

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. CB(1)857/07-08  
(These minutes have been seen  
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/PL/DEV/1

**Panel on Development**

**Minutes of special meeting**  
**held on Thursday, 10 January 2008, at 2:00 pm**  
**in the Chamber 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 James TIEN Pei-chun, GBS, JP  
Hon Albert HO Chun-yan  
Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai, SBS, S.B.St.J., JP  
Hon Mrs Sophie LEUNG LAU Yau-fun, GBS, JP  
Hon CHOY So-yuk, JP  
Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, GBS, JP  
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, SBS, JP  
Hon LEE Wing-tat  
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC  
Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming, SBS, JP

**Members attending:** Hon CHEUNG Man-kwong  
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP  
Hon CHIM Pui-chung

**Members absent** : Hon James TO Kun-sun  
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP  
Dr Hon Philip WONG Yu-hong, GBS  
Hon Miriam LAU Kin-yee, GBS, JP  
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip  
Hon Daniel LAM Wai-keung, SBS, JP  
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki

**Public officers attending** : Miss Jennifer MAK  
Director of Administration

Miss Shirley YUNG  
Deputy Director of Administration

Miss Winnie WONG  
Assistant Director of Administration  
(Tamar Development)

Mr Peter YUEN  
Project Director  
Architectural Services Department

Gammon-Hip Hing Joint Venture

Mr Rocco YIM  
Representative

Mr William TAM  
Representative

Ir Joseph LEUNG  
Representative

**Clerk in attendance** : Ms Anita SIT  
Chief Council Secretary (1)4

**Staff in attendance** : Mr WONG Siu-yee  
Senior Council Secretary (1)7

Ms Christina SHIU  
Legislative Assistant (1)7

---

Action

**I Update on the Tamar Development Project**  
(LC Paper No. CB(1)578/07-08(01) -- Information paper provided by the Administration)

The Director of Administration (D of Adm) briefed members on the latest development of the Tamar Development Project (the Project). She said that after obtaining funding approval from the Finance Committee in June 2006, the Administration commenced the tender exercise for the design-and-build contract for the Project. Tenders from the four prequalified tenderers were received by the

close of the tender period in mid-February 2007. The Administration organized a two-month public viewing exercise between March and May 2007 to give the public an opportunity to view and comment on the design and aesthetics aspects of the four tender designs. An independent consultant collated and analyzed the public comments received during the exercise, and submitted a report to the Special Selection Board for consideration. After assessing the tenders, the Special Selection Board decided to award the design-and-build contract at a cost of \$4,940 million to Gammon-Hip Hing Joint Venture, whose tender attained the highest overall score in terms of cost and quality. The contract covered the design and construction of a Central Government Complex (CGC), a Legislative Council Complex (LegCo Complex), an open space of not less than two hectares, two covered pedestrian footbridges and other ancillary facilities. She emphasized that the Project would be a green and sustainable Project, adopting various environmentally-friendly measures and energy-efficient building services. The Administration would coordinate with LegCo to ensure that its user requirements would be satisfied. The Administration would also coordinate with Gammon-Hip Hing Joint Venture to ensure that the Project would be completed smoothly.

2. The Project Director, Architectural Services Department (PD/ArchSD) briefed members on the arrangements for the execution of the contract. He explained that in a design-and-build contract, employer's requirements would be specified in the tender documents. The contractors participating in the tender exercise would engage their own architects and engineers to prepare a design proposal for the tender exercise. After the award of contract, the Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) would monitor the execution of the contract and implementation of the Project. The contractor would have to engage independent design checkers to check design plans, materials and products, etc. to ensure compliance with all relevant legislation and employer's requirements. ArchSD would then thoroughly check the submissions again before giving approval for works to proceed. During the implementation of the Project, ArchSD, the contractor and relevant parties would hold various kinds of meetings on a regular basis to monitor the design, quality, finance and progress of the Project to ensure that it would be completed on time and within the approved budget.

3. Mr Rocco YIM, representative of Gammon-Hip Hing Joint Venture, delivered a PowerPoint presentation on the details of the design of the Project. He explained the four design concepts of the Project, namely "Door Always Open", "Land Always Green", "Sky Will Be Blue" and "People Will Be Connected", and introduced the building components of CGC and LegCo Complex. He also briefed members on the details of the environmentally-friendly measures, energy-efficient building services, pedestrian and vehicular access, and other aspects of the Project design.

*(Post-meeting note: The soft copy of the presentation materials (LC Paper No. CB(1)581/07-08(01)) was subsequently issued to members on 11 January 2008.)*

4. In relation to the "Door Always Open" concept, the Chairman asked whether the concept originated from Mr Rocco YIM or the Administration.

5. In response, Mr Rocco YIM said that the concept was conceived by him and it reflected a spirit of openness. D of Adm added that the Administration respected the design concept of the Gammon-Hip Hing Joint Venture.

Admin

6. Mr Alan LEONG considered that the Administration should have known well in advance the date of formally awarding the contract for the Project. As such, he sought an explanation on why the Administration had given such a short notice in requesting the Panel to hold the meeting. The Panel had earlier requested the Administration to provide detailed information on the Project, some of which was still outstanding because the Administration indicated at that time that some information could not be released for various reasons. Without adequate information, the Panel could not perform its monitoring role. The Administration should explain the mechanism for monitoring the Project and coordinate with LegCo in monitoring the Project. He also queried whether there was/would be sufficient public participation in the Project. He requested the Administration to provide information on what roles the Panel and the public could play in participating in and monitoring the Project up to its completion. He requested the Clerk to the Panel to prepare a list of outstanding information requested by Members on past occasions for the Administration's written response.

7. The Chairman shared the view that the Administration should have given a longer notice and asked whether the Administration would improve the arrangements in future.

8. In response, D of Adm explained that the tender exercise was just completed and the contract was formally awarded to Gammon-Hip Hing Joint Venture on 9 January 2008. The Administration considered it appropriate to inform the public of this important development as early as possible. The Administration was aware that LegCo Members had been very concerned about the Project. As the Panel had scheduled its regular meeting for 22 January 2008, the Administration suggested that if the Panel so wished, the Administration would be prepared to brief the Panel on 10 January 2008 before making the public announcement. The Administration would provide further information as far as possible, keep the Panel informed of the latest development at various milestones of the Project and communicate with the Panel on monitoring the progress of the Project.

Admin

9. Noting this, Mr Alan LEONG said that there was no reason for not providing members with the public consultation report earlier because it was completed in June 2007. He requested the Administration to indicate the extent to which changes could be made to the design and other aspects of the Project after the award of contract, and provide the milestones at which the Administration would report to the Panel on the progress of the Project. He suggested that another meeting should be held to further discuss the subject.

10. Miss CHOY So-yuk also expressed a similar concern on whether changes could be made to the design of building elements such as curtain walls, and recycling systems for rain water and solid waste.

11. In response, D of Adm said that the tender documents were prepared based on employer's requirements and the assessment of the design proposals was also based on such requirements. There would be room for slight alterations only at this stage, but substantial addition of new requirements would increase the costs and lengthen the time for completing the Project. As such, there would be limitations for alterations, and whether any alternation could be entertained would depend on the exact nature of the alteration.

Admin 12. Despite the Administration's good intention to update Members on the Project, Mr LEE Wing-tat shared the view that the Administration should not have requested to hold the meeting so hurriedly. The Administration should improve the arrangement in future. He asked whether the public could, by appointment, have access to the top floor of CGC to enjoy the harbour view. As regards open space, he was worried that the open space provided would be small and segregated. He also asked whether there would be a designated area to accommodate 5 000 people for gatherings, petitions and other activities. In this regard, he criticized that the existing Central Government Offices resembled a cage. On the environmental protection front, he requested the Administration to indicate whether the Project would achieve zero carbon emission.

Admin

13. In response, D of Adm said the arrangements for gatherings had yet to be confirmed and the exact arrangements would depend on the detailed design. The open space should be made available for public use as far as possible and the Administration had to strike a balance between the needs of different users in using the place. Subject to operational and security requirements, the foyer to the multi-purpose hall in CGC could be made open to the public for enjoying the harbour view.

14. Ir Dr Raymond HO said that although he did not mind to attend an urgent meeting to receive an update on the Project, the Administration should be able to brief Members before the formal award of contract because such a briefing should not have any substantive effect on the formal award of contract. The Administration's mentality should be more open in this regard. As the commencement of the Project had been delayed for five months, he asked when the Project would be completed under the current schedule. In relation to independent consultant engineers and independent consultant architects, he sought an explanation on their roles and scopes of work and their working relationship with ArchSD. He also asked whether district cooling would be adopted, and whether the Project had to comply with the Buildings Ordinance.

15. In response, D of Adm said that the delay in commencement of the Project was due to the extra time allowed for the tenderers for submitting their tenders, the

exhibition of the design proposals for public viewing and the time required for the contractor to seek planning permission for its design scheme under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance. The construction works would take 39 months to complete and the completion date would be in May 2011.

16. PD/ArchSD said that the contractor would engage independent consultant engineers and independent consultant architects to conduct compliance checks on items like building designs and building materials to see whether they met relevant legislation and the requirements specified in the tender documents. ArchSD would then double check for compliance again. As such, their working relationship with ArchSD would not involve division of labour. The Project was exempted works under the Buildings Ordinance and therefore no approval from the Buildings Department was required. However, the independent consultants and ArchSD would check to ensure that the project was in compliance with the legislation. Ir Joseph LEUNG, Representative, Gammon-Hip Hing Joint Venture, added that the current design adopted sea water central cooling and the chiller plant had heat recovery capabilities. Sea water central cooling had better energy efficiency when compared with air cooling.

17. Mr James TIEN declared interest that Mr Rocco YIM was the architect of one of the properties of his company.

18. Mr Abraham SHEK declared interest that he was an independent non-executive director of NWS Holdings Limited, which owned Hip Hing Construction Company, Limited. He commented that the term "gateway" in English would be an even more appropriate term to describe the design, and asked how the public could access the future waterfront promenade from the hinterland through the "gateway" under CGC and how the design of the Project could integrate with that of the new waterfront areas. As regards making changes to the Project, he said that as the Project was implemented under a design-and-build contract, all the specifications of the Project had already been set out in the contract. After the award of contract, users could not make additions or alterations at liberty because substantial costs might be involved and the Project had to be completed within the approved funding.

19. In response, Mr Rocco YIM said that the Project would provide a pedestrian-friendly network. There would be footbridges linking the Project site with the pavement to the south of Harcourt Road where the Mass Transit Railway Admiralty Station was located and the CITIC Tower to the east. There would also be a landscaped deck over Road P2 to link the site with the future waterfront promenade, which would be barrier-free for pedestrians and run continuously from Two International Finance Centre to Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre. A Mass Transit Railway station to the north of the site had been planned and it would provide direct access to the site. D of Adm added that although the detailed design of the new waterfront areas had yet to be decided, all tenderers of the Project had been requested to provide a conceptual design of the waterfront areas adjoining the site to achieve good integration. The detailed design of the

new waterfront areas was within the scope of the Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront being undertaken by the Planning Department.

20. Mrs Sophie LEUNG considered that although detailed requirements from LegCo had already been provided earlier, further refinements might still be necessary. There should be flexibility in the design of the facilities, such as the LegCo Chamber, to facilitate optimal space usage and future expansion. She trusted that professionals would take care of other aspects of the Project, like environmental protection and integration.

21. In response, D of Adm said that the Administration had maintained close contact with LegCo and detailed user requirements in respect of the LegCo Complex had been reflected in the tender documents. Refinements could be considered during the detailed design stage subject to time and cost implications and the Administration would continue to maintain close contact with LegCo. The office block could be expanded and additional floor space provided under a separate project if LegCo required more space in future. The LegCo Chamber had already been designed to accommodate up to 120 Members. PD/ArchSD added that mock-up units for major spaces and samples of furniture items would be prepared for trial using to see if further improvements to the designs were required.

22. Miss CHOY So-yuk enquired about the details of various energy-saving and environmentally-friendly measures to be adopted, such as measures in reducing electricity consumption by air-conditioners, vertical and rooftop greening, waste management and sewerage collection.

23. In response, D of Adm said that the Project would adopt various environmentally-friendly design measures, such as building design measures to ensure good air ventilation to the hinterland. According to the present thinking, there would be vertical and rooftop greening, a central waste collection system, and rain water would be collected and recycled for irrigation. She undertook to provide further details on various energy-saving and environmentally-friendly design measures.

Admin

## **II Any other business**

24. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 3:35 pm.

Council Business Division 1  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
20 February 2008