently confirmed that Mrs FAN and Ms LAU were in fact appointed to the SSB in their personal capacity. He is disappointed with this arrangement. Nevertheless, he hopes that Mrs FAN and Ms LAU would take into account the views expressed by Members at this consultation meeting and reflect them duly when the SSB meets to consider the design proposals.</p> <p>When considering the design proposals, it is equally important to give regard to the cost in maintenance after construction.</p>
Prof Hon Patrick LAU	Many details are available in the tender documents and the exhibition materials, but one has to read them very carefully to locate the needed information. It is a regret that the Administration refuses to attend this meeting to explain the details to Members.
Hon Ronny TONG	A working group comprising Members should be set up to facilitate exchange of views with the Government in the course of implementing the project.
F. Individual Members' preferences	
Hon WONG Kwok-hing	Mr WONG is personally in favour of Design Proposal A.
Hon TAM Heung-man	Miss TAM is personally in favour of Design Proposal A, but is concerned that the design may have copied from another design.

**Consultative meeting to discuss matters relating to the
Legislative Council Complex held on 1 June 2007**

Summary of questions raised by Members

Hon TAM Heung-man	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There are critics alleging that certain design proposals for the Tamar Development Project (the Project) resemble some existing famous buildings. How would the Administration or the Special Selection Board (SSB) deal with the issue of infringement of intellectual property rights?
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Will there be any viewing gallery at the Central Government Complex (CGC) for the public to enjoy the harbour view?• What are the construction and maintenance costs for various building elements in the design proposals?• What environmental protection measures are included in the design proposals?• What are the design features in the design proposals, such as water features, to segregate the public from CGC?
Hon LEE Wing-tat	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Can the windows in the design proposals be opened?• Can the design proposals achieve "reduction of peak demand of electrical load" as required in the tender document? If so, how?• What is the actual amount of open space with amenities dedicated for public use? Is the open space easily accessible to the general public?• How far can changes be made to the design and other aspects of the Project before and after the award of contract?

Hon WONG Kwok-hing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Is there any plan to relocate the "Monument in Commemoration of the Return of Hong Kong to China" to the Tamar site? If not, will the Administration consider this arrangement?• What facilities will be available for pedestrian access to the future open space at the Tamar site?• What facilities will be available to ensure barrier-free access for the disabled to the future facilities at the Tamar site?• What facilities will be provided at the future Civic Place at the Tamar site to facilitate the expression of public opinions?
Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• What is the percentage of the "building-free zone" below the ridgeline in the design proposals?• What is the amount of open space and green areas in the design proposals and the boundary of the project site?• How far would the factor of sustainable development be taken into account in the tender selection process, in terms of design, building materials, cost of maintenance etc?• Are there special requirements regarding the inter-relationship among the major components of the Project; i.e LegCo Complex, CGC and Chief Executive's Office?
Hon Mrs Selina CHOW	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• What is the weighting given to the element of originality of design in the tender selection process?• How far do the design proposals comply with the requirements specified for the LegCo Complex?• How far would LegCo Members' views on the design of the LegCo Complex be taken into account in the tender selection process?

(Translation)

To: Mrs Anna LO
Principal Council Secretary (Administration)
Legislative Council Secretariat

31 May 2007

Dear Mrs LO,

I refer to the consultation meeting to discuss matters relating to the New Legislative Council Complex (LCC) under the Tamar Development Project. Given that the Administration will not attend the meeting to answer Members' questions, the following questions are raised for referral to the Administration for response.

1. With respect to each of the four design proposals, how many hectares of land are covered by the entire project? How many hectares of land are earmarked for the Central Government Complex (CGC) and LCC respectively? How many hectares of land are earmarked for open space for the public's enjoyment? How many hectares of land are earmarked for landscaped purposes? What is the coverage scale of open space for the public's enjoyment? What is the coverage scale of green areas?
2. With respect to each of the four design proposals, will there be a concourse or an open area where members of the public may congregate to enjoy fireworks display or participate in public consultation activities? If so, what is the estimated capacity of the area concerned?
3. With respect to each of the four design proposals, what are the heights above ground level of each of the buildings to be built under the proposal? How many floors are there in each of these buildings? How do the heights of these buildings compare with those of the buildings in the vicinity?
4. With respect to each of the four design proposals, what are the energy-saving measures to be adopted? Please state the energy-saving design and materials to be adopted in respect of the lighting system inside CGC and LCC. For example, will high efficiency electric lamps be used? What is the estimated energy efficiency to be achieved? How many units of electricity will be consumed every month for illuminating each square metre of area inside CGC and LCC?
5. With respect to each of the four design proposals, will environmentally-friendly building design be adopted, such as vegetation on rooftops or walls, and sky gardens, etc? Please state details of the designs and the specific amounts of energy that can be saved through such designs.

6. With respect to each of the four design proposals, can windows be opened and closed, so that room temperature may be regulated by natural ventilation during autumn and winter, thereby saving electricity?
7. With respect to each of the four design proposals, what is the area of the curtain wall to be used? How does the curtain wall affect electricity consumption? Has any evaluation been conducted on the impact of the resultant reflection of curtain walls on possible increase of outdoor temperature? If so, what is the result of the evaluation?
8. With respect to each of the four design proposals, will any water-saving measures be adopted, such as water recycling system or stormwater collection and reuse system? Please elaborate.
9. With respect to each of the four design proposals, will any facilities for waste sorting and recovery and solid waste recycling be used? Please elaborate.
10. With respect to each of the four design proposals, will environmentally-friendly construction materials be used? Please elaborate.
11. With respect to each of the four design proposals, has any ventilation impact study been conducted? Please provide details of the evaluation report, in particular its impact on ventilation in inland areas, and measures to mitigate the impact.
12. With respect to each of the four design proposals, has any noise impact study been conducted to assess the noise impact on surrounding areas upon the opening of P2 Road? If so, please state the noise impact and the measures adopted to mitigate such impact.
13. With respect to each of the four design proposals, which facilities inside CGC and LCC will be open for public use? How does the design embody the characteristic of CGC being “the people’s government headquarters”, as mentioned by the Chief Executive Donald TSANG? Does the proposal allow the public to visit CGC and LCC? Will members of the public be allowed to, through appointments, visit the viewing gallery, the information gallery and the public gallery? Will the public be allowed to, through appointments, visit CGC and the Chamber inside LCC, or use them as viewing platforms?
14. With respect to each of the four design proposals, what is the proposed principal datum of the Main Entrance to LCC? What is the visibility across the harbour? How can this conform to tender requirements?

15. With respect to each of the four design proposals, what is the arrangement for public demonstration outside CGC and LCC? Where is the expected location for demonstration? Will there be permanent or temporary railings to fence off the demonstrators? How many demonstrators can be accommodated outside CGC and LCC? Please elaborate.
16. With respect to each of the four design proposals, will closed-circuit televisions be installed? Will restricted areas barring public entry be designated? If so, please elaborate.
17. How do the four design proposals conform to the tender requirement of constructing a water feature with a width measuring not less than 10 m outside CGC?
18. With respect to each of the four design proposals, have any estimates been made regarding the basic maintenance fees for CGC and LCC in future? If so, what are the estimated annual maintenance fees?
19. Of the four design proposals, which one necessitates the construction of buildings on sites which are currently zoned as “open space”; hence requiring approval from the Town Planning Board? What is the estimated time required for this procedure? With respect to the proposal concerned, what is the area of the open space that will be occupied by buildings? Are there any means to make up for the loss of open space?
20. What is the construction price of each of the four design proposals?
21. With respect to each of the four design proposals, can it be altered in response to the requests of the public or the users? For example, can landscaped areas be expanded by planting more shade trees on the turfed area? If so, will the Government consult the public on the proposed alterations?

Thank you for your assistance.

(LEE Wing-tat)
Legislative Councillor of the
Democratic Party