

**立法會**  
***Legislative Council***

LC Paper No. PWSC149/17-18  
(These minutes have been seen  
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/F/2/1(14)B

**Public Works Subcommittee of the Finance Committee  
of the Legislative Council**

**Minutes of the 13<sup>th</sup> meeting  
held in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex  
on Monday, 12 February 2018, at 8:30 am**

**Members present:**

Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, SBS, MH, JP (Chairman)

Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP (Deputy Chairman)

Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP

Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, GBS, JP

Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, SBS, JP

Hon CHAN Hak-kan, BBS, JP

Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP

Hon Claudia MO

Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, SBS, JP

Hon WU Chi-wai, MH

Hon YIU Si-wing, BBS

Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP

Hon CHAN Chi-chuen

Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, SBS, MH, JP

Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP

Hon Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung, SBS, JP

Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung

Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan

Hon Alvin YEUNG

Hon CHU Hoi-dick  
Hon HO Kai-ming  
Hon LAM Cheuk-ting  
Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding  
Hon Wilson OR Chong-shing, MH  
Hon Tanya CHAN  
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, JP  
Hon HUI Chi-fung  
Hon LUK Chung-hung  
Hon LAU Kwok-fan, MH  
Dr Hon CHENG Chung-tai  
Hon KWONG Chun-yu  
Hon Jeremy TAM Man-ho

**Members absent:**

Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP  
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP  
Hon CHAN Han-pan, JP  
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki  
Hon Andrew WAN Siu-kin  
Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP

**Public officers attending:**

Mr Raistlin LAU Chun, JP	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) <sup>3</sup>
Mr Francis CHAU Siu-hei	Deputy Secretary for Development (Works) <sup>3</sup>
Ms Doris HO Pui-ling, JP	Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands) <sup>1</sup>
Mr Elvis AU Wai-kwong, JP	Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1)

Ms Margaret HSIA Mai-chi	Principal Assistant Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) (Works)
Mr Kenneth LEUNG Tak-yan	Chief Civil Engineer (Public Works Programme) Transport and Housing Bureau
Mr Edward TSE Cheong-wo	Project Director (3) Architectural Services Department
Ms Eugenia CHUNG Nga-chi, JP	Assistant Director of Home Affairs (2)
Mr CHONG Wing-wun, JP	District Officer (North) Home Affairs Department
Ms PANG Kit-ling	Assistant Director of Social Welfare (Elderly)
Mr FUNG Man-chung	Assistant Director of Social Welfare (Family and Child Welfare)
Mr CHIU Pbut-kay	Chief Architect (4) Housing Department
Mr Andrew LAI Chi-wah, JP	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) <sup>2</sup>
Mrs Sylvia LAM YU Ka-wai, JP	Director of Architectural Services
Mr Frank WONG Tak-choi	Project Director (1) Architectural Services Department
Ms Athena FUNG Chi-shan	Senior Project Manager 122 Architectural Services Department
Mr WONG Kuen-fai, JP	Commissioner of Inland Revenue

**Clerk in attendance:**

Ms Doris LO	Chief Council Secretary (1) <sup>2</sup>
-------------	--

**Staff in attendance:**

Mr Raymond CHOW	Senior Council Secretary (1)6
Ms Mandy LI	Council Secretary (1)2
Ms Christina SHIU	Legislative Assistant (1)2
Ms Christy YAU	Legislative Assistant (1)7
Ms Clara LO	Legislative Assistant (1)8

---

Action

The Chairman advised that there were six funding proposals on the agenda for the meeting. The first to fifth proposals were carried over from the previous meeting, while the sixth proposal was a new item submitted by the Administration. He reminded members that in accordance with Rule 83A of the Rules of Procedure ("RoP") of the Legislative Council ("LegCo"), they should disclose the nature of any direct or indirect pecuniary interests relating to the funding proposals under discussion at the meeting before they spoke on the proposals. He also drew members' attention to Rule 84 of RoP on voting in case of direct pecuniary interest.

**Head 711 – Housing**

**PWSC(2017-18)28 202SC Community hall-cum-social welfare facilities at Queen's Hill, Fanling**

2. The Chairman advised that the proposal, i.e. PWSC(2017-18)28, sought to upgrade 202SC to Category A at an estimated cost of \$536.1 million in money-of-the-day ("MOD") prices for the construction of a community hall-cum-social welfare facilities ("the proposed CHSWF") at Queen's Hill, Fanling. The Subcommittee had commenced deliberation on the proposal at the meeting on 6 February 2018.

Planning of the proposed CHSWF site

3. Mr CHU Hoi-dick enquired whether the proposed CHSWF and the residential blocks of the public housing development at Queen's Hill ("QH public housing development") were co-located on one site and therefore, the floor areas of both the proposed CHSWF and the public housing blocks at QH should be taken into account when calculating the plot ratio of the site in question. Chief Architect (4), Housing Department ("CA(4)/HD"), replied in the affirmative.

4. Mr LAU Kwok-fan supported the proposed works. However, he pointed out that in many current or planned public housing projects,

community facilities and public housing blocks were co-located on the same Government, Institution and Community ("GIC") site under a combined plot ratio. In view of the enormous demand for public housing, the Administration would reduce the scale of the community facilities at those sites to the minimum standards to release more plot ratio for public housing development. Since the plot ratios of those sites had been fully utilized, it would be difficult to expand or provide additional community facilities in future upon the request of the local community. Mr LAU enquired whether the Administration would consider relaxing the plot ratio for GIC sites or lifting the restrictions, so as to allow future expansion of community facilities as necessary.

5. Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)1 ("DS(P&L)1/DEVB") replied that given the co-location of the proposed CHSWF and the residential blocks of QH public housing development, the project was subject to the specific planning restrictions of the public housing project. For the GIC sites outside the public housing development and designated for use as community facilities only, the Administration would determine a suitable plot ratio, having regard to the surrounding environment, to ensure that the sites would be fully utilized. Moreover, the Chief Executive had announced in the 2017 Policy Agenda the implementation of a "single site, multiple use" model in the development on government land, so as to make optimal use of land resources for provision of more community facilities.

6. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen pointed out that while members generally had no objection to funding proposals for the construction of community facilities such as the proposed CHSWF, most members were concerned that the proposed community facilities were insufficient to meet community needs and thus called for the provision of additional community facilities. Dr Fernando CHEUNG expressed similar views. Dr CHEUNG opined that under the current planning mechanism, the relevant government departments might not be fully coordinated in the planning process and hence, social welfare facilities were unable to fully support the service demand brought about by the housing developments. Taking QH public housing development as an example, the 150 places to be provided by the residential care home for the elderly ("RCHE") in the proposed CHSWF were apparently insufficient to meet the need of more than 30 000 residents in the public housing development. In this connection, Dr CHEUNG enquired whether the Administration would review the current mechanism to see if there was any room for improvement, including whether it was necessary to set up an inter-departmental working group to undertake the planning work.

7. In reply, DS(P&L)1/DEVB cited the example of new development areas and said that under the current mechanism, the Administration would set up an inter-departmental working group to coordinate the requirements of various government departments in order to plan for the provision of community facilities during the early stage of planning. In response to members' concerns, the Administration would consider briefing the Panel on Development on the relevant planning mechanism and receiving members' views in due course.

8. Mr CHU Hoi-dick opined that the Administration should exercise flexibility in planning for the provision of various community facilities. Should it be confirmed that the 150 places provided at the proposed RCHE were insufficient to meet residents' demand, the Administration should consider using the floor area originally earmarked for other community facilities to provide another RCHE, so as to provide additional places.

9. Chief Civil Engineer (Public Works Programme), Transport and Housing Bureau ("CCE(PWP)/THB"), reiterated that the Administration had fully utilized the plot ratio of the site of QH public housing development to provide public housing units and various community facilities. In proposing the provision of various community facilities, a balance had been struck among the different needs of residents.

Admin

10. The Chairman advised that as the plot ratio of the site of QH public housing development had been fully utilized, it was difficult to provide more social welfare facilities unless the project plan was revised. Notwithstanding this, he urged the Administration to review the planning arrangements of the sites designated for community facilities and provide a written response to the questions/comments raised by Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Dr Fernando CHEUNG on such arrangements. The response should cover details of the existing mechanism for planning the provision of community facilities (including welfare, educational, recreational and other facilities) in public housing developments; whether the Administration would review the existing planning mechanism; and whether it would consider relaxing the plot ratio for GIC sites or lifting relevant restrictions. The Chairman also said that some questions put forward by members involved government policy on land planning. He reminded members that policy issues should be followed up at the relevant Panel(s).

#### Design and facilities of the proposed CHSWF

11. Mr CHU Hoi-dick enquired about the social welfare facilities to be provided under the entire QH public housing development, apart from those provided in the proposed CHSWF. The Chairman said that members had

raise similar questions at the last meeting, and the Administration had undertaken to provide supplementary information. He requested the Administration to provide the information as soon as possible.

12. CCE(PWP)/THB advised that the entire QH public housing development would provide a number of retail, education and social welfare facilities. In addition to the social welfare facilities in the proposed CHSWF, the public housing development would be provided with several kindergartens, a day care centre for the elderly and a family support services centre. The Administration would provide the relevant supplementary information in writing as soon as possible.

13. Mr CHU Hoi-dick suggested that in its future funding submissions for community facilities located in public housing development projects for consideration by the Subcommittee, the Administration should set out in its discussion papers information on existing or proposed community facilities in those public housing projects so that members could grasp the full picture. The Administration took note of Mr CHU's suggestion.

14. Dr Fernando CHEUNG noticed that the construction cost of some of the social welfare facilities (e.g. the relevant facilities in the proposed CHSWF) would be funded by the Lotteries Fund ("LF"), while that of some other similar facilities would be funded by the Capital Works Reserve Fund ("CWRF"). He enquired how it was decided that the construction cost of a social welfare facility should be funded by LF, and which government department would make the decision. Dr CHEUNG also asked the reason why LF could only be used to fund the construction cost of social welfare facilities, but not the construction cost of other community facilities (e.g. community halls) or the recurrent expenditure of social welfare service schemes.

15. Assistant Director of Social Welfare (Elderly) ("ADSW(E)") explained that the objective of LF was to provide grants to meet the non-recurrent commitments for construction, fitting-out and purchase of furniture and equipment, etc. for social welfare facilities. As such, expenditures related to most social welfare facilities were funded by LF. However, as the construction of some social welfare facilities was required to be carried out in tandem with other public works projects, the construction cost concerned would be covered by CWRF as well, while expenditures such as the costs of fitting-out and purchase of furniture and equipment would still be funded by LF.

16. Dr Fernando CHEUNG noted that QH public housing development would be completed in phases in 2021 and construction of the proposed

CHSWF was expected to complete in the third quarter of 2021. He was concerned that similar to the problems facing other new housing development projects (e.g. the public housing developments at Shui Chuen O, Sha Tin), the facilities concerned would not be readily available for use by residents with the population intake of the public housing since procedures such as inviting tenders from social welfare service providers and interior fitting-out, etc. took time even if the proposed CHSWF had been completed. Dr CHEUNG requested the Administration to ensure that the commissioning dates of the social welfare facilities in the proposed CHSWF could tie in with the population intake of QH public housing development.

17. CCE(PWP)/THB replied that the construction and completion of the proposed CHSWF and QH public housing development would take place concurrently. ADSW(E) supplemented that the neighbourhood elderly centre, child care centre and integrated children and youth services centre in the proposed CHSWF would continue to be run by existing operators, so tendering process was not necessary. The Administration believed that the commissioning dates of the said three centres could tie in with the population intake of QH public housing development. The proposed RCHE in the proposed CHSWF was expected to commence operation about one year later than the said three centres as tenders had to be invited to select the service provider. Since the RCHE mainly provided places for the elderly on the Central Waiting List, its commissioning date would have no implication on the elderly services provided in QH public housing development.

18. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen noted that as shown on the floor plan at Enclosure 5 to [PWSC\(2017-18\)28](#), the podium on the second floor of the proposed CHSWF was facilities of the Hong Kong Housing Authority ("HKHA"). He enquired about the use of such facilities and whether the Administration or HKHA would bear the construction cost; whether the Administration would require HKHA to share the cost of foundation works, etc. on a pro-rata basis when calculating the relevant cost should the construction cost be borne by HKHA.

19. CCE(PWP)/THB and CA(4)/HD explained that three badminton courts would be provided on the podium on the second floor, which would be managed by HKHA and open to users of the proposed CHSWF and the public. HKHA would share the construction cost (including the cost of foundation works, etc.) according to the area occupied by the three badminton courts in the gross construction floor area of the proposed CHSWF. The construction cost of the remaining parts of the proposed CHSWF would be funded by CWRF.



20. Referring to the floor plan at Enclosure 7 to [PWSC\(2017-18\)28](#), Mr CHAN Chi-chuen enquired about the use of the common area on the roof floor of the proposed CHSWF, whether those places were publicly accessible, and whether mobility-handicapped persons might access the roof floor and the upper roof floor of the proposed CHSWF.

21. CA(4)/HD replied that the roof floor of the proposed CHSWF would be open to CHSWF users, while mobility-handicapped persons might access the roof floor by the accessible lift and barrier-free access. The upper roof floor, which would mainly be used by maintenance staff, would not be open to the public.

Admin 22. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen requested the Administration to provide an impression of the perspective view of the proposed CHSWF from another direction, in addition to the one showing the perspective view from the north eastern direction at Enclosure 10 to [PWSC\(2017-18\)28](#). The Administration would provide another impression after the meeting.

Voting on PWSC(2017-18)28

23. There being no further questions on the item from members, the Chairman put PWSC(2017-18)28 to vote. At the request of members, the Chairman ordered a division. Fourteen members voted for the proposal. No member voted against it or abstained from voting. The votes of individual members were as follows:

*For:*

Mr Tommy CHEUNG  
Mr Paul TSE  
Mr MA Fung-kwok  
Mr Christopher CHEUNG  
Mr Alvin YEUNG  
Mr HO Kai-ming  
Mr Wilson OR  
(14 members)

Ms Starry LEE  
Mr YIU Si-wing  
Ms Alice MAK  
Dr Fernando CHEUNG  
Mr CHU Hoi-dick  
Mr Holden CHOW  
Mr LAU Kwok-fan

*Against:*

(0 member)

*Abstain:*

(0 member)

24. The Chairman declared that the item was endorsed by the Subcommittee. The Chairman consulted members on whether the item

would require separate voting at the relevant meeting of the Finance Committee ("FC"). No member made such a request.

*(Post-meeting note: After the meeting, Mr CHU Hoi-dick informed the Secretariat on the same day (i.e. 12 February 2018) through his assistant that he requested the item, i.e. PWSC(2017-18)28, be voted on separately at the relevant FC meeting.)*

### **Head 703 – Buildings**

#### **PWSC(2017-18)29 122KA Inland Revenue Tower in Kai Tak Development**

25. The Chairman advised that the proposal, i.e. PWSC(2017-18)29, sought to upgrade 122KA to Category A at an estimated cost of \$3,600 million in MOD prices for the construction of Inland Revenue Tower ("the new IR Tower") in the Kai Tak Development ("KTD"). The Administration had consulted the Panel on Financial Affairs on the proposed project on 6 November 2017. A gist of the Panel's discussion was tabled at the meeting.

#### Plan of relocating government departments in the Wan Chai Government Offices Compound

26. Mr YIU Si-wing noted that the Administration planned to relocate the Wan Chai Government Offices Compound ("WCGOC") (i.e. the Revenue Tower, the Immigration Tower and the Wanchai Tower), which involved a total of 28 government departments and the Judiciary, about 175 000 square metres in office floor area, and more than 10 000 staff members. Mr YIU supported the relocation exercise so that the WCGOC site could be vacated for development of convention and exhibition ("C&E") venues to address the shortage of C&E facilities in Hong Kong. He asked the Administration to elaborate on the relocation arrangements of the various government departments at WCGOC and the timetable concerned. Regarding the new IR Tower project, Mr YIU enquired about the number of staff members of the Inland Revenue Department ("IRD") whose offices would be moved to the new IR Tower, and whether other government departments, apart from IRD, that were currently housed at WCGOC would be relocated to the new IR Tower.

27. Mr Holden CHOW pointed out that while WCGOC covered a total office floor area of about 175 000 square metres, the new IR Tower provided a net operational floor area ("NOFA") of only 45 570 square metres.

Mr CHOW enquired about the number of government departments currently housed at WCGOC which could be accommodated in the new IR Tower.

28. Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury)3 ("DS(Tsy)3/FSTB") explained that the Administration planned to relocate the government departments currently housed at WCGOC to nine new government buildings ("replacement building projects"). It was the Government's target to complete all the replacement building projects by 2026. Among the nine replacement building projects, the West Kowloon Government Offices, for which project funding had been approved, was nearly completed. Apart from the new IR Tower, the Administration also intended to submit funding proposals to the Subcommittee and FC within the current session for construction of the Joint-user Government Office Building in Cheung Sha Wan and the Government Data Centre Complex. Funding proposals for projects of other new buildings would be submitted one after the other. Regarding the new IR Tower project, Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury)2 ("DS(Tsy)2/FSTB") said that about 3 000 IRD staff members were currently working at the Revenue Tower in Wan Chai. Their offices would be moved to the new IR Tower in future. Under the relocation plan, except for IRD, other government departments at WCGOC would not be relocated to the new IR Tower.

29. Dr Fernando CHEUNG enquired the reason why KTD, which might have other potential uses, was chosen as the location for reprovisioning the Revenue Tower. He opined that the new IR Tower could promote local employment if located in a remote area with few employment opportunities, while the site at KTD could be released for other uses. DS(Tsy)2/FSTB explained that reprovisioning the Revenue Tower at KTD, which was in the centre of Kowloon, was aimed at continuing the provision of easily accessible services to the public after reprovisioning.

30. Dr Fernando CHEUNG requested the Administration to elaborate on its overall plan to relocate the 28 government departments and the Judiciary at WCGOC, including the progress of identifying reprovisioning locations, the factors considered in selecting the locations, and the relocation schedules of various departments. Mr Alvin YEUNG made a similar request. The Chairman urged the Administration to provide comprehensive information on the relocation exercise at the request of members after the meeting.

*(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC133/17-18\(01\)](#) on 5 March 2018 .)*

31. Mr CHU Hoi-dick was worried that the Administration would sell the WCGOC site in future for developers to carry out demolition and redevelopment for other development purposes. He said that while he had no comment on relocating the government departments at WCGOC, he considered demolition and redevelopment of those buildings contrary to the principles of waste reduction and resources saving. He requested the Administration to undertake that LegCo would be consulted on the demolition plan and related project funding in future.

32. DS(Tsy)3/FSTB said that according to the latest plan of the Administration, the current site of WCGOC would be converted to C&E, hotel and office uses. Should the Government be responsible for the demolition works concerned, the Administration would submit funding request to the Subcommittee and FC following the established procedure.

33. The Chairman said that as a general practice, the Administration should first consult the relevant Panel(s) on funding proposal for the demolition works.

#### Design and facilities of the new Inland Revenue Tower

##### *Net operational floor area of the new Inland Revenue Tower*

34. Mr WU Chi-wai noted that according to the supplementary information paper provided by the Administration for the Subcommittee ([LC Paper No. PWSC110/17-18\(01\)](#)), the efficiency ratio (i.e. total construction floor area ("CFA")/NOFA) of the new IR Tower was around 1.73, while the efficiency ratio of the nearby Trade and Industry Tower was around 2.0. In other words, the NOFA of the new IR Tower took up a higher proportion in the CFA of the building, meaning more floor area for office use. Mr WU enquired about the reason for the difference in efficiency ratios between the two government office buildings, whether the Administration had set standards for the efficiency ratio of government office buildings, and whether it would consider further increasing NOFA of the new IR Tower for better utilization of land resources.

35. Director of Architectural Services ("DArchS") explained that NOFA of the new IR Tower took up a higher proportion in CFA as the building was solely used by IRD, thus obviating the need of some non-NOFA-accountable area for use as facilities such as common corridors, which were otherwise necessary in other joint-user government office buildings (e.g. the Trade and Industry Tower). She said that during the detailed design stage of the new IR Tower, the Administration would make an effort to minimize the

non-NOFA-accountable area as far as practicable, including the area required for plant rooms and corridors on each floor.

*Parking spaces*

36. Mr MA Fung-kwok supported the relocation proposal. He pointed out that the relevant building height restrictions had been lifted following the cessation of operation of Kai Tak Airport. However, Mr MA noticed that the new IR Tower was only 18 storeys high (excluding the basement). He enquired about the respective limits on the building height and plot ratio of the new IR Tower, and whether additional floors could be built. Moreover, Mr MA noted that under the current design, the car park of the new IR Tower was provided at grade. He enquired why the car park was not located on other floors (e.g. basement) to release the space at grade for uses such as greenery and open space.

37. DS(Tsy)2/FSTB said that all project sites at KTD were subject to building height restrictions. In 2015, the Town Planning Board ("TPB") had relaxed the height restriction for the new IR Tower to not more than 80 metres. Under the current design, the height of the new IR Tower already reached 79.6 metres, which was close to the maximum height permitted. DArchS supplemented that according to the TPB Guidelines, two ventilation corridors had to be provided at the project site, one (about 25 metres wide) on the western side of the new IR Tower and the other (about 10 metres wide) on the eastern side. Since no buildings were allowed around the ventilation corridors, the ventilation corridor on the western side was used for greenery and the one on the eastern side for provision of an at-grade car park, so as to put the land to optimal use.

38. Mr Holden CHOW noted that in response to the concern raised by members of the Panel on Financial Affairs at the meeting in November 2017, the Administration proposed to increase the number of parking spaces at the new IR Tower from 40 in the original proposal to 66. He asked how the Administration would provide the additional parking spaces, and whether the increased number of parking spaces was sufficient to meet the parking demand of users of the new IR Tower.

39. DS(Tsy)2/FSTB replied that IRD was allocated 33 parking spaces at the existing Revenue Tower in Wan Chai. In response to the suggestion put forth earlier by members of the Panel on Financial Affairs, the Administration decided to install double-decker parking systems at grade at the new IR Tower, so as to increase the number of parking spaces from 40 in the original proposal to 66 for use by IRD staff members and visitors.

40. Mr Alvin YEUNG noted that the provision of the 26 additional parking spaces through installation of double-decker parking systems would involve an additional project cost of about \$14 million. On the other hand, the Administration advised that it had examined the option of providing additional car parking spaces in the basement but decided not to pursue it because of the inhibiting cost. Mr YEUNG enquired about the additional number of parking spaces to be provided and the additional cost involved should the basement option be adopted, and whether the parking spaces could meet the future parking demand in KTD.

41. In response, DS(Tsy)2/FSTB said that according to the preliminary estimation of the Architectural Services Department, expansion of the basement currently earmarked as plant rooms for use as a car park which could provide about 80 additional parking spaces would incur an additional cost of about \$340 million in MOD prices. By comparison, the Administration's proposal of installing double-decker parking systems was more cost-effective. He further said that as shown on the plan at Enclosure 7 to [PWSC\(2017-18\)29](#), a comprehensive development area was located to the southwest of the new IR Tower. The developer which was awarded the site would build shopping malls, offices and a car park providing about 900 parking spaces. Moreover, there were two commercial sites in the vicinity and the Administration initially estimated that a certain number of parking spaces would also be provided on those sites.

42. Dr Helena WONG was concerned about the lack of parking spaces in Hong Kong. She pointed out that while road-side parking spaces were insufficient, many government multi-storey public car parks had been or would be demolished to make way for other development purposes. Dr WONG opined that solely relying on developers to provide car parks in commercial development projects could not solve the problem of insufficient parking spaces. She called on the Administration to reserve space for public parking spaces for private cars and commercial vehicles in its future development of government office buildings. For the new IR Tower, the Administration should consider building additional floors to provide parking spaces and installing double-decker parking systems, so as to maximize the number of public parking spaces to meet the future parking demand in KTD.

43. DS(P&L)1/DEVB advised that the Administration would consider factors such as the surrounding environment and cost effectiveness in determining the number of parking spaces to be provided under the construction projects of government office buildings. For the new IR Tower, the Administration considered it desirable to install double-decker parking systems at grade in view of the large number of public parking spaces to be provided by the commercial development projects nearby, the proximity of

the new IR Tower to the future Kai Tak Station of the Shatin-to-Central Link of MTR, and the inhibiting cost of providing a car park at the basement level. On the other hand, the Government was conducting an internal review of the local demand for government multi-storey public car parks, under which the need to build new government multi-storey public car parks at suitable locations would be explored.

44. Mr LEUNG Che-cheung said that since additional cost was involved in the installation of double-decker parking systems, he would not support the proposal of installing those systems unless the parking spaces would be open for public use.

45. DS(Tsy)2/FSTB explained that the Administration had decided to install double-decker parking systems at the new IR Tower in response to the suggestion of the members of the Panel on Financial Affairs to provide more parking spaces for use by IRD staff and visitors. Nevertheless, the Administration would consider the possibility of converting the parking spaces into hourly parking spaces during nighttime for use by the public if necessary in future.

46. Mr WU Chi-wai noted that the future management and maintenance costs of the double-decker parking systems were around \$220,000 per year. He enquired whether the amount covered the management and maintenance costs of all parking spaces of the double-decker parking systems, and how the costs compared with the maintenance cost of government car parks in general. He also enquired about the serviceable life of the parking systems and details of the recurrent expenditure after the serviceable life had expired.

47. DS(Tsy)2/FSTB replied that the estimated management and maintenance costs of the double-decker parking systems, which amounted to around \$220,000 per year, covered the relevant costs of the 49 parking spaces the systems accommodated and the staff operating the systems. The Administration considered the cost level reasonable.

#### *Glass curtain walls of the new Inland Revenue Tower*

48. Mr HO Kai-ming said that the reflected glare from the glass curtain walls of the Trade and Industry Tower adjacent to the new IR Tower had caused nuisance to the nearby residents of The Latitude in San Po Kong. As the new IR Tower also had glass curtain walls in its design, members of the local District Council ("DC") had raised their concern with the Administration at relevant meetings. Mr HO enquired whether the new IR Tower would adopt the same curtain wall design as that of the Trade

and Industry Tower; if so, whether the Administration would revise the design to prevent the occurrence of the same problem.

49. DS(Tsy)2/FSTB and DArchS responded that in response to the concern raised by the local DC and local community about the curtain wall design of the new IR Tower, the Administration would stipulate in the works contract that the contractor must use high-efficiency, low-reflective glass in the curtain wall design to allow good light penetration, so as to ensure that the design could reduce the impact on residents in the vicinity. DArchS further said that the new IR Tower must comply with the Practice Note for Authorised Persons, Registered Structural Engineers and Registered Geotechnical Engineers issued by the Buildings Department which required that curtain walls of buildings should have an external reflectance of not more than 20%. Moreover, the contractor would be required to install more sunshades and aluminium cladding panels on the façade of the new IR Tower as far as practicable, so as to minimize the effects of reflection.

#### *Energy conservation features*

50. Ms Claudia MO enquired about the percentage of the power to be generated by the proposed photovoltaic system of the new IR Tower in the total amount of electricity consumption of the building. DArchS responded that the proposed energy conservation and green measures (e.g. the greening facilities and sunshades installed on the façade of the building to reduce heat absorption and electricity consumption on air conditioning) could achieve an 11.8% energy saving in the annual energy consumption.

51. Mr CHU Hoi-dick requested the Administration to explain why the supplementary information paper ([LC Paper No. PWSC110/17-18\(01\)](#)) stated that the photovoltaic system proposed to be installed under the project "does not have a payback period that may serve as a useful reference", and advise on the payback period of the system.

*(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC140/17-18\(01\)](#) on 14 March 2018 .)*

#### Connection between the new Inland Revenue Tower and surrounding developments

52. Mr Holden CHOW noted that as shown in Enclosure 7 to [PWSC\(2017-18\)29](#), the new IR Tower would be connected with a proposed underground shopping street and a proposed footbridge. He enquired



whether the cost estimate of the proposed project covered the construction costs of the underground shopping street and footbridge.

53. DS(Tsy)2/FSTB said that the cost estimate of the proposed project covered the construction cost of a footbridge linking to the Trade and Industry Tower. The footbridge would also be connected to the existing footbridge system in the vicinity, so as to facilitate users of the new IR Tower in travelling between the building and San Po Kong. The developer which bought the project site for development would undertake the construction of the proposed underground shopping street.

54. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen enquired about the future use of the site designated for "other specified uses" to the south of the new IR Tower; whether the Administration had sold the site; whether the development progress of the site would affect the construction progress of the said underground shopping street; and whether the completion date of the new IR Tower could tie in with the completion date of the underground shopping street, so that members of the public could access the new IR Tower from MTR Kai Tak Station via the underground shopping street. Mr CHAN also enquired about the walking distance between the new IR Tower and MTR Kai Tak Station.

55. DS(Tsy)2/FSTB and DArchS responded that the new IR Tower and MTR Kai Tak Station were about 300 to 400 metres apart, which was a five to 10 minutes' walk. Users of the new IR Tower might access the building from MTR Kai Tak Station via the at-grade pedestrian crossing on Concorde Road and the footbridge linking the building and the Trade and Industry Tower. As mentioned above, the relevant developer would undertake the construction of the proposed underground shopping street, and the date of completion would depend on the development schedule of the site concerned. Users of the new IR Tower might also access the building from MTR Kai Tak Station via the underground shopping street in future. Regarding the site designated for "other specified uses" as mentioned by Mr CHAN, DArchS said that it would be used for residential and commercial development. However, specific information on the sale of the site was not available at the moment.

#### Other concerns

56. Mr LEUNG Che-cheung noted that the contingencies for the proposed project was about \$327 million, which accounted for about 10% of the project cost. He enquired about the circumstances under which the Administration would make use of the contingencies. Ms Claudia MO enquired whether the contingencies provision was expected to be used up,

and whether implications of factors such as increased construction costs, etc. on the project cost had been taken into account when calculating the amount of the contingencies.

57. DArchS explained that the Administration normally allowed in the project cost a provision for contingencies to cater for additional costs arising from unforeseen circumstances, such as unexpected ground conditions, underground utilities more complicated than expected, and the need to carry out additional works to meet future policy needs.

58. Ms Claudia MO noted that in 2016-2017, there were some 460 000 and 280 000 public visits to IRD's Business Registration Office and Stamp Duty Office respectively. She enquired whether the Administration had planned to introduce more e-services in line with the policy direction of Smart City, so as to bring down the annual number of public visits to IRD; if so, about the timetable to implement the plan concerned. DS(Tsy)2/FSTB said in recent years, IRD had made efforts to promote and encourage the use of e-services by the public.

59. The Chairman said that the Subcommittee would continue to discuss this item at the next meeting. The meeting ended at 10:29 am.