

**立法會**  
***Legislative Council***

LC Paper No. PWSC230/17-18  
(These minutes have been seen  
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/F/2/1(22)B

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

**Minutes of the 21<sup>st</sup> meeting  
held in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex  
on Wednesday, 9 May 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  
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP  
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP  
Hon Claudia MO  
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP  
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 CHAN Han-pan, JP  
Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP  
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki  
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung

Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan  
Hon Andrew WAN Siu-kin  
Hon CHU Hoi-dick  
Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP  
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  
Hon Gary FAN Kwok-wai  
Hon AU Nok-hin  
Hon Vincent CHENG Wing-shun, MH  
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS

**Members absent:**

Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, SBS, MH, JP  
Hon Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung, SBS, JP  
Hon Alvin YEUNG

**Public officers attending:**

Mr Raistlin LAU Chun, JP	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) <sup>3</sup>
Mr HON Chi-keung, JP	Permanent Secretary for Development (Works)
Ms Doris HO Pui-ling, JP	Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands) <sup>1</sup>

Mr Donald TONG Chi-keung, JP	Permanent Secretary for the Environment
Ms Margaret HSIA Mai-chi	Principal Assistant Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) (Works)
Mr Jack CHAN Jick-chi, JP	Under Secretary for Home Affairs
Ms Sandy CHEUNG Pui-shan	Principal Assistant Secretary for Home Affairs (Culture)2
Mrs Sylvia LAM YU Ka-wai, JP	Director of Architectural Services
Mr Edward TSE Cheong-wo	Project Director (3) Architectural Services Department
Ms Jacqueline LEE Mei-yan	Senior Project Manager 333 Architectural Services Department
Ms Elaine YEUNG Chi-lan	Assistant Director (Performing Arts) Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Mr CHAN Shing-wai	Assistant Director (Heritage and Museums) Leisure and Cultural Services Department

**Clerk in attendance:**

Ms Doris LO	Chief Council Secretary (1)2
-------------	------------------------------

**Staff in attendance:**

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

---



project unless the Administration undertook to increase the number of parking spaces in its design. Mr LAU said that he supported the two proposed projects. He enquired about the additional capital cost and construction time expected to be required for the NTECC project if more parking spaces were to be provided as per members' suggestion above. Ms Starry LEE and Mr Holden CHOW urged the Administration to maintain communication with the relevant stakeholders (e.g. the local community) to jointly explore possible options for providing more parking spaces.

5. Ms Alice MAK urged the Administration to, before commencing the construction works of HCRC, re-provision the temporary car park operating at the proposed site to a nearby location for the provision of no less than its existing number of parking spaces. Mr LUK Chung-hung was dissatisfied that the Administration was still unable to put forward a concrete plan on re-provisioning the two aforesaid temporary car parks.

6. While the Administration had cited security and operational considerations as the reasons for not providing public parking spaces at the proposed HCRC, Mr LUK Chung-hung and Ms Alice MAK commented that the justifications put forward by the Administration were insufficient. The Chairman opined that the security considerations could be addressed by way of project design, such as providing the entrance/exit of public parking at a separate location to divert the traffic.

7. Mr LAM Cheuk-ting and Mr CHAN Hak-kan pointed out that when discussing the proposed NTECC project, members of the North District Council ("DC") were deeply concerned whether the number of parking spaces provided under the project could meet the needs of North District residents. Mr LAM urged the Administration to enhance inter-departmental coordination to examine thoroughly the supply and planning of parking spaces in various districts, with a view to providing a suitable number of parking spaces to meet public demand when implementing different public works projects.

8. In response to the above concerns and enquiries raised by members, Under Secretary for Home Affairs ("USHA") said that the Administration would consider the overall arrangements for various community facilities (including parking spaces) when implementing public works projects. The Administration was aware of the pressing demand of North District residents for parking spaces and high patronage of the temporary car park currently operating at the proposed HCRC site. In response to the requests of Members and the local community, the Administration would continue to explore whether and how more parking spaces could be provided under the proposed projects. Upon completion of the pre-construction activities, the

Government would consult the relevant DCs on the detailed designs of the two proposed projects.

9. Regarding the proposed NTECC, USHA advised that 95 parking spaces were planned to be provided under the original design of the project. Taking into account the views of North DC members and other stakeholders, the Administration was proactively considering a substantial increase in the number of parking spaces. One of the options being explored was to build an additional storey or a basement for the provision of about 100 more parking spaces. Besides, the Administration was considering adopting a similar arrangement, i.e. adding a storey or a basement in the project design, for the subsidized housing development near the NTECC site to provide some 100 additional parking spaces. Subject to technical feasibility, such an arrangement could bring the number of parking spaces to be provided at NTECC and the subsidized housing development to about 380.

10. USHA also said that the Administration would explore the feasibility of adding storeys or a basement to the project design of the proposed HCRC for provision of more parking spaces. He added that the existing temporary car park at the project site could continue to operate when the pre-construction activities were being carried out. The Administration would re-provision the temporary car park at a nearby location before commencing the construction works. A "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") site to the southeast of the HCRC site, which was currently planned for construction of a sports complex, was one of the possible options.

11. At the request of the Chairman and a number of members, the Administration would provide a written response on the above issue of adding storeys/basements for the provision of more parking spaces (including the implications on the capital cost and construction period of the proposed NTECC) after the meeting, and explain (a) the expected completion date of the subsidized housing development in the vicinity of NTECC; (b) the Administration's plan on re-provisioning the temporary car park at another location during the construction of the proposed HCRC to provide no less than its existing number of parking spaces; and (c) whether the development at the G/IC site adjacent to HCRC would include the construction of a permanent public car park.

*(Post-meeting note: The written response provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC212/17-18\(01\)](#) on 21 May 2018.)*

12. Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr CHAN Hak-kan and the Chairman suggested that the Administration should consider increasing the height of the car park storeys/basements of the two proposed projects to make room for the installation of innovative parking facilities, such as mechanized double-deck car stackers. Director of Architectural Services ("DArchS") and USHA responded that the Administration was open to the above suggestion and would provide a written response after the meeting.

*(Post-meeting note: The written response provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC212/17-18\(01\)](#) on 21 May 2018.)*

13. Mr CHAN Han-pan also suggested that when reprovisioning the temporary car parks being affected, the Administration should also consider installing similar innovative parking facilities in the new temporary car parks.

14. Mr LAM Cheuk-ting was concerned whether the parking spaces provided in the aforesaid subsidized housing development would be open for public use and whether the parking spaces at the proposed NTECC would allow overnight parking. USHA said that the Administration would consider the operational arrangement of the parking spaces at NTECC at a later stage. The Home Affairs Bureau ("HAB") would also discuss with the relevant bureaux/departments the operational arrangement of the parking spaces provided in the subsidized housing development.

15. In response to further enquiries from Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, DArchS said that the Administration had conducted a preliminary traffic impact assessment ("TIA") for the proposed NTECC, which also covered the demand for parking spaces. Subject to the funding approval for the pre-construction activities, the Administration would conduct a more detailed TIA for the project.

16. In response to Dr KWOK Ka-ki's question, USHA said that parking spaces for motorcycles and bicycles would be provided under the proposed NTECC project.

#### Plot ratios of the two project sites

17. Mr Gary FAN, the Chairman, Mr Tony TSE, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Dr KWOK Ka-ki and Mr CHAN Hak-kan urged the Administration to pursue actively the development model of "optimizing land use" and "single site, multiple use" by accommodating as many suitable community facilities (especially parking spaces and facilities for the elderly) in works projects as possible, so as to address the current shortage of community facilities. In

this connection, they suggested that the Administration should consider relaxing the plot ratio of the proposed NTECC site to achieve the above objective. Mr TSE enquired about the preliminary estimated gross floor area ("GFA") of the proposed NTECC.

18. Mr LAU Kwok-fan requested the Administration to elaborate on the factors it considered in determining the respective plot ratios and height restrictions of the sites of NTECC and the subsidized housing development in its vicinity.

19. Dr KWOK Ka-ki said that he supported the two proposed projects. He enquired whether the Administration would organize a design competition for the NTECC project.

20. Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)<sup>1</sup> and DArchS advised that under the relevant Outline Zoning Plan, the proposed NTECC site was zoned for G/IC use and was not subject to planning restrictions in terms of plot ratio and building height per se. However, the site was located near the Former Fanling Magistracy, a low-rise historic building. Having considered the surrounding environment and other factors, the Planning Department recommended that the plot ratio of the development at the site should not be higher than 2.7, so that the new buildings could blend in with the surrounding environment. As estimated currently, the total GFA of the proposed NTECC would be close to 50 000 square metres, bringing the plot ratio to a level exceeding 90% of that recommended. DArchS stressed that while NTECC should be designed mainly for arts and cultural facilities, the Government would consider including other types of public facilities where feasible. The Administration would request the consultant to follow such direction in its study and design work and offer different options for the Government's consideration. No design competition would be organized for the project, but the relevant DCs would be consulted on its detailed design.

21. At the request of the Chairman, Mr Tony TSE and Mr LAU Kwok-fan, the Administration would provide a written response on the following issues after the meeting: (a) the preliminary estimated GFA of the proposed NTECC and the plot ratio of the site; (b) the factors considered by the Government in determining the respective plot ratios and height restrictions of the sites of NTECC and the subsidized housing development in its vicinity; (c) whether the Government would consider relaxing the plot ratio of the NTECC site; and (d) the scope and preliminary estimated areas of the major cultural facilities to be provided in NTECC, with a breakdown by facility.



*(Post-meeting note: The written response provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC212/17-18\(01\)](#) on 21 May 2018.)*

22. Mr CHAN Han-pan enquired whether the Administration had fully utilized the permissible GFA of the proposed HCRC site, and whether it was possible to construct a multi-storey car park at the site in addition to the other planned uses. DArchS replied that the plot ratio of the site was 5.4. As the floor area adopted in the preliminary project design had exceeded the maximum permissible GFA (which was allowed under the relevant guidelines), there was no room for adding a multi-storey car park. During the detailed design stage of the project, the Administration would request the consultant to explore how various proposed facilities could be integrated, so that the development parameters of the site could be met.

#### Timetables and costs of the projects

23. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen and Mr CHU Hoi-dick enquired about the expected completion dates of the two proposed cultural facilities. USHA replied that subject to the funding approval by the Finance Committee ("FC"), the pre-construction activities of the proposed NTECC were expected to be completed in the first quarter of 2022. The Administration would submit the funding proposal for the associated main works in due course for construction to commence in 2022 and completion in the third quarter of 2026. DArchS said that the proposed HCRC was expected to be completed in 2025. At the request of Mr CHAN, the Administration would provide a written response on the expected completion date of NTECC after the meeting.

*(Post-meeting note: The written response provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC212/17-18\(01\)](#) on 21 May 2018.)*

24. Considering that the progress of the two proposed projects was slow, Mr CHU Hoi-dick expressed concern about the progress in constructing community facilities for which there was even stronger public demand (e.g. public markets). The Chairman, Mr MA Fung-kwok and Mr Gary FAN also considered that the progress of the proposed NTECC project was disappointingly slow and urged the Administration to expedite its progress. USHA undertook that the Administration would explore possible ways to expedite the progress of the two proposed projects. He would relay Mr CHU's concern to the relevant bureaux.

25. Mr CHU Hoi-dick and Mr Tony TSE noticed that the time required for the pre-construction activities of the proposed NTECC and HCRC was

about 40 and 30 months respectively. They enquired why more time was required for the pre-construction activities of the former. Moreover, Mr CHU and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen requested the Administration to provide the following information: (a) the reasons for not implementing the proposed NTECC project after years of planning since its preliminary conceptual stage; (b) the timeline for the project throughout planning, design and public consultation stages; (c) the reasons for the long duration of about 40 months required for the pre-construction activities of the project, and a timetable of the major activities involved; and (d) for the purpose of comparison, the implementation timetable of Hong Kong Palace Museum from its preliminary conceptual stage to completion.

26. DArchS replied that more time was required for the pre-construction activities of the proposed NTECC because the project involved the construction of performance venues such as an auditorium and a theatre, making its design more complicated than ordinary buildings. Moreover, there was a footbridge connecting to MTR Fanling Station at the project site, which was built on a slope. To achieve the purpose of "optimized land use", the Administration would erect structures on that slope and re-provision part of the footbridge and the cycle track. The statutory gazettal procedures and public consultation required for the works would also take quite some time to complete.

27. USHA undertook to provide the information requested by Mr CHU Hoi-dick and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen mentioned in paragraph 25 above after the meeting. He pointed out that given the many differences between Hong Kong Palace Museum and NTECC in terms of their designs and usage, it was inappropriate to make a comparison thereof.

*(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC212/17-18\(01\)](#) on 21 May 2018.)*

28. Mr Tony TSE enquired how the Administration arrived at the estimates of the consultants' fees for the pre-construction activities of the two proposed projects. DArchS replied that the consultants' fees required for the two projects were estimated by data analysis under the established mechanism. The fees would only be confirmed after the consultants had been selected. At the request of Mr TSE, the Administration would provide supplementary information to explain the discrepancies between the estimated consultants' fees listed in paragraph 10 of Enclosure 1 to PWSC(2018-19)5 and that provided in Annex 2 to Enclosure 1. A similar situation was also found in paragraph 10 of Enclosure 2 and Annex 2 to Enclosure 2.

(*Post-meeting note:* The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC212/17-18\(01\)](#) on 21 May 2018.)

29. Mr MA Fung-kwok and the Chairman opined that the Administration should explain in its submission to FC the reasons why the pre-construction activities of the proposed HCRC would cost more than those of the proposed NTECC although the former's total site area was much smaller.

Target groups of the proposed New Territories East Cultural Centre

30. Dr CHENG Chung-tai questioned whether the name of "NTECC" could truly reflect the positioning and target groups of the cultural facility to be provided in Area 11, Fanling. He requested the Administration to explain whether it had any plans to set up a regional cultural centre in each of the geographical constituencies for LegCo elections, and whether the cultural facility concerned would be renamed as "New Territories North Cultural Centre" should there be a new geographical constituency of "New Territories North" covering Fanling in future.

31. Dr Fernando CHEUNG said that he supported the two proposed projects. He enquired whether NTECC would be positioned as a cross-district performance venue. If the answer was in the affirmative, he was concerned that hire charges for its facilities might be higher than those of district cultural facilities in general, thus being unaffordable to smaller performing groups.

32. USHA explained that the scope and positioning of the Government's performance venues could broadly be divided into the following three tiers: (a) territorial venues serving all people in Hong Kong, such as Hong Kong Cultural Centre, City Hall and Hong Kong Coliseum; (b) cross-district venues serving mainly residents of the local and neighbouring districts, such as Kwai Tsing Theatre and Sha Tin Town Hall; and (c) district cultural facilities serving mainly residents of the local districts, such as Sheung Wan Civic Centre and Sai Wan Ho Civic Centre. The proposed NTECC was a cross-district venue serving mainly residents of the North and Tai Po districts. The naming had no direct relation to the delineation of geographical constituencies for elections. Performance venues of different sizes would be provided in NTECC, including a multi-purpose studio with 180 seats which was suitable for use by medium and small groups. However, as Dr Fernando CHEUNG had rightly pointed out, smaller district-based groups usually hired district cultural facilities.

33. Assistant Director (Performing Arts), Leisure and Cultural Services Department ("AD(PA)/LCSD") supplemented that cross-district venues under the management of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department ("LCSD") adopted a multi-purpose design to provide facilities catering for the needs of local groups as well (such as facilities for schools to hold graduation ceremonies). Under the current hiring policy, concessionary rates with reductions of up to 65% were provided for non-profit making organizations hiring performance venues under the management of LCSD. She also pointed out that the proposed NTECC, being close to MTR Fanling Station, could provide cultural facilities and services for residents along the MTR East Rail Line. With the development of the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Bay Area ("the Bay Area"), Hong Kong would enjoy closer liaison with other cities in the Bay Area, rendering it possible for NTECC to attract visitors from those cities.

34. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr KWOK Ka-ki and Mr Gary FAN questioned whether the target audience of the proposed NTECC should include visitors from outside Hong Kong. They stressed that in developing new performance venues, the Government should give priority to the needs of local audience. USHA reiterated that the planning intention of NTECC was to provide residents of the North and Tai Po districts with a cross-district performance venue. However, it was possible that cultural and arts groups and visitors from the Mainland would be attracted to use the facilities of NTECC due to its close proximity to the boundary and easy access.

#### Supply of performance venues in Hong Kong

35. Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Ms Starry LEE and Mr LAU Kwok-fan urged the Administration to address squarely the severe shortage of performance venues in Hong Kong and take forward the works projects of various cultural facilities expeditiously. They also raised the following concerns and suggestions: (a) some of the outstanding cultural facility projects of the two former Municipal Councils were still pending implementation; (b) the Administration should draw up a territory-wide blueprint for the development of performance venues in Hong Kong; and (c) while developing major cultural facilities such as the West Kowloon Cultural District, the Administration should also provide more community performance venues as soon as possible for use by small cultural and arts groups or the general public. Ms Starry LEE expressed agreement to the policy direction of the NTECC and HCRC development.

36. Mr Gary FAN opined that there would be a rapid population growth in New Territories East, and the existing and planned cultural facilities would

not be able to meet the future needs of local residents. Moreover, he was dissatisfied that the Administration still did not have any plan to build a cultural centre in Tseung Kwan O to serve residents of Tseung Kwan O and Sai Kung.

37. In response to the above concerns raised by members, USHA said that the Administration was aware of the shortage of performance venues in Hong Kong and would increase the supply of such venues by taking forward the relevant works projects as soon as possible. For instance, construction works of the East Kowloon Cultural Centre had commenced in 2016 and was expected to be completed in 2021. Moreover, HAB was exploring other solutions to increase the supply of performance venues, such as opening up school facilities for use by cultural and arts groups.

38. Mr YIU Si-wing enquired about the utilization rates of North District Town Hall and Tai Po Civic Centre. He urged the Administration to make appropriate arrangements, so that some venues and time slots could be made available to visiting performance groups from outside Hong Kong for the benefit of in-depth cultural exchange while the demand of local cultural and arts groups was being met. AD(PA)/LCSD replied that the utilization rates of North District Town Hall and Tai Po Civic Centre reached 95%. USHA said that it was the Administration's vision to develop Hong Kong into a cultural hub of the Bay Area as well as Southeast Asia. To that end, when planning major performance venues, the Administration would set its goal at meeting local demand as well as attracting Mainland and overseas visitors.

### Functions and design of the proposed Heritage Conservation and Resource Centre

#### *Heritage storage and exhibition*

39. Mr Holden CHOW said that he supported the two proposed projects in principle. He requested the Administration to explain how the collections of museums and heritage centres were being deposited in temporary storages. Mr KWONG Chun-yu enquired whether some collections were being deposited in cargo containers placed under flyovers; whether some collection items had been damaged due to their being deposited in temporary storages; and whether some collection items had been found scattered in the Hong Kong Wetland Park ("HKWP") in Tin Shui Wai.

40. USHA and Assistant Director (Heritage and Museums), Leisure and Cultural Services Department ("AD(HM)/LCSD") explained that the proposed HCRC would become a dedicated heritage storage and conservation facility for preserving the collections of 17 museums and heritage centres

under the management of LCSD. At present, individual museums/heritage centres had limited storage space for their collections, and the remaining collections were being deposited in off-site storages at 23 temporary locations, such as cargo containers, transient stores and warehouses. Most of those cargo containers were placed at open car parks outside the museums/heritage centres. The scattered storage of museum collections at present had created many management problems, such as substantial manpower implications for conducting regular inspections at temporary storage sites to monitor the collections' conditions, and the considerable amount of resources incurred in renting those premises. As such, there was a strong need for the Administration to construct the proposed HCRC serving as a central repository for museum collections, so as to enhance heritage management. AD(HM)/LCSD clarified that there had not been any cases of damaged collections of museums/heritage centres due to the temporary storage arrangements. Nor were any collection items lost and scattered in HKWP, although some of them had been exhibited in HKWP on loan. All temporary storages were equipped with basic air-conditioning for protection of the collections. Every collection item was wrapped and handled individually.

41. Mr CHU Hoi-dick enquired why the Hong Kong Film Archive ("HKFA") did not provide in-house storage for all of its 1.2 million collection item, and whether the Administration would consider allocating more resources for heritage conservation, so that remains/artefacts could be preserved and exhibited in-situ as far as possible. AD(HM)/LCSD said that HKFA did not have sufficient storage space for all its archives. At present, nearly all of them were deposited in temporarily-rented warehouses. Most archaeological excavations in Hong Kong were rescue excavations carried out during the implementation of works projects. Owing to constraints such as those imposed by the scopes of the works projects concerned, it was often impossible to preserve the remains and artefacts unearthed in-situ. That said, the Administration would endeavour to preserve in-situ some of such remains and artefacts as far as practicable.

#### *Public education and visits*

42. Mr MA Fung-kwok suggested that a semi-open plan design should be adopted for the proposed HCRC, such as through installation of glass panels, so that visitors could view closely how heritage conservation work was carried out without causing disruptions to the staff concerned. Mr KWONG Chun-yu also enquired about the arrangements for public visits in HCRC.

43. USHA advised that about 25% of the floor area in HCRC would be used for education, exhibition and scholarly purposes, including the exhibition galleries on the ground floor for display of large exhibits. Educational activities would be held in HCRC to enable students and members of the public to view or participate in heritage conservation work. The Government intended to adopt a semi-open design for the relevant facilities.

44. Mr MA Fung-kwok was concerned whether parking spaces for coaches/school buses would be provided at HCRC; and if so, whether there would be sufficient parking spaces to meet the needs of visiting groups. DArchS responded that the Administration had conducted a preliminary TIA for HCRC. A preliminary option was to provide two pick-up/drop-off points for coaches. The Administration would request the consultant to follow up with the Transport Department on the transport arrangements for HCRC.

45. Mr AU Nok-hin said that, to his understanding, the Administration had considered providing astronomical observation equipment on the rooftop of HCRC. However, the proposal was opposed by the local community. He enquired about the Administration's latest plan in this regard. AD(HM)/LCSD said that upon initial assessment, the Administration considered that given some technical constraints, installation of astronomical observation equipment on the rooftop of HCRC might not be feasible. Furthermore, due to the low height of its roof and the possible hindrance posed by the surrounding environment, HCRC was not an ideal location for astronomical observation. He added that the Hong Kong Space Museum had set up the Astropark in Sai Kung in recent years which, being equipped with astronomical instruments, was a relatively better location for astronomical observation. Moreover, some innovative telescopes that could be operated remotely through the Internet were available for use by the public, even though they were not installed at convenient locations such as building rooftops in urban areas.

#### Synergies with the neighbouring facilities

46. Mr AU Nok-hin sought elaboration on how NTECC would achieve synergies with the proposed Hong Kong Federation of Youth Groups Institute for Leadership Development (i.e. the revitalization project of the Former Fanling Magistracy). AD(PA)/LCSD explained that NTECC would become a new landmark, while the Former Fanling Magistracy was a Grade III historic building. These two adjoining facilities were expected to achieve synergies for attracting more visitors.

47. As the proposed HCRC was located near HKWP and Tin Sau Bazaar in Tin Shui Wai, Mr KWONG Chun-yu suggested that the Administration should step up its publicity efforts to encourage the public to visit these three facilities on the same day, and suitably provide convenient supporting transport. USHA concurred that synergies could be achieved between HCRC and its neighbouring facilities, thereby attracting more visitors and bringing benefits to the local economy.

48. As the contents of some questions put forward by members involved broad policy issues, the Chairman reminded members that those policy issues should be raised to the relevant Panels. He also reminded members not to raise questions on the same subject repeatedly.

Voting on PWSC(2018-19)5

*65RE - New Territories East Cultural Centre in Area 11, Fanling*

49. There being no further questions on the item from members, the Chairman put PWSC(2018-19)5 to vote. At the request of Mr CHU Hoi-dick, the Chairman put the two proposed projects under the item to vote separately. The Chairman first put 65RE to vote. At the request of members, the Chairman ordered a division. Twenty-six members voted for and one member voted against the proposal. One member abstained from voting. The votes of individual members were as follows:

*For:*

Mr Charles Peter MOK (Deputy Chairman)	Mr Abraham SHEK
Mr Tommy CHEUNG	Ms Starry LEE
Mr CHAN Hak-kan	Ms Claudia MO
Mr Michael TIEN	Mr Frankie YICK
Mr YIU Si-wing	Mr MA Fung-kwok
Mr CHAN Chi-chuen	Mr CHAN Han-pan
Dr Helena WONG	Mr Andrew WAN
Mr HO Kai-ming	Mr LAM Cheuk-ting
Mr Holden CHOW	Mr Wilson OR
Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan	Mr HUI Chi-fung
Mr LAU Kwok-fan	Mr KWONG Chun-yu
Mr Jeremy TAM	Mr AU Nok-hin
Mr Vincent CHENG	Mr Tony TSE
(26 members)	



*Against:*

Dr CHENG Chung-tai  
(1 member)

*Abstain:*

Mr CHU Hoi-dick  
(1 member)

50. The Chairman declared that the project was endorsed by the Subcommittee.

*72RE - Heritage Conservation and Resource Centre in Area 109, Tin Shui Wai*

51. The Chairman then put 72RE under the item to vote. The project was voted on and endorsed.

52. No member requested that the item be voted on separately at the relevant FC meeting.

*[At 10:23 am, the Chairman suggested that the meeting be extended for 15 minutes so as to enable members to complete the voting on PWSC(2018-19)5. No member objected to the suggestion.]*

53. The meeting ended at 10:36 am.

Council Business Division 1  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
1 June 2018