

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)2248/09-10
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/PL/DEV/1

Panel on Development

Minutes of meeting
held on Tuesday, 27 April 2010, at 2:30 pm
in Conference Room A of the Legislative Council Building

- Members present** : Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBM, GBS, JP (Chairman)
Prof Hon Patrick LAU Sau-shing, SBS, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Hon Albert HO Chun-yan
Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai, SBS, S.B.St.J., JP
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP
Hon WONG Yung-kan, SBS, JP
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, SBS, JP
Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, SBS, JP
Hon WONG Kwok-hing, MH
Hon LEE Wing-tat
Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming, GBS, JP
Hon KAM Nai-wai, MH
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun
Hon IP Kwok-him, GBS, JP
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-ye, GBS, JP
Dr Hon Samson TAM Wai-ho, JP
- Members absent** : Hon Mrs Sophie LEUNG LAU Yau-fun, GBS, JP
Dr Hon Philip WONG Yu-hong, GBS
Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, GBS, JP

**Public officers
attending** : **Agenda item IV**

Mrs Carrie LAM CHENG Yuet-ngor, JP
Secretary for Development

Mrs Jessie TING YIP Yin-mei, JP
Deputy Secretary for Development (Works) 1

Mr Jack CHAN Jick-chi
Commissioner for Heritage
Development Bureau

Agenda item V

Mrs Carrie LAM CHENG Yuet-ngor, JP
Secretary for Development

Ms Gracie FOO Siu-wai, JP
Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)1

Mr CHOW Man-tat
Deputy Project Manager (Hong Kong Island and Islands)
Civil Engineering and Development Department

Mr CHEUK Wai-fun
Chief Engineer/Islands
Civil Engineering and Development Department

Agenda item VI

Mrs Carrie LAM CHENG Yuet-ngor, JP
Secretary for Development

Ms Gracie FOO Siu-wai, JP
Deputy Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)1

Mrs Jessie TING YIP Yin-mei, JP
Deputy Secretary for Development (Works) 1

Mr Jack CHAN Jick-chi
Commissioner for Heritage
Development Bureau

Attendance by invitation : Agenda item IV

Mr Michael Y K WONG
Chairman, Executive Committee
Hong Kong Youth Hostels Association

Mr Terry C Y LIU
Member, Executive Committee
Hong Kong Youth Hostels Association

Ms Iris TSANG Hoi-kee
General Manager
Hong Kong Youth Hostels Association

Mr Rex CHAN
Representative from Lead Consultant and Authorized Person (AD+RG)
Hong Kong Youth Hostels Association

Mr Andy LEE Shiu-chuen
Vice-President (Administration) and Secretary
Hong Kong Baptist University

Mr LAM Long-chau
Director of Estates
Hong Kong Baptist University

Dr BIAN Zhaoxiang
Director of Clinical Division, School of Chinese Medicine
Hong Kong Baptist University

Mr Tony LAM
Lead Consultant and Authorized Person (AGC)
Hong Kong Baptist University

Clerk in attendance : Mr WONG Siu-yee
Chief Council Secretary (1)4

Staff in attendance : Mr Daniel SIN
Senior Council Secretary (1)5

Mr Simon CHEUNG
Council Secretary (1)7

Ms Christina SHIU
Legislative Assistant (1)7

Action

I Confirmation of minutes

- (LC Paper No. CB(1)1508/09-10 -- Minutes of meeting on
26 January 2010
LC Paper No. CB(1)1712/09-10 -- Minutes of meeting on
23 February 2010)

The minutes of the meetings held on 26 January 2010 and 23 February 2010 were confirmed.

II Information papers issued since last meeting

- (LC Paper No. CB(1)1606/09-10(01) -- Letter dated 7 April 2010 from Hon James TO Kun-sun requesting the Research and Library Services Division of the Secretariat to prepare an information note on the compulsory land sale mechanism adopted in other places
LC Paper No. CB(1)1677/09-10(01) -- Submission on public open space in private developments from Designing Hong Kong Limited dated 11 April 2010
LC Paper No. CB(1)1688/09-10(01) -- Administration's response to issues raised at the meeting between Legislative Council Members and Heung Yee Kuk members on 14 January 2010 in relation to revision of rural development strategy
LC Paper No. CB(1)1688/09-10(02) -- Administration's response to issues raised at the meeting between Legislative Council Members and Heung Yee Kuk members on 14 January 2010 in relation to planning and

development strategy for the land released from the Frontier Closed Area and the land within the Frontier Closed Area

LC Paper No. CB(1)1688/09-10(03) -- Administration's response to issues raised at the meeting between Legislative Council Members and Heung Yee Kuk members on 14 January 2010 in relation to review of the Town Planning Ordinance

LC Paper No. CB(1)1688/09-10(04) -- Administration's response to issues raised at the meeting between Legislative Council Members and Heung Yee Kuk members on 14 January 2010 in relation to "missing lots" causing distress to persons with interests in the land concerned

LC Paper No. CB(1)1688/09-10(05) -- Administration's response to issues raised at the meeting between Legislative Council Members and Heung Yee Kuk members on 14 January 2010 in relation to review of section 12(c) of the Lands Resumption Ordinance and the New Territories zonal compensation system)

2. Members noted that the above information papers had been issued since the meeting on 30 March 2010.

III Items for discussion at the next meeting

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1666/09-10(01) -- List of outstanding items for discussion

LC Paper No. CB(1)1666/09-10(02) -- List of follow-up actions)

3. Members noted the letter from Mr KAM Nai-wai, which was tabled at the meeting, proposing that the Panel should discuss at its meeting on 25 May 2010 development-related issues under the Framework Agreement on Hong Kong/Guangdong Co-operation.

(*Post-meeting note*: The letter (LC Paper No. CB(1)1755/09-10(01)) was issued to members on 29 April 2010.)

4. Members agreed that the following items should be discussed at the regular meeting scheduled for 25 May 2010 --

- (a) Progress of implementation of Total Water Management initiatives;
- (b) Progress report on Kai Tak Development;
- (c) Review of the Urban Renewal Strategy -- Stage 3 Public Engagement; and
- (d) Development-related issues under the Framework Agreement on Hong Kong/Guangdong Co-operation.

IV CWP item no. 8004QW "Revitalisation Scheme -- Conversion of Lui Seng Chun into Hong Kong Baptist University Chinese Medicine and Healthcare Centre" and CWP item no. 8007QW "Revitalization Scheme -- Conversion of Mei Ho House as City Hostel"

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1666/09-10(03) -- Administration's paper on revitalization of Mei Ho House as City Hostel and revitalization of Lui Seng Chun as the Hong Kong Baptist University Chinese Medicine and Healthcare Centre under the Revitalising Historic Buildings Through Partnership Scheme

LC Paper No. CB(1)1666/09-10(04) -- Paper on heritage conservation prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat (Updated background brief)

5. Secretary for Development (SDEV) said that Mei Ho House and Lui Seng Chun were the last two of six historic buildings under the first batch of the Revitalising Historic Buildings Through Partnership Scheme (Revitalisation Scheme) submitted to the Legislative Council for funding support. The funding proposals for the two projects would be submitted to the Public Works Subcommittee and the Finance Committee for consideration in June 2010. The Administration was vetting revitalization applications for five historic buildings under the second batch of the Revitalisation Scheme. More historic buildings were being identified for inclusion under the third batch for revitalization.

6. Mr Michael WONG, Chairman, Executive Committee of the Hong Kong Youth Hostels Association, said that Mei Ho House was built in 1954 for resettling victims of the Shek Kip Mei fire. The building was structurally simple, but had suffered wear and tear after years of use. Substantial repair and renovation were required and additional facilities had to be installed to meet the latest building services standards. The City Hostel project could extend the life of Mei Ho House and provide affordable accommodation for promoting cultural exchange between visitors and the local community. A Museum of Public Housing would be provided to display the lifestyle of early public housing tenants. Residents of Shek Kip Mei would be recruited to lead guided tours to introduce the history of Mei Ho House and the community life in Sham Shui Po District in the past to visitors.

7. Mr Andy LEE Shiu-chuen, Vice-President (Administration) and Secretary, Hong Kong Baptist University, said that Lui Seng Chun, which was built in 1931, was a typical Chinese tenement building of the time. When renovation was completed and the Chinese Medicine and Health Centre started operation in the first quarter of 2012, the revitalized Lui Seng Chun would be a local landmark and provide quality and professional healthcare service for the community.

8. Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming said that with the revitalization of Mei Ho House, Lui Seng Chun and North Kowloon Magistracy, it appeared that the Administration intended to adopt the Conserving Central model to group various major historic buildings and sites for promoting heritage conservation in the area. He asked if the Administration had systematic plans to carry out similar heritage conservation initiatives for other districts. SDEV said that the Administration had made continuous efforts in identifying new opportunities for heritage conservation and revitalization in local districts, e.g. in Central and Wanchai. With various revitalization project underway (such as Mei Ho House, Lui Seng Chun, North Kowloon Magistracy and the former Lai Chi Kok Hospital), Sham Shui Po could be another local district with good potential for heritage conservation. The revitalisation of old industrial buildings would also bring new impetus to the district. The Administration could consider how this approach could be applied to other districts having regard to the resource implications and prioritization. The Administration would also identify the characteristics of individual districts that could be harnessed for self-regeneration.

9. Ms Starry LEE said that Yau Tsim Mong and Kowloon City also had rich heritage legacies. She asked what progress had been made to rejuvenate these communities with its historical heritage. SDEV said that Kai Tak Development would be the impetus for the regeneration of Kowloon East and nearby districts, in particular Kowloon City. The Administration would report the progress of Kai Tak Development at the next Panel meeting.

10. Ms Starry LEE said that the Administration should develop a bottom-up mechanism and draw up heritage conservation initiatives and revitalization projects in collaboration with local District Council members. At present, there was no designated office to co-ordinate the matter. SDEV said that the Administration had a clear objective of connecting heritage sites and buildings into a heritage trail or cluster. Given the limited resources, older districts should be accorded higher priority in such revitalization efforts. Seven District Councils had participated in the District Aspiration Studies. The Administration would report further progress on urban regeneration when it briefed the Panel on the latest update of the review of the Urban Renewal Strategy.

11. Mr KAM Nai-wai enquired about the reason for the significant cost difference between the Mei Ho House project and the Lui Seng Chun project, and the criteria adopted in determining the amount of funding. Mr KAM noted that many of the cost items were related to structural repair. He asked if it was the Administration's policy to bear the cost of first-time structural maintenance for buildings under the Revitalisation Scheme, and whether the organizations operating in the revitalized buildings would be responsible for the subsequent recurrent expenses on a self-financing basis.

12. Commissioner for Heritage (C for H) explained that, with a site area of about 2 700 square metres, the scale of the Mei Ho House project was about 20 times larger than that of the Lui Seng Chun project. The cost for the Mei Ho House project was estimated at \$202 million, compared with \$25 million for the Lui Seng Chun project. Compared to that for the Mei Ho House, the unit cost per square metre for the Lui Seng Chun project was higher as it benefited less from the economy of scale with a smaller site. About half of the estimated cost would be spent on the foundation works and building strengthening works, which were required to ensure that these old buildings would meet the prevailing higher building standards. The Administration would assess the financial viability and the long-term self-sustainability of each proposal.

13. SDEV said that under the Revitalisation Scheme, the Administration would be responsible for the capital cost according to the needs and nature of the projects because the historic buildings were government properties and, in reflection of the objective of the Scheme, the projects should not become too commercial. She added that the Administration would not set any ceiling on the amount of capital cost for individual projects and each case would be considered on its own merits. The Administration would select a proposal that would benefit the community the most and an organization would not be given more favourable consideration simply because it offered to bear some or all of the capital cost. Selected non-profit-making organizations had to operate as a social enterprise and operate their businesses in the revitalized buildings on a self-sustaining basis. However, in the initial two years of operation, each organization could on

application receive up to \$5 million in government funding to support its operating expenses.

14. Prof Patrick LAU noted that the central structure connecting the two wings of Mei Ho House would be demolished and rebuilt. He considered that the central structure was important in supporting the building. The project consultants should carry out thorough investigation and exercise extra care in the demolition and construction works. The revitalized building should be able to preserve the profile of early public housing architecture so that the public would understand the changing development of public housing in Hong Kong.

15. C for H said that Mei Ho House was an example of Mark I H-type resettlement housing block. The H-shape architecture of Mei Ho House would be preserved. However, as the central connecting structure of the building had been used for communal bathrooms and toilets for many years, there was serious water seepage and the original structure might not be safe for use in future. It was therefore proposed that the original central connecting structure should be demolished and rebuilt to accommodate a lift for disabled persons and an emergency fire escape staircase. Information about the central connecting structure and its previous functions would be displayed in the Museum of Public Housing.

16. Mr Rex CHAN, Representative from Lead Consultant and Authorized Person (AD+RG), Hong Kong Youth Hostels Association, said that investigation into the structural safety had been conducted on the central connecting structure of Mei Ho House. It was concluded that the structure needed to be demolished and rebuilt, but the new structure would bear the same architectural design and the external shape as the original structure.

17. The Chairman said that members' views would be reported to the Public Works Subcommittee for its consideration of the relevant funding proposals.

V PWP Item 417RO -- Improvement works at Tai O

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1632/09-10(01) -- Administration's paper on the funding proposal for "PWP Item 417RO -- Improvement works at Tai O"

LC Paper No. CB(1)1717/09-10(01) -- Paper on improvement works at Tai O prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat (Background brief))

18. Members noted the submission from Association for Tai O Environment and Development tabled at the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: The soft copy of the submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)1752/09-10(01)) was issued to members by email on 28 April 2010.)

19. SDEV advised that the Administration had briefed the Panel on the Tai O Revitalisation Concept Plan on 28 July 2009. For the improvement works at Tai O, the Administration had adopted a district-based and bottom-up approach, making considerable efforts in seeking the views of local residents and relevant stakeholders. The Administration had also taken on board members' views that in revitalizing Tai O, efforts should be made to conserve the heritage of Tai O and address the actual needs of local residents. She solicited members' support of the three proposed items of improvement works.

20. Deputy Project Manager (Hong Kong Island and Islands) (DPM(HK&I)) delivered a powerpoint presentation to brief members on the details of the proposed improvement works. He advised that Tai O residents generally supported these improvement works. The riverwall at Yat Chung would protect low-lying areas along Wing On Street and Tai Ping Street against inundation of seawater during high tides under average meteorological conditions, and it would be constructed using hydraulically-operated press-in method for installation of the double sheet piles to minimize noise, vibration and impact on the nearby stilted houses and village houses. To respond to the views of local residents, the Administration would use natural stone facing for beautifying the outer side of the riverwall. Small marine creatures and plants could grow in the recesses formed between the stones. Landscaping works would be provided in the area behind the riverwall. A stormwater pumping station and drainage system would be installed to drain the rain water away to the Creek. A sewerage system intercepting the sewage currently discharging into Tai O Creek would be built to improve environmental hygiene. The open space in front of Kwan Tai Temple would be renovated for holding religious and cultural activities. By using modest design and natural materials, the new signage to be put up in the inner core area of Tai O would blend in with the local environment.

(Post-meeting note: The soft copy of the presentation materials (LC Paper No. CB(1)1758/09-10(01)) was issued to members by email on 28 April 2010.)

21. Prof Patrick LAU enquired whether it was necessary to set the height of the riverwall at 3.3 meters, because this would block the view towards the sea. Furthermore, while the riverwall would relieve flooding in Wing On Street, he asked whether the riverwall would have adverse effects on nearby areas such as Kat Hing Street and the stilted houses at Yee Chung.

22. DPM(HK&I) explained that 3.3 meters referred to the coping level of the riverwall above Principal Datum (i.e. mPD), and the riverwall would only be about

1.1 metres above the ground level of the area behind the riverwall. Therefore, the riverwall would not cause any visual obstruction to Tai O Creek. He assured members that the construction of the riverwall would not affect the tidal level in the Creek and increase the flooding risks at nearby areas such as Kat Hing Street and the stilted houses at Yee Chung because both were located at a higher level. In response to further enquiries from Prof Patrick LAU, he advised that normal water level at high tides ranged from 2.4 to 2.5 mPD, but spring tides coupled with strong wind might reach 3.0 mPD. As for the pumping station, he said that it would drain the rain water collected behind the riverwall to the Creek.

23. Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming supported the construction of the riverwall and considered that the Administration should have upgraded the improvement works to Category A much earlier. As the construction of the riverwall would last for two and a half years, he urged that the Administration should prepare for excessive rainfall which might lead to flooding during the interim. He enquired whether it was possible to shorten the construction period. He sought clarification on whether the riverwall at a height of 3.3 mPD would still be able to prevent flooding during typhoons as strong as Typhoon Hagupit, which slashed Hong Kong in September 2008 and led to serious flooding in Tai O. Mr WONG Kwok-hing expressed similar concerns on the need for interim measures and said that the Administration should have appropriate preventive measures before the completion of the riverwall.

24. DPM(HK&I) advised that Tai O improvement works, i.e. 417RO, was included in Category B in 2006. In view of growing community concern, the Administration conducted further consultation with local residents and relevant stakeholders, and organized the Design Competition for Revitalisation of Tai O in March 2008. Based on the design concepts collected through the design competition, the Tai O Revitalisation Concept Plan was drawn up. There was strong aspiration to tackle the flooding problem in Tai O urgently. To solve the flooding problem completely, he advised that either the low-lying areas had to be filled up or a huge tidal barrier had to be built around Tai O, but such proposals were not accepted by the local residents. On the cause of flooding, he clarified that as rain water associated with heavy rainstorms would readily be drained to the Creek within a short period of time, it was not the major cause of flooding. The height of the riverwall was deliberated during several rounds of consultation with local residents, who generally agreed to the height now proposed. The Administration aimed to complete the core works of the riverwall by December 2011. A riverwall at the height of 3.3mPD should be able to withstand inundation of seawater in most circumstances. Nonetheless, extreme weather conditions such as strong typhoons and huge storm surges coupled with high tides might still cause flooding in low-lying areas. To cater for such emergency situation, an early warning system for serious flooding in Tai O had been put in place under the co-ordination of the Home Affairs Department with support from other relevant departments, including Drainage Services Department, Hong Kong Observatory, police, Civil Aid Service and Fire Services Department.

25. Mr KAM Nai-wai queried whether the Administration had deliberately played down the opposing views of the organizations and residents they had consulted. Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)¹ advised that the Administration had consulted various parties including the Islands District Council, Tai O Rural Committee, green groups as well as local residents. While residents and these parties were in general supportive of the improvement works, a green group did express reservation on the cost-effectiveness of the riverwall at Yat Chung. The outcome of the consultation had been duly reflected in the Panel paper. During the discussions with these parties, the Administration was frank and open in stating the limitations of the riverwall under extreme weather conditions such as typhoons of a scale on par with Typhoon Hagupit.

26. Mr WONG Kwok-hing opined that the Administration should pay due attention to the beautification of the riverwall by planting trees and greeneries along it so that it would not stand out from the natural environment. Given that the stilted houses in Tai O were wooden structures, he considered it necessary for the Administration to improve fire services installations such as fire hoses on site so that fire could be put off immediately when it broke out.

27. SDEV responded that while the primary aims of the riverwall and the drainage and sewerage works were to relieve flooding and improve the sewerage system, efforts would be made to ensure that the design of the riverwall would not be at odds with the natural environment and there would be abundant greeneries. On fire safety, DPM(HK&I) advised that the Administration had increased the number of fire hydrants on site after a fire that broke out more than 10 years ago. At present, there were a fire boat and two fire stations serving Tai O, and the fire services installations were considered adequate.

28. The Chairman said that members' views would be reported to the Public Works Subcommittee when it considered the relevant funding proposal.

VI Conserving Central

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1666/09-10(05) -- Administration's paper on conserving Central

LC Paper No. CB(1)1666/09-10(04) -- Paper on heritage conservation prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat (Updated background brief))

29. SDEV said that the Conserving Central initiative was a major heritage conservation initiative announced in the Chief Executive's (CE) Policy Address for 2009-10. Several rounds of public consultation, including briefing sessions for the Central and Western District Council, had been held and exhibitions were

organized to enhance public understanding of the initiative. The conservation projects under the initiative were carried out by different means involving public and private organizations and had achieved smooth progress.

30. Mr KAM Nai-wai suggested that Central district should be designated as a historic town district, and that an overall holistic conservation plan should be developed rather than piecemeal preservation of isolated historic buildings. SDEV said that designating the whole of Central district as a historic town required consideration of some fundamental planning principles and considerations. Questions such as how modern non-historic private buildings within a historic town district should be treated would need to be addressed. The Administration at present had no plan to adopt a historic town district concept in the planning and implementation of the Conserving Central initiative.

31. As some of the proposed Conserving Central projects were likely to attract high pedestrian flow, Mr KAM Nai-wai said that the Administration should conduct in-depth assessment on their traffic, environment and social impacts. SDEV said that detailed impact assessment would certainly be conducted when more details of the projects were available. In particular, the Administration would examine how connectivity and accessibility within the district could be improved.

32. Mr KAM Nai-wai and Ms Cyd HO said that the Administration's paper had not included some conservation initiatives in Central such as the two Urban Renewal Authority (URA) projects in Wing Lee Street and Graham Street. For Wing Lee Street in particular, Ms HO asked whether other sites nearby such as the side streets connecting the area would also be conserved.

33. SDEV said that the paper was intended to report the progress of the eight Conserving Central projects as announced in the CE's Policy Address. They represented the beginning, not the end, of the Administration's conservation efforts in Central, the success of which would depend on the participation of other private or public organizations. The plan of the Fringe Club to refurbish its building and URA projects in Graham Street, Wing Lee Street and Pak Tsz Lane were encouraging examples of joint efforts in heritage conservation. The Administration was ready to initiate necessary town planning procedures to facilitate heritage conservation efforts by the private sector.

34. As regards Wing Lee Street, SDEV stressed that the decision to conserve Wing Lee Street was made as early as 2008. With this decision, the proposed Staunton Street project (which included Wing Lee Street) was expected to incur deficits. The conservation of Wing Lee Street would cover not just the buildings, but also the neighbourhood including the access and the adjacent open market.

35. Mr WONG Kwok-hing suggested that old photographs of significant historic buildings (whether or not they had been demolished or redeveloped), with

explanatory notes on the history of the buildings and the historic events occurring therein should be displayed at those heritage sites. This would make the sites more attractive to visitors. The beautification project in Tsuen Wan where the relevant District Council put up display boards showing old photographs of Chung On Street was a good example.

36. Mr IP Kwok-him said that promoting heritage conservation was an important objective of the work of the Central and Western District Council. He referred to the Sun Yat-sen Park, which would display information on the historical events that had happened in the district, as an example. Although District Councils (DCs) lacked the staffing support to carry out conservation projects on their own, the Development Bureau and other executive agents could work with DC members who had rich knowledge of local historical development and could contribute toward the conservation efforts.

37. SDEV said that similar signs had been put up along the Dr. Sun Yat-sen Historical Trail, as well as along the heritage trails in Wanchai. Display boards would also be provided on Pak Tsz Lane to explain the significant historic events that had taken place there. The Administration would consider providing information boards at more historic sites after the completion of various revitalisation projects.

38. Mr WONG Kwok-hing further suggested that information could also be posted on the street maps displayed inside MTR stations. Mr IP Kwok-him referred to a recent example where MTR Corporation Limited displayed photographs in the Central station showing the life in Hong Kong in the 1960s. He said that the Administration should raise public awareness of heritage conservation and revitalisation by stepping up publicity efforts in areas where pedestrian flow was high. SDEV said that she would consider members' suggestions in our continued promotional efforts. She said that community awareness in conservation had increased over the years and the Administration appreciated the participation and contribution of many organizations such as the MTR Corporation Limited in this regard. The Administration would continue to promote community efforts through the on-going activities of the Commissioner of Heritage's Office.

39. Prof Patrick LAU suggested that, given its prominent location, a museum of Hong Kong architecture and development could be set up in the Central Market to underline the historical significance of Central District in Hong Kong's development. Models showing Hong Kong's different stages of development from colonial to recent times could be displayed and explained. With its high ceiling, the Central Market building was particularly suitable for use as an exhibition venue. SDEV agreed to refer Prof LAU's suggestions to URA for consideration. URA had received many suggestions for the conservation of the Central Market, but the floor area that could be made available was limited.

40. In response to an enquiry from Prof Patrick LAU, SDEV said that the Hong Kong Jockey Club, the agent responsible for the revitalization of the Central Police Station Compound, had been examining the various suggestions received from previous public consultation sessions. The project design had taken longer time than expected. She expected that a scheme should be available around July 2010.

41. Prof Patrick LAU agreed to the view that the connectivity among historic sites and buildings in Central was important and resources should be provided to improve pedestrian access. Ms Cyd HO said that a pedestrian path linking the Central Police Station Compound, Graham Street, Wing Lee Street, and the Hollywood Road Former Married Police Quarters should be maintained, and streets of historical significance such as Ladder Street and Pottinger Street should be preserved as well. SDEV said that it was an important objective of the Administration to conserve the pedestrian environment as well and Ladder Street had already been covered in the recent grading exercise for historic buildings.

42. Ms Starry LEE said that in the past it was not clear which party should take the lead in implementing conservation projects. She asked if Conserving Central was a joint initiative of URA and the Development Bureau with the latter taking a central co-ordinating role, and whether this model would be adopted for future conservation projects. SDEV said that URA was one of the executive agents in implementing Conserving Central, and the Development Bureau assumed an overall co-ordinating role.

43. Ms Starry LEE asked whether it was essential for the Development Bureau to take the lead in heritage conservation, and whether it was possible for other organizations such as DCs to play a similar role at district level. SDEV advised that as DCs did not have executive power, they had to rely on different departments as the execute agents at the local level. The Hong Kong Housing Society, URA, and other organizations including commercial ones could be invited to participate in the conservation projects as necessary, with the Development Bureau maintaining a central co-ordination role.

44. Mr KAM Nai-wai proposed to move a motion to urge the Administration to consider planning and developing Central and Sheung Wan as a historic town district, and that it should conduct a comprehensive assessment on the traffic, environmental and social impact. In order to allow sufficient time for members to express their views on the proposed motion, the Chairman suggested and members agreed that the proposed motion should be dealt with at the next regular meeting scheduled for 25 May 2010.

VII Any other business

Revitalization of industrial buildings policy

45. Mrs Regina IP said that there were complaints about the unfairness of exempting waiver fee under the revitalization of industrial buildings policy. She asked the Administration to provide a progress report on the implementation of the revitalization of industrial buildings policy. The report should explain how the policy to revitalize industrial buildings was planned and co-ordinated, and should include information such as the number of applications received, their status, the impacts on traffic and the community, the justifications for exempting waiver fee and the amount of revenue to be forgone as a result, whether the Administration would revitalize some of its industrial buildings for the development of other industries, and whether modifications to the policy would be made.

46. SDEV said that the revitalization of industrial buildings policy had been implemented on 1 April 2010, and applications received were being processed. She agreed to provide the information as requested.

(Post-meeting note: The Administration's supplementary information (LC Paper No. CB(1)1957/09-10(01)) was circulated to members on 19 May 2010.)

Operation Building Bright

47. Ms Starry LEE said that the Administration should report the latest progress of Operation Building Bright before the end of the current legislative session, and asked when a new round of application would start. SDEV responded that the Administration intended to seek additional funding of \$500 million before the end of the legislative session for launching a new round of application. The Administration would brief members on the latest progress of and the funding proposal for Operation Building Bright in June 2010.

48. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 4:30 pm.