

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. PWSC181/20-21
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref: CB1/F/2/1(21)B

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

**Minutes of the 21st meeting
held in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex
on Wednesday, 25 August 2021, at 8:30 am**

Members present:

Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS, JP (Chairman)
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, GBS, MH, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, GBS, JP
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, SBS, JP
Hon MA Fung-kwok, GBS, JP
Hon CHAN Han-pan, BBS, JP
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, SBS, MH, JP
Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP
Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP
Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding
Hon Wilson OR Chong-shing, MH
Hon LUK Chung-hung, JP
Hon LAU Kwok-fan, MH, JP
Dr Hon CHENG Chung-tai
Hon Vincent CHENG Wing-shun, MH, JP

Member attending:

Hon SHIU Ka-fai, JP

Members absent:

Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP

Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP

Public officers attending:

Mr Howard LEE Man-sing	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) ³
Mr LAM Sai-hung, JP	Permanent Secretary for Development (Works)
Ms Bernadette LINN, JP	Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)
Dr Samuel CHUI Ho-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 Daniel CHENG Chung-wai, JP	Director of Administration Administration Wing Chief Secretary for Administration's Office
Ms Eva YAM Ya-ling	Deputy Director of Administration 2 Administration Wing Chief Secretary for Administration's Office
Ms Winnie HO Wing-yin, JP	Director of Architectural Services
Mr Kevin SUEN Chi-hang	Senior Project Manager 121 Architectural Services Department

Mr Paul LAU Cheuk-kit	Senior Property Services Manager (Central, Peak and Mid-Levels) Architectural Services Department
Mr Nevin LAM Yiu-hon	Senior Property Services Manager (Accommodation Design Group) Architectural Services Department
Mr Kenneth CHEN, SBS	Secretary General Legislative Council Secretariat
Ms Dora WAI	Deputy Secretary General (Council and Corporate Services) Legislative Council Secretariat
Mr Thomas WONG	Principal Council Secretary 2 Legislative Council Secretariat
Miss Ida LAI	Chief Council Secretary (Special Duties) Legislative Council Secretariat
Mr Ivanhoe CHANG Chi-ho	Commissioner for Heritage Development Bureau
Mr SHUM Jin	Chief Assistant Secretary for Development (Works) ² (Acting)
Mr Lawrence TANG Luen-tai	Chief Property Services Manager (1) Architectural Services Department

Attendance by invitation:

Dr Andrew LUK Leung	Chairman Hong Kong Roberts Block Centre Limited
Dr Annissa LUI Wai-ling, JP	Chairman (Acting) Lutheran Luen Wo Market—House of Urban and Rural Living Limited
Mr LAM Wai-pong	Chairman Hong Kong Guide Dogs Academy Limited

Mr Benjamin TSANG Boon-chi	Principal MATTER Limited
Mr Billy TAM Hon-wah	Director Thomas Chow Architects Limited
Mr Calvin KWOK Kin-chung	Associate Thomas Chow Architects Limited

Clerk in attendance:

Ms Connie HO	Chief Council Secretary (1)2
--------------	------------------------------

Staff in attendance:

Mr Raymond CHOW	Senior Council Secretary (1)10
Miss Iris SHEK	Council Secretary (1)2
Ms Christina SHIU	Legislative Assistant (1)2
Ms Christy YAU	Legislative Assistant (1)8
Ms Clara LO	Legislative Assistant (1)9

Action

The Chairman advised that there were two papers for discussion on the agenda for the meeting, both of which were new funding proposals submitted by the Administration. The two funding proposals involved a total funding allocation of \$1,556.9 million. 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 703 — Buildings

PWSC(2021-22)27 141KA Expansion of the Legislative Council Complex

2. The Chairman advised that the proposal (i.e. [PWSC\(2021-22\)27](#)) sought to upgrade 141KA to Category A at an estimated cost of \$1,171.4 million in money-of-the-day ("MOD") prices for the expansion of the Legislative Council Complex ("the Complex"). The Administration had

consulted the Legislative Council Commission ("LCC") on the proposed expansion on 10 May and 16 August 2021. LCC members supported the expansion plan. The press releases issued by the Legislative Council Secretariat ("the Secretariat") after the relevant LCC meetings were tabled at the meeting.

3. The Deputy Chairman, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung and Mr Holden CHOW expressed support for the proposed expansion. They considered the existing office space in the Complex insufficient to accommodate the 20 additional Members (with the number of Members increased from the existing 70 to 90) in the Seventh LegCo, making the expansion necessary for meeting Members' demand for office space. Mr LEUNG also commended the Secretariat and the Architectural Services Department for their high efficiency in drawing up an expansion plan in a short span of just a few months.

4. Mr Tommy CHEUNG also said that members belonging to the Liberal Party supported the proposed expansion. Mr CHEUNG was concerned whether members should declare their membership of LegCo before they spoke on the funding proposal for the expansion of the Complex despite that they had no personal interest in the public works project.

5. The Chairman advised that LegCo Members of the current term were responsible for examining funding proposals submitted by the Administration and monitoring the use of public money. The proposed expansion would be completed during the next LegCo term at the earliest, and it was uncertain if Members of the current term would continue to serve as Members in the next LegCo term at this stage. Besides, the expansion plan sought to increase office space for not only Members, but also the Secretariat. Taking the above into consideration, the Chairman opined that the Subcommittee's vetting procedure of the proposed expansion was no different from the funding proposals for other public works projects. He had reminded members in his opening remarks that they were required to disclose the nature of any pecuniary interests relating to the funding proposals under discussion at the meeting before they spoke on the proposals. It was up to members to decide on the need to make such declaration.

Project cost and construction arrangements

6. Mr Holden CHOW enquired about the transitional arrangement for Members' offices and the Secretariat's offices affected by the proposed expansion during construction, including whether such offices would need to be relocated to other areas temporarily and how long it would take before they could move back to the Complex.

7. Director of Administration, Administration Wing, Chief Secretary for Administration's Office ("DoA/AW/CSAO") and Secretary General, Legislative Council Secretariat ("SG/the Secretariat") replied that the proposed expansion works would be carried out in two phases. Phase 1 (which took about three years to complete) included addition of new floors on top of the existing roof of the High Block and the entrance forecourt on G/F of the Complex to provide additional facilities such as Members' offices and the Secretariat's offices. Phase 2 (which took about nine months to complete) would commence only after Phase 1 and the necessary decanting work had been completed, during which conversion/refurbishment works would be carried out to some facilities on 1/F to 8/F of the existing Complex to provide a new conference venue and other facilities. The phased implementation of construction works would obviate the need of repeated decanting of the affected offices.

8. DoA/AW/CSAO and SG/the Secretariat further said that Members' offices on 9/F and 10/F of the High Block of the Complex had to move out to vacate the floors before commencement of Phase 1 of the proposed expansion, so that works could be carried to add new floors on top of the roof of the High Block. As a transitional arrangement, the Administration had rented offices at a nearby commercial building for use by Members, Members' staff and the Secretariat. The fitting-out works of these temporary offices were going ahead in full steam for completion before the commencement of the Seventh LegCo. Other transitional measures included converting the Education Activities Room on 3/F of the Complex into Members' meeting rooms and open plan workstations for Members' staff and converting the upper level of the Ante-chamber into three Members' meeting rooms, so as to provide more meeting rooms for use by Members. Upon completion of the works under Phase 1, Members' offices operating outside the Complex could move back to the Complex.

9. The Deputy Chairman said that the original design of the Complex had allowed room for expansion (e.g. provision of extra loading capacity for its foundation), which paved the way for the proposed expansion. He opined that in addition to giving priority consideration to construction safety, the project team should also strive to ensure the construction quality and shorten the construction lead time when implementing the proposed expansion. As the proposed expansion included addition of new floors on top of the existing roof of the High Block of the Complex, the Deputy Chairman enquired about the reprovisioning arrangement of facilities such as the plant rooms currently located on the top floor of the High Block, and asked whether the Administration would adopt the Modular Integrated Construction ("MiC") method in the proposed expansion to enhance works efficiency.

10. Director of Architectural Services ("DArchS") responded that although the original design of the Complex had allowed room for expansion (e.g. provision of an extra lift shaft at the north lift lobby which currently provided three lifts to cater for the future provision of a fourth lift), the proposed expansion still faced many engineering challenges. The proposed expansion involved the addition of four new floors of offices and one floor for plant rooms on top of the roof of the High Block of the Complex, as well as the addition of 10 office floors and one floor for plant rooms at the location of the terrace on 1/F facing Tim Mei Avenue. During construction, LegCo would remain in operation. Furthermore, when adding new floors on top of the roof of the High Block of the Complex, the existing facilities there (e.g. the plant rooms) had to be reprovisioned at other locations. Facilities such as backup plant rooms should be provided to ensure that the operation of building services systems (e.g. air-conditioning) in the Complex would not be affected during construction.

11. Regarding the use of new construction methods in the proposed expansion, DArchS said that in the future, the new floors added on top of the roof of the High Block of the Complex would be used for providing Members' offices which would be identical in size and facility. The Administration would adopt the MiC method whereby prefabrication components were manufactured off-site and transported to the Complex for on-site assembly outside the operating hours of LegCo (e.g. at night, on public holidays and during the recess of LegCo), so as to minimize the nuisances caused by the works to LegCo's operation.

12. Noting that the construction unit cost of the proposed expansion was \$40,264 per square metre ("sq m") of construction floor area in MOD prices, which was higher than that of other government building projects, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung enquired if that was related to the engineering difficulties arising from the addition of new floors to the existing Complex under the expansion plan.

13. DArchS said that the proposed expansion included adding new floors to the existing Complex and carrying out the associated conversion/refurbishment works. Given that the construction of additional floors was carried out at the existing Complex and involved many complicated processes (e.g. the installation of steel structure and the demolition and reinstallation of glass curtain walls), and coupled with the need to avoid disruption of operation of the Complex and the Council, the project cost of the new expansion portion was on the high side. On the other hand, the project cost of the conversion/refurbishment works of the Complex was comparable to that of other similar government building projects. The Administration

would earmark sufficient provisions for the proposed expansion to ensure that the relevant works were properly managed.

14. Dr Priscilla LEUNG considered that the Administration should ensure the construction quality of the proposed expansion while meeting the tight construction schedule. DArchS said that the offices and conference facilities provided for LegCo would be of high quality.

Impacts of the works on the operation of the Legislative Council

15. Expressing concern that impacts on the operation of LegCo were inevitable during the construction period of the proposed expansion, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung urged that when inviting tenders for the proposed expansion, the Administration should require the successful bidder to take appropriate measures to minimize the impacts of the works.

16. DArchS responded that the Administration would require the contractor, under the relevant contract requirements, to implement specific construction management and mitigation measures to mitigate the noise, dust and site run-off nuisances arising during construction, and carry out the noisy works outside the operational hours of LegCo, so as to minimize the impacts on the operation of LegCo. For the other construction works that would not generate noises, the Administration would discuss with the Secretariat to work out the works arrangements.

17. As the proposed expansion would take some time to complete and many resident site staff would need to access the Complex during the construction period while LegCo would remain in operation, the Chairman requested the Administration and the Secretariat to take appropriate security and management measures. He was also concerned whether the Secretariat had sufficient manpower to implement those measures. SG/the Secretariat and DArchS replied that 9/F and 10/F of the High Block of the Complex would be vacated during Phase 1 of the proposed expansion, so as to enable the addition of new floors on top of the roof of the High Block. Metal supporting frames would be installed temporarily on 10/F to reinforce the building structure, while 9/F would be used as the buffer zone, site office and storage space for materials. Resident site staff would be required to use the designated entrance to enter the Complex for access to the works area. The relevant security measures and access arrangement for site staff would be worked out after the detailed plans had been drawn up for the proposed expansion. The Secretariat believed that the existing manpower should be able to cope with the security and management tasks, and would seek additional staffing resources from LCC where necessary in the light of the actual operation in the future.

Additional floor area at the Legislative Council Complex

18. Members noted from the discussion papers that the remaining expandable area of the Complex was, upon its completion in 2011, about 12 000 sq m in gross floor area ("GFA"). On the other hand, the proposed expansion involved a construction floor area ("CFA") of about 23 860 sq m, including the addition of net operating floor area ("NOFA") of about 7 800 sq m. The Chairman requested the Administration to clarify if the proposed expansion of approximately 23 860 sq m in CFA referred to the floor area involved in the relevant works (and whether the affected floor area in the existing Complex was included), or involved only the additional floor area resulted from the expansion.

19. DArchS responded that the project scope of the proposed expansion involved a total CFA of about 23 860 sq m at the Complex, including the addition of NOFA of about 7 800 sq m and reshuffling/reinstatement of the existing areas of about 6 600 sq m. DArchS further explained that NOFA was the floor area allocated to the users of a building for carrying out the intended activities and was the floor area definition usually used for indicating the floor area requirement of government departments. GFA included both NOFA and the other communal facilities in the building, such as toilets, lift lobbies and stair halls, and was the floor area definition usually used for calculating the plot ratio of the project. The total CFA included GFA and all the construction area (e.g. car parks and plant rooms) and was the floor area definition used for estimating the construction cost of the project.

20. To enable members and the public to have a better understanding of the proposed expansion plan, the Chairman and Mr LUK Chung-hung requested the Administration to explain the definitions of GFA, total CFA and NOFA as well as the relations of these three floor area definitions in the works project. They also requested the Administration and the Secretariat to list out the floor areas to be used for Members' offices and facilities, the Secretariat's offices and other LegCo facilities respectively after completion of the proposed expansion, together with floor plans showing the distribution of the floors affected by the project and the floors to be added. DArchS undertook to provide a written reply on the information requested by the Chairman and Mr LUK after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC173/20-21\(01\)](#) on 7 September 2021.)

21. Mr Tommy CHEUNG hoped that after completion of the proposed expansion, the Complex could provide sufficient office space for the Secretariat to obviate the need for Secretariat staff to be accommodated outside the Complex.

22. DoA/AW/CSAO replied that the planning permission for the expansion of the Complex as part of the Tamar Development Project was approved well prior by the Town Planning Board. The Complex had also been provided with room for expansion before it was completed in 2011. The current expansion project would achieve the maximum expandable allowance of the Complex according to the planning permission. SG/the Secretariat supplemented that some Secretariat staff had to be accommodated at the Queensway Government Offices ("QGO") currently. After completion of the proposed expansion, most Secretariat staff (including staff providing support services for the meetings of LegCo and its committees) could have their offices moved back to the Complex, except for a small number of staff who would still need to be accommodated at QGO. As QGO was located not far from the Complex, such an arrangement would not have significant implications on the operation of the Secretariat.

23. The Chairman said that an expansion plan had been provided for in the tender document of the Tamar Development Project to prepare for the addition of floor area at the Complex should the number of LegCo seats increase by 60 (i.e. from 60 seats then to 120 seats in the future). He was concerned if the relevant departments had underestimated the office space requirement of Members and the Secretariat when formulating the expansion plan, resulting that a small number of Secretariat staff would still have to be accommodated at QGO after completion of the proposed expansion even though the number of LegCo seats would only increase to 90 in the seventh term.

24. SG/the Secretariat said that the seating in the LegCo Chamber could be expanded to accommodate 120 Members. When the relevant departments made predictions on the office space requirement of Members and the Secretariat some 10 years ago, the currently complicated work of the Council might be unanticipated. As for the Secretariat, the number of staff had indeed increased since the Complex commenced operation in 2011, thus some staff had to be accommodated outside the Complex currently. However, most Secretariat staff could have their offices moved back to the Complex after completion of the proposed expansion. The Secretariat would need to make further planning of office accommodation at the Complex should there be further increase in the number of LegCo Members.

Enhancing the facilities of the Legislative Council Complex

25. Mr LEUNG Che-cheung pointed out that the conference venues and meeting rooms at the Complex were inadequate even now when there were 70 LegCo seats. Moreover, while the Information Display System was installed at Members' desks in Conference Room 1 for Members to read papers during the meetings, similar equipment was not provided in Conference Rooms 2 and 3. Mr LEUNG enquired whether the Secretariat would provide new conference venues and meeting rooms through the proposed expansion and promote paperless meetings by acquiring the relevant computer equipment. The Chairman also enquired whether the Secretariat would enhance the facilities at the Complex through the proposed expansion.

26. SG/the Secretariat responded that works were being carried out at Conference Room 4 in the Complex to modify it from a venue only for closed meetings to one for open meetings, so that a new conference venue would be made available shortly for use by various committees. In the longer run, a new conference venue (i.e. Conference Room 6) would be provided under Phase 2 of the proposed expansion. To meet Members' pressing need of meeting rooms, the Secretariat would also provide additional meeting rooms on the floors of Members' offices through the proposed expansion. Moreover, the Secretariat would introduce measures in the Seventh LegCo to move further towards a paperless legislature, during which Members could access papers for the meeting online using their own notepads or other mobile devices at the conference venues. In view of Members' increased demand for data service, the Secretariat was enhancing progressively the volume of Wi-Fi data transmission at the Complex to facilitate the work of Members.

27. Dr Priscilla LEUNG considered that the quality of some existing facilities at the Complex could be enhanced further and urged the Secretariat to make improvement through the proposed expansion. For example, to facilitate Members' attendance at the meetings, some lifts at the Complex might be reserved for the exclusive use by Members to carry them directly to the floors of conference venues. Moreover, consideration could be given to designate a certain area of the Cafeteria on G/F of the Complex to provide table service for the exclusive use by Members, while the Coffee Corner on 5/F could offer more food varieties. Dr LEUNG also enquired whether the Roof Garden on 5/F of the Complex would be affected by the proposed expansion.

28. DArchS and SG/the Secretariat said that the Administration and the Secretariat would explore ways to improve the operating arrangement of lifts in the Complex, including selecting the suitable smart lift assignment system to enhance the passenger carrying efficiency. Moreover, the Roof Garden on 5/F of the Complex would be retained, while the rooftop of the new expansion

portion facing Tim Mei Avenue would be used for providing another roof garden serving similar purpose as the original terrace on 1/F. The Secretariat also planned to provide landscaping and greening features on various levels in the new expansion portion of the Complex as appropriate. The greening area would be about 650 sq m in size.

29. Deputy Secretary General (Council and Corporate Services), Legislative Council Secretariat supplemented that the area occupied by the Cafeteria would increase by about 30% in the future. The Secretariat was considering dedicating the additional area for the exclusive use of Members, while the existing area of the Cafeteria would continue to be opened to staff and users of the Complex. The Secretariat also planned to expand the Coffee Corner and enhance its facilities to offer more food varieties.

Voting on PWSC(2021-22)27

30. There being no further questions from members on the item, the Chairman put [PWSC\(2021-22\)27](#) to vote.

31. The item was voted on and endorsed. The Chairman requested that the item (i.e. [PWSC\(2021-22\)27](#)) be voted on separately at the relevant meeting of the Finance Committee ("FC").

Head 708 — Capital Subventions

PWSC(2021-22)28	35QW	Revitalisation Scheme—Revitalisation of the Roberts Block, Old Victoria Barracks into Roberts Block Open HeArts Centre
	36QW	Revitalisation Scheme—Revitalisation of the Luen Wo Market into Luen Wo Market—House of Urban and Rural Living
	37QW	Revitalisation Scheme—Revitalisation of the Former Lau Fau Shan Police Station into Hong Kong Guide Dogs Academy

32. The Chairman advised that the proposal (i.e. [PWSC\(2021-22\)28](#)) sought to upgrade 35QW, 36QW and 37QW to Category A at the respective estimated costs of \$219 million, \$68.2 million and \$98.3 million in MOD prices. The Administration had consulted the Panel on Development on the three projects on 10 May 2021. Panel members generally supported the submission of the three funding proposals to the Subcommittee for consideration. A report on the gist of the Panel's discussion was tabled at the meeting.

Revitalisation Scheme—Revitalisation of the Roberts Block, Old Victoria Barracks into Roberts Block Open HeArts Centre

33. The Chairman noted that the capital cost of the proposed revitalisation of the Roberts Block of the Old Victoria Barracks into Roberts Block Open HeArts Centre ("Open HeArts Centre") was as high as \$219 million. He requested the Administration to explain the reason for the high capital cost and advise whether this had something to do with the building of the new lift and linkbridge.

34. Commissioner for Heritage, Development Bureau ("C for H/DEVB"), said that the capital cost of individual revitalisation projects would be subject to the prevailing conditions, geographical location and internal fittings of the historic building concerned. As the design of most historic buildings might not comply with the current requirements of building safety, barrier-free access, etc. under the Buildings Ordinance (Cap. 123), the Administration had to provide the necessary facilities when revitalising the historic buildings, resulting in the high capital cost. Meanwhile, the increase in capital cost was also due to the additions/alterations of various degrees required to be made to the historic buildings in the light of the recommendation made by the selected non-governmental organizations ("NGOs") under the Revitalising Historic Buildings Through Partnership Scheme ("the Revitalisation Scheme").

35. Regarding the project of the proposed Open HeArts Centre, C for H/DEVB explained that the three-storey Roberts Block of the Old Victoria Barracks was built in the early 1900s. Located on a slope, it was not provided with vehicular accesses in its surrounding area. To facilitate public access to Open HeArts Centre in the future and provide a safe environment, the Administration was required to carry out basic refurbishment and drainage works at the Roberts Block and provide the linkbridge and lift connecting from Kennedy Road, together with the strengthening of the slabs. In view of the above, the capital cost of the project was higher than the revitalisation projects of the Luen Wo Market and the Former Lau Fau Shan Police Station.

Revitalisation Scheme—Revitalisation of the Luen Wo Market into Luen Wo Market—House of Urban and Rural Living

36. Mr CHAN Han-pan expressed support for the revitalisation of the Luen Wo Market ("LWM") into Luen Wo Market—House of Urban and Rural Living ("LWM-HURL"). He noted that LWM-HURL would collaborate with accredited local farms to supply quality local vegetables to promote local agricultural products, provide stalls to deliver a trading platform for local residents and create job opportunities for the local community. Mr CHAN

enquired about the procedure adopted by the NGO operating the project in selecting farm partners and stall tenants.

37. Chairman, Lutheran Luen Wo Market—House of Urban and Rural Living Limited ("C/LWM-HURL") said that the NGO had submitted the detailed operation proposal to the Advisory Committee on Built Heritage Conservation when applying for operating the revitalisation project. The proposed project would revitalise LWM by reviving the traditional market function of the site and enhancing its ambience as a modern bazaar. LWM-HURL would provide different stalls and shops and host weekend bazaars selling local agricultural products and creative handicrafts designed by young people, thereby creating a showcasing and trading platform for local farms and youths.

38. Mr CHAN Han-pan asked how the NGO operating the project determined the rents of stalls and the tenancy policy of the stalls in LWM-HURL. He noted that if the project could not achieve breakeven, the operating organization might apply to the Administration for a one-off grant to meet the deficits in the first two years of operation at a ceiling of \$5 million, in addition to the annual recurrent expenditure of \$40,000. In this connection, he was concerned whether the operating organization could, while revitalising LWM, operate the project effectively to make it financially self-sustainable, so as to reduce public expenditure.

39. C/LWM-HURL said that stall tenants had to pay a utilization fee. To attract more farmers and young people to showcase and sell their produce and products at the rented stalls, adding that short-term and occasional bazaars would be held in LWM-HURL, the rents would not be set too high so as to encourage the participation of young people and farmers.

40. C/LWM-HURL added that to achieve breakeven, LWM-HURL would resort to various means to increase patronage and income, including organizing guided cycling tours of monuments/heritage and visits to farms, setting up stalls and hosting Saturday and Sunday bazaars selling local agricultural products and creative handicrafts, and operating a restaurant serving food made mainly from local produce. It was hoped that the project could not only break even, but also create job opportunities for the local community and promote local agricultural products and creativity. The Commissioner for Heritage's Office would monitor the income and expenditure of the project. C for H/DEVB clarified that the \$40,000 annual recurrent expenditure mentioned by Mr CHAN Han-pan was the repair cost payable to the Architectural Services Department for maintaining the historic buildings rather than subsidizing the day-to-day operation of the project.

41. The Chairman noted that although the project involved only refurbishment works, the construction unit cost was as high as \$34,300 per sq m of construction floor area. He requested the Administration to explain the reason for the high construction cost. Principal, MATTER Limited explained that the works in question, which involved the preservation and revitalisation of a historic building, would adopt a minimal intervention approach. To comply with the requirements under the Buildings Ordinance (Cap. 123), a new annex block would be built under the project to accommodate the necessary fire service as well as electrical and mechanical facilities. In addition, necessary conversion and reinforcement works would also be carried out to the structure of LWM, including some relatively complicated works such as the reinforcement and repair of the main canopy and the plaque at the entrance. As a result, the construction cost was higher than refurbishment works in general.

42. Mr CHAN Han-pan was concerned about the busy traffic situation at the current location of LWM. The vacant site to the west of the market, which was previously used as a temporary car park, would be converted into the West Plaza after the revitalisation. In this connection, Mr CHAN enquired about the parking and traffic arrangements of LWM after the revitalisation. He urged the Administration to prevent the nuisance that might be caused to local residents when there were inadequate parking spaces for the increasing number of driving visitors. Principal, MATTER Limited said, to bring back to life LWM's history as a traditional market and enhance its ambience as a holiday bazaar, the vacant sites to the east and the west of LWM would be converted into plazas. As most visitors were expected to access the future LWM-HURL by public transport, no parking spaces would be provided at the two plazas. In this connection, Mr CHAN Han-pan expressed worries about the traffic conditions in the vicinity of LWM after the revitalisation and hoped that the relevant government departments would keep a watchful eye on the situation.

Revitalisation Scheme—Revitalisation of the Former Lau Fau Shan Police Station into Hong Kong Guide Dogs Academy

43. The Deputy Chairman expressed support for the three proposed projects, namely 35QW, 36QW and 37QW. He further enquired about the number of guide dogs that would be trained annually after the revitalisation of the Former Lau Fau Shan Police Station into Hong Kong Guide Dogs Academy ("the Academy"), and the experience of the NGO responsible for the revitalisation project (i.e. Hong Kong Guide Dogs Academy Limited) in training guide dogs.

44. Chairman, Hong Kong Guide Dogs Academy Limited said that upon commissioning, the Academy was expected to breed about 20 dogs annually,

of which about 10 would be trained as guide dogs, while the remaining about 10 would become service dogs providing services for children with special education needs and the elderly with dementia. He advised that the Hong Kong Guide Dogs Academy Limited had two to three years of experience in training service dogs helping children and the elderly, and its services had achieved satisfactory results. Apart from training guide dogs, the service scope of the Academy would also cover the provision of services for the aforesaid people in need, and the matching of suitable trained dogs with guide dog users to enable the safe and effective use of guide dogs by the latter.

Management of historic buildings

45. Mr CHAN Han-pan enquired about the government department responsible for the revitalisation of historic buildings. C for H/DEVB replied that historic buildings of the Government were managed by different government departments. Members of the public might make direct enquiries with the responsible departments about the revitalisation of historic buildings. The Antiquities and Monuments Office would provide the relevant departments with technical advice on the maintenance of historic buildings from the conservation perspective.

46. Mr CHAN Han-pan pointed out that many historic buildings with revitalisation potential were not put to proper use currently. In this connection, he asked whether the Administration had formulated plans on publicizing the list of historic buildings on a regular basis and inviting organizations to participate in their revitalisation as part of its effort to manage historic buildings with revitalisation potential.

47. C for H/DEVB said that the Government would select suitable historic buildings on a regular basis for inclusion in the Revitalisation Scheme, under which NGOs might apply for revitalising government-owned historic buildings in the form of social enterprise. The Revitalisation Scheme had moved on to Batch VI by now. It was expected that by early 2022, a total of 13 historic buildings (under Batches I to IV) would have been revitalised under the Scheme and opened to the public. He also advised that it was the Administration's aim to continue to implement the Scheme to allow more historic buildings to be revitalised and opened to the public.

48. Mr CHAN Han-pan further enquired about the length of the initial tenancy period of historic buildings for successful applicants under the Revitalisation Scheme, and whether the Administration would review the revitalisation projects operated by partner organizations for considering tenancy renewal. C for H/DEVB said that under the Revitalisation Scheme, the tenancy period of historic buildings was normally of an initial term of

three years. The Administration would decide on the tenancy renewal after negotiating with the partner organizations and having regard to the actual utilization of the buildings and the advice given by the Advisory Committee on Built Heritage Conservation.

Other views and concerns

49. The Chairman sought information from the Administration about the progress of conservation work of the service reservoir in Sham Shui Po. C for H/DEVB said that the Water Supplies Department was carrying out improvement works to the service reservoir with the aim of allowing its restricted opening for visit by the public by the end of this year, and enabling them to appreciate its historical value and architectural merit through guided tours.

Voting on PWSC(2021-22)28

50. There being no further questions from members on the item, the Chairman put [PWSC\(2021-22\)28](#) to vote.

51. The item was voted on and endorsed. The Chairman consulted members on whether the item would require separate voting at the relevant meeting of FC. No member raised such a request.

52. The meeting ended at 9:49 am.