

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)2483/11-12
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref: CB1/PS/2/09/1

Panel on Development

Subcommittee on Building Safety and Related Issues

**Minutes of the meeting held on
Monday, 11 June 2012, at 2:30 pm
in Conference Room 2A of the Legislative Council Complex**

Members present : Prof Hon Patrick LAU Sau-shing, SBS, JP (Chairman)
Hon KAM Nai-wai, MH (Deputy Chairman)
Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai, SBS, S.B.St.J., JP
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP
Hon Tanya CHAN

Members absent : Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, SBS, JP
Hon LEE Wing-tat
Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming, GBS, JP
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, JP
Hon IP Kwok-him, GBS, JP
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC

Public officers attending : **Agenda item I**

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

Mr Rex CHANG Wai-yuen, JP
Deputy Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)²

Mr Ryan CHIU Pit-ming
Principal Assistant Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)³

Mr AU Choi-kai, JP
Director of Buildings

Mr HUI Siu-wai
Deputy Director of Buildings

Agenda item II

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

Mr Rex CHANG Wai-yuen, JP
Deputy Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)²

Mr Ryan CHIU Pit-ming
Principal Assistant Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)³

Mr AU Choi-kai, JP
Director of Buildings

Mr HUI Siu-wai
Deputy Director of Buildings

Mr Paul PANG Tat-choi
Assistant Director/Existing Buildings 1
Buildings Department

Agenda item III

Mr Rex CHANG Wai-yuen, JP
Deputy Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)²

Mr Victor NG Hon-wing
Principal Assistant Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)⁶

Mr AU Choi-kai, JP
Director of Buildings

Mr HUI Siu-wai
Deputy Director of Buildings

Mr KOON Chi-ming
Assistant Director/New Buildings 2
Buildings Department

Attendance by invitation : Agenda item I

Professor KO Jan-ming
Independent Expert

Mr Daniel LAM Chun, BBS, JP
Independent Expert

Agenda item II

Mr WONG Kit-loong
Chief Executive Officer & Executive Director
Hong Kong Housing Society

Mr Sanford POON Yuen-fong
General Manager (Property Management)
Hong Kong Housing Society

Ir Calvin LAM Che-leung
Executive Director
(Operations and Project Control)
Urban Renewal Authority

Clerk in attendance : Ms Sharon CHUNG
Senior Council Secretary (1)4

Staff in attendance : Mr Simon CHEUNG
Senior Council Secretary (1)9

Ms Christina SHIU
Legislative Assistant (1)4

Action

I Results of the Independent Expert Review on the Buildings Department's Enforcement Procedures and Practices in relation to Dilapidated Buildings

(LC Paper No. CB(1)2099/11-12(01) -- Administration's paper on the Buildings Department's Review of Enforcement Procedures and Practices for Dilapidated Buildings and views of Independent Experts

LC Paper No. CB(1)2112/11-12(01) -- Independent Expert's Full Report on the Buildings Department's Enforcement Procedures and Practices in relation to Dilapidated Buildings by Professor KO Jan-ming

LC Paper No. CB(1)2112/11-12(02) -- Independent Expert's Full Report on the Buildings Department's Enforcement Procedures and Practices in relation to Dilapidated Buildings by Mr Daniel LAM Chun)

II "Operation Building Bright" -- Progress and update

(LC Paper No. CB(1)2099/11-12(02) -- Administration's paper on Operation Building Bright -- Progress and update)

III Seismic resistant design requirements for new buildings in Hong Kong

(LC Paper No. CB(1)2099/11-12(03) -- Administration's paper on introduction of seismic-resistant building design standards in Hong Kong

Action

LC Paper No. IN31/11-12

-- Paper on seismic-resistant design for new buildings in Hong Kong prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat (Information note))

The Subcommittee deliberated on the above subjects (index of proceedings at the **Appendix**).

IV Any other business

2. The Chairman said that since the establishment of the Subcommittee in 2010, it had held eight meetings with the Administration to discuss issues related to the enhancement of building safety. The Chairman suggested and members agreed that the Subcommittee should wind up its work. The Clerk would prepare a report on the Subcommittee's deliberations for submission to the Panel on Development.

(Post-meeting note: The report of the Subcommittee was submitted to the Panel on Development by circulation on 13 July 2012 vide LC Paper No. CB(1)2364/11-12.)

3. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 4:32 pm.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
21 August 2012

Panel on Development

Subcommittee on Building Safety and Related Issues

**Proceedings of the meeting on
Monday, 11 June 2012, at 2:30 pm
in Conference Room 2A of the Legislative Council Complex**

Time Marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action Required
000911 – 001038	Chairman	Opening remarks	
<p>I. <u>Results of the Independent Expert Review on the Buildings Department's Enforcement Procedures and Practices in relation to Dilapidated Buildings</u></p>			
001039 – 001203	Administration	<p><u>Introductory remarks</u></p> <p>(a) In late January 2010, a building at 45J Ma Tau Wai Road collapsed and led to four deaths and serious injury of two others. The Coroner conducted an inquest on the cause of death and delivered the findings on 16 August 2011. Responding to the Coroner's recommendations, the Buildings Department ("BD") conducted a comprehensive review on its building safety enforcement procedures and practices for dilapidated buildings and compiled a report.</p> <p>(b) Professor KO Jan-ming and Mr Daniel LAM Chun, experts in the structural engineering and building surveying fields respectively, were appointed as independent experts in February 2012 to examine BD's review.</p> <p>(c) In the wake of the building collapse incident, the Panel on Development set up the Subcommittee on Building Safety and Related Issues in February 2010 to provide a focused discussion forum on building safety issues. The Administration was thankful to the work of the Subcommittee, which provided valuable suggestions and views on enhancing building safety over the past two years.</p>	

Time Marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action Required
001204 – 001513	Administration	<p data-bbox="616 232 1278 300"><u>Progress of the measures introduced since 2010 to enhance building safety</u></p> <p data-bbox="616 342 1278 629">(a) The Chief Executive announced in his Policy Address 2010-2011 that the Administration would adopt a multi-pronged approach to enhance building safety through measures on four fronts, i.e. legislation, enforcement, support and assistance to building owners and publicity and public education. The measures were making good progress.</p> <p data-bbox="616 672 1278 994">(b) On the legislation front, full implementation of the Mandatory Building Inspection Scheme ("MBIS") and the Mandatory Window Inspection Scheme ("MWIS") would commence on 30 June 2012. Legislative process for inclusion of building works associated with subdivided flats under the Minor Works Control System ("MWCS") had also been completed.</p> <p data-bbox="616 1037 1278 1323">(c) On the enforcement side, BD had commenced a new enforcement policy against unauthorized building works ("UBWs") by extending the scope of actionable UBWs and conducting large-scale operations targeting at UBWs, dilapidated buildings and subdivided flats, including those inside industrial buildings.</p> <p data-bbox="616 1366 1278 1727">(d) As for support and assistance for building owners, in addition to Operation Building Bright, the Administration, in collaboration with the Hong Kong Housing Society ("HKHS") and the Urban Renewal Authority ("URA"), had consolidated various technical and financial assistance schemes. The first Urban Renewal Resource Centre providing one-stop service to building owners was opened in April 2012.</p> <p data-bbox="616 1769 1278 2024">(e) Additional resources were set aside to improve BD's manpower and financial positions in the past two years, resulting in an increase of 24% on BD's staff establishment from 996 in 2010 to 1 232 in 2012, and an increase of 25% in operating expenses from \$800 million in 2010 to \$1 billion in 2012.</p>	

Time Marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action Required
001514 – 003026	Administration	<p data-bbox="616 232 1278 306"><u>Briefing on BD's review of building safety enforcement procedures and practices</u></p> <p data-bbox="616 344 1278 1003">(a) BD's review was conducted by an internal working group ("the WG") consisting of experienced professional staff of the Department. The scope of the review covered BD's enforcement procedures and practices, including manuals and guidelines on inspection of buildings, as well as issuance of investigation/repair and demolition orders. The review was completed in December 2011 and then examined by the two independent experts, Professor KO Jan-ming and Mr Daniel LAM Chun. The review should serve as a basis for future reviews as ongoing reviews would be necessary to ensure BD's procedures and practices would cater for present-day needs. BD would continue to step up efforts and improve its work in enhancing building safety.</p> <p data-bbox="616 1048 1278 1368">(b) The WG concluded that BD's existing guidelines and instructions with regard to building safety inspections and subsequent enforcement actions were generally adequate. Nonetheless, the WG found that there was room for improvement on certain aspects relating to building inspections and reporting, issuance of statutory orders and subsequent monitoring.</p> <p data-bbox="616 1413 1278 2033">(c) To provide frontline staff with clear guidance in their enforcement work, the WG recommended the introduction of a new rating of "V -- Severe" in the severity index scale to reflect serious dilapidated conditions of a building so that emergency remedial works could be undertaken when circumstances warranted, and closure order and/or demolition order issued as necessary. The WG also recommended provision of a standard inspection tool kit for every inspection team and setting up a centralized body for procurement and replacement of equipment. Clear guidelines setting out the timeline for submission of inspection reports and re-inspection cycle and frequency, etc. would be drawn up.</p>	

Time Marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action Required
		<p>(d) On the Coroner's recommendation on conducting joint inspections by a building surveyor ("BS") and a structural engineer ("SE") for all cases of emergencies related to buildings as well as non-emergency reports on dilapidated buildings, the WG was of the view that the recommendation might not be an efficient and effective way of deploying resources, and could give rise to dereliction of duties of the inspecting officers. The established cross-discipline consultation mechanism was pragmatic and effective. To improve the mechanism, the WG recommended incorporation of indicators of qualitative assessment to alert staff to initiate cross-discipline consultation at the right time.</p> <p>(e) As regards the Coroner's recommendation that BD should issue a repair order immediately in respect of a dangerous building instead of an advisory letter, the WG believed that the existing practice to issue an advisory letter prior to a statutory order should continue, as the advisory letter could remind building owners early of their responsibility to maintain their properties. In fact, the issuance of the advisory letter and the preparation of the statutory order, which involved verifying the ownership of the building, were performed in parallel.</p> <p>(f) The WG agreed with the Coroner's view on the need for BD to monitor progress of rectification works to ensure owners' compliance with repair orders. The WG recommended that all outstanding cases should be regularly reviewed by BD's monitoring committees at various levels.</p> <p>(g) On the way forward, BD would set up a dedicated task force within a month to work out the details of implementation, taking into account the technical, manpower and financial resource implications.</p>	
003027 – 003215	Professor KO Jan-ming Mr Daniel LAM Chun	<p>Professor KO's and Mr LAM's comments that --</p> <p>(a) their review was based primarily on the study of the BD's review report, the relevant internal manuals and guidelines of BD as well</p>	

Time Marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action Required
		<p>as meetings with BD staff and relevant professional bodies; and</p> <p>(b) they felt encouraged with BD's positive response to their various suggestions and its decision to set up a task force to take them forward</p>	
003216 – 004111	Mr James TO Administration	<p>Mr James TO said that he was surprised that both the WG and the independent experts had come to conclusions different from the recommendations of the Coroner.</p> <p>Mr TO's enquiry about the meaning of "<i>there is room for improvement in providing guidelines for the issuing of demolition orders vis-à-vis repair orders</i>" (item (a) under Recommendation (V) in paragraph 13 of Annex B to LC Paper No. CB(1)2099/11-12(01))</p> <p>The Administration's response that --</p> <p>(a) the issuance of investigation and repair orders depended on the findings of the inspection which was partly based on the professional judgement of BD's staff. There were criteria in the current manual for issuance of the orders in accordance with the existing four severity index scales of building defects; and</p> <p>(b) the term "<i>room of improvement</i>" in item (a) referred to the need to provide clearer directions under the guidelines for issuance of demolition orders vis-à-vis repair orders. The addition of the new rating of "V -- Severe" in the manual would facilitate BD's response to urgent situations where emergency remedial works and/or issuance of a closure order or a demolition order would be warranted</p> <p>Mr James TO's query about the lesson the Administration had learnt from the building collapse incident in Ma Tau Wai Road, given that BD would not pursue the Coroner's recommendation on conducting joint inspections by SEs and BSs and that the new rating of "V -- Severe" would not result in immediate issuance of a demolition order for effecting emergency remedial works on a dilapidated building</p>	

Time Marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action Required
		<p>The Administration's response that when a case was rated "IV -- Poor" or "V -- Severe", an in-depth structural assessment on the building involving cross-discipline consultation would be carried out and a joint inspection would be conducted if considered necessary</p>	
004112 – 004315	Professor KO Jan-ming	<p>Professor KO Jan-ming's comments that --</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) while he supported the spirit of the Coroner's recommendation on joint inspections by BSs and SEs, it was unrealistic to do so when there were tens of thousands of cases each year; and (b) "V -- Severe" was actually split from the existing rating of "IV -- Poor". Once a case reached the rating of IV or above, cross-discipline consultation would be triggered off and a joint inspection by BS and SE would be conducted 	
004316 – 005138	Miss Tanya CHAN Administration Chairman	<p>Miss Tanya CHAN seeking clarification on --</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) BD's follow up action when the rating for a dilapidated building reached IV or V; (b) whether the threshold for triggering cross-discipline inspection would be higher under the new five-rating system; and (c) whether the Development Bureau ("DEVB") and BD had a time-table for implementing the revised guidelines and procedures and providing training for BD's frontline staff <p>The Chairman's enquiry on the party responsible for overseeing implementation of the recommendations of the WG and the independent experts</p> <p>The Administration's response that --</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) BD had already set up a task force, comprising members of the WG and experienced professional staff from the BS and SE grades, to formulate a work plan within one month for the implementation of the new procedures; 	

Time Marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action Required
		<p>(b) DEVB would provide policy steer as well as legislative and financial support for BD to implement the various building safety-related measures. The Administration would monitor the implementation of the new enforcement procedures and practices on a regular basis with a view to ascertaining whether further changes were required; and</p> <p>(c) cross-discipline consultation and joint inspection would be activated if the rating of a building reached IV. There would be no change in the threshold. The new rating of V called for urgent actions for severe cases, such as conduct of immediate emergency works, serving of closure orders or demolition orders</p>	
005139 – 010450	Dr Priscilla LEUNG Administration Mr Daniel LAM Chun	<p>Dr Pricilla LEUNG's views that --</p> <p>(a) as the building in Ma Tau Wai Road had been issued with a number of statutory orders prior to its collapse, it was doubtful whether implementation of the various recommendations in BD's enforcement procedures could address the root of the problem and prevent similar building collapse incidents;</p> <p>(b) if the root of the problem was related to inadequate knowledge and skills of the building contractors, it was necessary for the Administration to formulate strategies to enhance their professional standards; and</p> <p>(c) the Administration should encourage the public to report on dilapidated buildings so that timely remedial action could be taken</p> <p>The Administration's response that --</p> <p>(a) the collapse of the building in 45J Ma Tau Wai Road was contributed by many factors, including the carrying out of repair works inside the building before the time of the collapse;</p> <p>(b) the multi-pronged measures to enhance building safety aimed at tackling problems arising from dilapidated buildings as</p>	

Time Marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action Required
		<p>effectively as possible. For instance, the Administration would enforce MBIS and MWIS, and the implementation of MWCS would facilitate building owners to carry out minor works lawfully through simplified procedures. The Administration would continue to provide support to building owners and promote public education on building safety in order to instill a "building safety culture" among building owners; and</p> <p>(c) BD welcomed reports from the public on building safety problems, and would attend to non-emergent complaints within ten days</p> <p>Mr Daniel LAM Chun's view that it was of paramount importance to educate building owners on the importance of building safety</p>	
010451 – 010829	Chairman Administration	<p>The Chairman's enquiry about BD's follow up actions on non-compliance of building owners with repair orders</p> <p>The Administration's response that --</p> <p>(a) BD would follow up each case upon expiry of the compliance period of the order; and</p> <p>(b) the relevant guideline for re-inspection of buildings would be improved to specify the required actions and timelines</p>	
010830 – 011031	Chairman Miss Tanya CHAN Administration	<p>Enquiries by the Chairman and Miss Tanya CHAN on --</p> <p>(a) when the task force's implementation plan would be ready; and</p> <p>(b) whether the plan would be provided to the Panel on Development for discussion</p> <p>The Administration's response that --</p> <p>(a) the recommendations of the WG and the experts would be implemented as soon as possible; and</p> <p>(b) if additional resources were required for the implementation, they would be reflected in the Draft Estimates of Expenditure for the next financial year</p>	

Time Marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action Required
011032 – 012304	Deputy Chairman Administration	<p>Deputy Chairman's views that --</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) he had serious doubt in the reliability of building inspections conducted by BD's staff as revealed in cases involving aged buildings; and (b) notwithstanding the difficulty in conducting joint inspection by BS and SE in every building inspection, it would be necessary to seek a "second opinion" on the structural condition of a building reported to have safety problems in order to avoid human errors and allay the concerns of owners/occupants <p>The Administration's response that --</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) in determining the structural safety of aged buildings, professional judgement of BD officers would play a more important role than written guidelines as guidelines only set out requirements and standardize the practices to be followed by inspection staff; (b) BD had confidence in the professional standard of BD officers conducting inspections on buildings. Given the existing mechanism on cross-discipline consultation on building safety matters, it was not necessary to seek a second opinion on BD's assessment; and (c) in handling a complaint relating to dilapidated buildings and UBWs, BD needed time to undertake investigation and ascertain the problems before considering issuance of appropriate orders 	
<p>II. <u>Operation Building Bright -- Progress and update</u></p>			
012305 – 013240	Administration	<p><u>The Administration's presentation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Up to 30 April 2012, a total of 3 151 target aged buildings were included for assistance under Operation Building Bright ("OBB"), of which 789 had completed repair works; 797 had repair works underway; and works for another 1 043 buildings would commence upon completion of procurement procedures. 	

Time Marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action Required
		<p>(b) OBB had created around 30 555 jobs by 30 April 2012. The unemployment rate of the construction sector had decreased from 12.8% in the quarterly period of February-April 2009 to 6.2% in the same period of 2012. The unemployment rate in the decoration, repair and maintenance for buildings sub-sector had also dropped from 21.7% to 9.7% in the same period.</p> <p>(c) OBB had established a good foundation for the implementation of major building safety programmes in future, including MBIS and MWIS.</p>	
013241 – 013644	Miss Tanya CHAN Administration	<p>Miss Tanya CHAN's enquiries on --</p> <p>(a) whether the Administration would review the amount of financial assistance for building owners under OBB; and</p> <p>(b) the estimated number of dilapidated buildings requiring repair works after completion of OBB and how the Administration would assist the owners of these buildings</p> <p>The Administration's response that --</p> <p>(a) with a total funding commitment of \$3.5 billion, OBB was able to assist over 3 100 buildings aged over 30 years to carry out repair and maintenance works. The Administration considered that it was the responsibility of owners to maintain their buildings in good conditions;</p> <p>(b) the Administration would continue to render assistance to building owners after completion of OBB. \$1 billion had been set aside for the Building Maintenance Grant Scheme for Elderly Owners in which a maximum grant of \$40,000 would be made available for eligible elderly owner-occupiers to repair their buildings. The Scheme still had a balance of about \$0.7 billion. Moreover, the Comprehensive Building Safety Improvement Loan Scheme was in place to provide financial assistance to owners of buildings for carrying out repair works;</p>	

Time Marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action Required
		<p>(c) to facilitate the implementation of MBIS, financial assistance and technical support would be provided by HKHS and URA to building owners. Subject to a ceiling, eligible owners' corporations would be provided with financial support to carry out the first inspection under MBIS; and</p> <p>(d) in short, after the completion of OBB, through BD and other partner organizations, the Administration would continue to provide financial and technical assistance to building owners to enhance building safety. It would closely monitor and evaluate its work in promoting building safety and would bring in new forms of assistance, where necessary</p>	
<p>III. <u>Seismic resistant design requirements for new buildings in Hong Kong</u></p>			
<p>013645 – 014256</p>	<p>Administration</p>	<p><u>The Administration's briefing</u></p> <p>(a) The Administration's paper was to seek members' views on the Administration's proposal to consult the building industry and relevant stakeholders on whether statutory seismic-resistant building design standards should be introduced for new buildings and major alteration and addition works in existing buildings in Hong Kong.</p> <p>(b) Hong Kong was not located within active seismic belts and hence the possibility of serious earthquakes in the territory was relatively low. At present, the buildings in Hong Kong were not subject to any specific seismic-resistant design standards under the law. Nevertheless, as required by statute, buildings in Hong Kong were designed and built with a relatively high load-resisting capacity to withstand strong winds. According to a consultancy study, local buildings were basically safe in the event of an earthquake.</p> <p>(c) It was noteworthy that many cities, including Shanghai and New York, which were located in areas of seismicity comparable to that of Hong Kong, had introduced statutory</p>	

Time Marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action Required
		<p>seismic-resistant design standards for new buildings.</p> <p>(d) Before bringing in seismic-resistant building standards, it was necessary to strike a balance between the increase in construction cost and benefit in reducing casualties caused by earthquakes. The Government's consultant estimated that the increase in construction costs was estimated to fall within a range from 0% to 0.3%.</p> <p>(e) Government buildings would follow suit if seismic-resistant standards for private buildings were specified in the law.</p>	
014257 – 014808	Miss Tanya CHAN Administration	<p>Miss Tanya CHAN's views/enquiries that --</p> <p>(a) in view of latest global trends, practices in other cities and relatively small cost implications, she supported the Administration's plan to consult relevant stakeholders on the proposal to bring in seismic-resistant building design standards in Hong Kong;</p> <p>(b) whether the Administration had worked out the scope and time-table of the consultation. The Administration should report to the Legislative Council ("LegCo") the results of consultation within a reasonable time and allow sufficient time for Members to examine the finalized plan and related legislative proposals, if any; and</p> <p>(c) whether the Administration would set a higher seismic-resistant design standard for special buildings, such as hospitals</p> <p>The Administration's response that --</p> <p>(a) it planned to consult relevant stakeholders, including building professional institutions, building contractor associations, developers' associations, local academics of the relevant fields and LegCo, etc., in the coming nine months;</p> <p>(b) the consultation would cover the need for setting a higher seismic-resistant standard for specific buildings such as hospitals; and</p>	

Time Marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action Required
		<p>(c) though it was advisable to make reference to seismic-resistant building standards of other jurisdictions, these standards might not suit the local circumstances. Hong Kong could develop its own seismic-resistant standards with input from relevant consultants</p>	
014809 – 015614	Mr Paul TSE Administration Chairman	<p>Mr Paul TSE's enquiries on --</p> <p>(a) the capability of local buildings to withstand earthquakes;</p> <p>(b) whether there were local buildings constructed in accordance with international seismic-resistant standards and the details; and</p> <p>(c) cost of the public consultation exercise to be launched</p> <p>The Administration's response that --</p> <p>(a) buildings in Hong Kong were built with a relatively high load-resisting capacity to withstand strong winds up to 250 kilometres per hour. They were basically safe and would not collapse during an earthquake with intensity up to VII on the Modified Mercalli Scale ("MMS"). However, it should be noted that the capacity to withstand strong wind was not fully comparable with the capacity to withstand earthquakes;</p> <p>(b) seismic-resistant building standards involved dedicated designs in buildings and such requirements were not covered in the existing statutory wind-resistant building design standards in Hong Kong. To reduce possible damage to buildings caused by earthquakes, it would be advisable to introduce seismic-resistant building design standards</p> <p>(c) while no private buildings in Hong Kong had adopted seismic-resistant building standards, certain public infrastructural projects launched by the Administration, such as highways, bridges, tunnels, reservoirs, etc. had adopted seismic-resistant standards; and</p>	

Time Marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action Required
		<p>(d) expenditures on the proposed public consultation would be absorbed by DEVB and BD</p> <p>In response to the Chairman's enquiry, the Administration confirmed that the new Central Government Offices and the LegCo Complex at Tamar had adopted seismic-resistant building standards.</p>	
015615 – 020116	Miss Tanya CHAN Chairman Administration	<p>Miss Tanya CHAN's enquiry on whether there was any scientific correlation between the load-resisting capability of Hong Kong's buildings to withstand strong winds and an earthquake up to MMS Intensity VII</p> <p>The Chairman's view that in comparison with other cities, Hong Kong had adopted a high structural safety standard for buildings; and his enquiry on reasons for cities located far from active seismic belts, such as Shenzhen and Guangzhou, to introduce seismic-resistant building standards</p> <p>The Administration's response that --</p> <p>(a) the analogy between resistance to strong winds up to 250 kilometres per hour and an earthquake up to MMS Intensity VII only served as a rough comparison; and</p> <p>(b) the reasons for cities located away from seismic belts to adopt seismic-resistant building standards were probably due to global trend in enhancing structural safety of buildings</p> <p>The Chairman said that he supported conducting public consultation to seek views on the need to introduce seismic-resistant building design standards in Hong Kong, and suggested that professional bodies should organize seminars on relevant subjects for buildings professionals to share their views and experiences with the experts in the field.</p>	
IV. <u>Any other business</u>			
020117 – 020205	Chairman Members	The Chairman said that since the establishment of the Subcommittee in 2010, it had held eight	

Time Marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action Required
		<p>meetings with the Administration to discuss issues related to enhancement of building safety.</p> <p>The Chairman suggested and members agreed that the Subcommittee would wind up its work, and the Clerk would prepare a report on the Subcommittee's deliberations for submission to the Panel on Development.</p>	Clerk

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
21 August 2012