

立法會

Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(2) 1588/01-02

(These minutes have been seen by
the Administration)

Ref : CB2/HS/1/00

Subcommittee to follow up the outstanding capital works projects of the former municipal councils

**Minutes of meeting
held on Thursday, 15 November 2001 at 8:30 am
in Conference Room A of the Legislative Council Building**

Members Present : Dr Hon TANG Siu-tong, JP (Chairman)
Hon Fred LI Wah-ming, JP
Hon CHAN Yuen-han, JP
Hon Andrew WONG Wang-fat, JP
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon IP Kwok-him, JP

Member Attending : Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, JP

Members Absent : Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan
Hon WONG Sing-chi
Hon WONG Yung-kan
Hon LAU Ping-cheung

Public Officers Attending : Item II (a)
Mrs Stella HUNG
Deputy Secretary for the Environment and Food (A)

Mr David LAU
Principal Assistant Secretary for the Environment and Food (A) 2

Mrs Marion LAI
Deputy Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene
(Administration and Development)

Mr HUNG Chi-pai
Assistant Director (Operations) 1
Food and Environmental Hygiene Department

Mrs Angel CHOI
Chief Executive Officer (Planning) 2
Food and Environmental Hygiene Department

Mr WONG Shiu-kwan
Project Director 3
Architectural Services Department

Items II(b) and III

Mr NG Shek-hon
Deputy Secretary for Home Affairs (3)

Ms Lolly CHIU
Deputy Director of Leisure and Cultural Services
(Administration)

Mr WONG Shiu-kwan
Project Director 3
Architectural Services Department

Ms Pamela CHAN
Chief Executive Officer (Planning) 1
Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Mr Daniel MAK
Chief Executive Officer (Planning) 2
Leisure and Cultural Services Department

**Clerk in
Attendance**

: Mrs Constance LI
Chief Assistant Secretary (2)5

Staff in Attendance : Miss Betty MA
Senior Assistant Secretary (2)1

Action

I. Confirmation of minutes of meeting

[LC Paper No. CB(2) 351/01-02]

The minutes of the meeting on 21 June 2001 were confirmed.

II. Administration's response to concerns raised by members at the meeting on 16 October 2001

(a) Retro-fitting of air-conditioning to 19 existing markets and/or cooked food centres

[LC Paper No. CB(2) 353/01-02(01)]

2. Members noted that the Administration had provided a response to the concerns raised at the last meeting on 16 October 2001.

Implementation time-table

3. Deputy Secretary for the Environment and Food (DS(EF)) said that the implementation time-table for the retro-fitting projects was only a rough indication of the project commencement and completion dates. The Administration would consult the Market Management Consultative Committees (MMCC) and stall lessees as soon as the schematic design works for the projects were completed. Once the agreement with the lessees had been obtained, the design works could be finalised and tenders called. DS(EF) added that the construction work of an individual retro-fitting project could start immediately once these procedures were completed.

4. Mr IP Kwok-him asked whether the Administration could provide more concrete information on the commencement dates and completion dates for each of the 19 projects. He wanted to know whether some projects could commence earlier.

5. Deputy Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene (Administration and Development) (DD(FEHD)) responded that the detailed design for individual projects could commence as soon as consultation was completed. She envisaged that consultation with MMCC and stall lessees could start in February 2002 (when the consultants should have completed the schematic design work for the projects), and

Action

the consultation should take about two months. The Administration would provide progress reports to the Subcommittee in due course. In reply to Mr IP, Project Director 3/Architectural Services Department (PD3/ArchSD) said that funds had been earmarked for engaging the services of consultants for the schematic design work. As eight consultants would be engaged, the schematic design work for the 19 projects could start at the same time and complete around February 2002.

6. Mr IP Kwok-him asked whether relocation of market stalls would be required during the construction period. DD(FEHD) said that the stall lessees would be consulted on the arrangements, such as whether some stalls would have to be closed or relocated during the construction period.

7. Mr IP Kwok-him said that the Administration should formulate plans for consultation with the stall lessees to avoid further delay in implementation. DD(FEHD) responded that the Administration had indeed formulated such plans. The Administration would not advocate the proposal of relocating the affected stall lessees to a temporary market in view of the costs involved and the possibility of loss of business for stall lessees concerned.

8. Mr Abraham SHEK said that he was not a member of the Subcommittee. Mr SHEK sought clarification on why construction works could only commence in April 2003, which was one year after the schematic design work for the projects was completed.

9. PD3/ArchSD explained that the retro-fitting projects were at present included in Category B of the Public Works Programme (PWP). After the schematic design was completed, FEHD would carry out consultation with the stall lessees concerned which would take about two months. After consultation, the consultants would prepare the detailed design and tender documents. When the projects were ready for upgrading to Category A, funding approval would be sought from the Public Works Subcommittee (PWSC) and Finance Committee (FC) in October and November 2002 respectively. Subject to FC approval, tender would be called for so that the projects could commence in early 2003.

10. Mr Abraham SHEK said that the Administration should speed up the process as there was a strong call from the community for early implementation of public works projects in order to create more employment opportunities. He considered that the implementation could be expedited with the engagement of consultants.

11. The Chairman said that at the PWSC special meeting on 14 November 2001, members had discussed measures to accelerate project delivery, such as taking parallel actions for tender and funding. He asked whether these measures could be applied to the 19 retro-fitting projects.

Action

12. PD3/ArchSD said that the implementation time-table was drawn up after discussion with the consultants and taking into account the experience of previous retro-fitting projects. In view of the complexity of these projects and the lead time required for the preparation of detailed design and tender documents, he did not envisage that there would be much room for further compressing the implementation timetable.

13. Mr Abraham SHEK disagreed with the Administration's explanation. He said that as far as he knew, many project consultant firms were not very busy these days and they could readily take up the 19 projects. He further said that as the eight consultants had yet to be engaged, he did not understand why the Administration would know that the consultants could not further compress the timetable. He stressed that he did not accept that the projects would need so long to complete, and he urged the Administration to critically examine ways to further streamline the workflow and demand early project delivery from the consultants.

14. The Chairman said that as more consultants would be engaged to carry out the projects, it should be possible to expedite the project delivery. Miss CHAN Yuen-han and Mr IP Kwok-him expressed similar views. Miss CHAN Yuen-han said that while the Legislative Council (LegCo) Members agreed that it was necessary to follow statutory procedures and to ensure the quality of project delivery, it was also important to respond to the call from the community for the creation of more employment opportunities. She urged the Administration to further explore ways to streamline the procedures and accelerate the projects. She said that LegCo could convene urgent meetings to consider these public works proposals if necessary.

15. Mr IP Kwok-him said that the lead time of 14 months for the projects to commence after the completion of schematic design work was too long. He pointed out that eight consultants would be engaged and no environmental impact assessment studies were required for these projects. He could not accept the explanation that the implementation time-table could not be further compressed because of procedures for upgrading projects under the Public Works Programme (PWP).

16. In view of members' concerns, DS(EF) undertook to discuss with the consultants and relevant government departments to see whether there was any room for further expediting project delivery. She said that the Administration would revert to the Subcommittee.

Job creation

17. Referring to the Administration's paper, Mr Fred LI asked whether the 1 610 jobs to be created included those in the consultants' firms and private companies. PD3/ArchSD advised that the 1 610 jobs referred to those outside the civil service.

Action

Retro-fitting of air-conditioning in other public markets

18. Mr Fred LI asked whether the Administration had any plans to carry out retro-fitting of air-conditioning in other public markets or cooked food centres which were not included in the 19 projects. He also asked whether the Administration would draw up a five-year rollover programme for the existing markets. Miss CHAN Yuen-han expressed a similar concern. Miss CHAN said that the Administration should include more public markets in the programme and carry out retro-fitting works in other markets expeditiously.

19. DD(FEHD) responded that as considerable resources were required for the retro-fitting of air-conditioning projects, it was only pragmatic to adopt a phased approach for implementation of the projects. As regards those existing public markets which were not included in the current proposal, DD(FEHD) said that there were improvement plans to gradually upgrade their ventilation conditions and facilities. Her department was discussing with ArchSD the relative priorities for carrying out improvement works in these markets.

20. Mr Andrew WONG asked about the plan for constructing a permanent market in Tai Po as the current temporary market in the district had been in use for many years. DD(FEHD) said that her department was reviewing the overall policy for the construction of new markets and the viability of the 81 public markets under the management of FEHD. In considering whether new markets should be constructed to replace existing ones, the Administration would have to take into account the physical conditions, business environment and patronage of the markets. She pointed out that the Director of Audit had recommended in his report published in 1997 that viability should be the overriding consideration in planning public markets. DD(FEHD) said that in the meantime, her department would closely monitor the conditions in temporary markets and take necessary actions to upgrade the facilities in these markets.

21. Mr Andrew WONG said that Tai Po Temporary Market had a high patronage and there were no other public markets in the vicinity. He urged the Administration to seriously consider constructing a permanent market in the district. The Chairman advised that new projects which were outside the list of 169 outstanding projects of the ex-Provisional Municipal Councils (PMCs) should more appropriately be followed up by the relevant Panel.

(*Post-meeting note* : The Administration subsequently advised that FEHD had a plan to reprovision the existing Tai Po Temporary market to the Tai Po Complex, the construction works of which had started in late 1999 for completion in 2003.)

Action

- (b) Implementation of the Accelerated Programme for capital works projects
involving leisure and cultural services facilities
-

[LC Paper No. CB(2) 353/01-02(02)]

22. Deputy Secretary for Home Affairs (DS(HA)) said that in view of members' comments at the last meeting, the Administration had reviewed the implementation programme for the 64 capital works projects involving leisure and cultural services facilities. The Administration had further compressed the planning lead time for those projects which were relatively straightforward, so that more projects could start in 2002-03. The Chairman advised that the Administration now proposed to include 15 projects, instead of seven projects, in the Accelerated Programme for 2002-03.

Projects under the accelerated programme

23. Mr Albert CHAN said that he could not accept the recommendations made in the Administration's paper. He pointed out that there was an uneven distribution of projects for different districts, e.g. no projects were proposed for Tsuen Wan in 2002-03 and 2003-04. He queried the criteria adopted by the Administration in determining the projects to be included in the Accelerated Programme. Mr CHAN further said that the implementation time-table proposed for some projects by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) were far behind the schedule recommended by the ex-PMCs. For example, the Provisional Regional Council (ProRC) planned to start the construction of the district library in Tin Shui Wai in 2000-01 and complete the project by 2002-03. However, LCSD now recommended to start the construction works of the project only in 2005-06. Mr CHAN said that as the site for the library should be available well before 2005-06, he did not understand why there was such a delay in the project commencement date as recommended by LCSD. He asked whether this was caused by a change in policy after the abolition of the PMCs.

24. DS(HA) responded that as he had explained at previous meetings of the Subcommittee, the Administration would try its best to proceed with the ex-PMC projects as early as practicable where there was a need for such facilities. He said that the Administration had already compressed the planning lead time for projects which were of a relatively straightforward nature. However, for regional or district performance facilities such as civic centres, they were not included in the Accelerated Programme, as these projects would be subject to the outcome of the "Consultancy Study for the Provision of Regional/District Cultural and Performance Facilities in Hong Kong". DS(HA) assured members that the Administration would continue to implement new projects to meet local demand for the facilities. If the Administration decided not to proceed with any ex-PMC projects, it would revert to the Subcommittee as soon as possible.

Action

25. Deputy Director of Leisure and Cultural Services (DD/LCSD) said that her department had consulted the 18 District Councils (DCs) in drawing up the relative priority of projects in the Accelerated Programme 2002-03, taking into account the readiness of individual projects in terms of site availability and accessibility. Referring to Mr Albert CHAN's comment that the 2002-03 and 2003-04 programmes did not include any projects for Tsuen Wan, DD/LCSD explained that the projects for Tsuen Wan would be taken forward once the sites were available on completion of the reclamation work.

26. Mr Albert CHAN disagreed with DD/LCSD's explanation on not including any projects for Tsuen Wan in the Accelerated Programme for the coming two years. He pointed out that not all the 10 projects in Tsuen Wan had to be constructed on reclaimed land.

27. Regarding the temporary library in Tin Shui Wai, Mr Albert CHAN noted that it was located in leased premises. While he accepted the provision of a temporary library in Tin Shui Wai as an interim arrangement, he was of the view that the Administration should start constructing the district library as early as possible. Mr CHAN said that as the site for the proposed district library was ready, he saw no reason why construction had to be deferred as this would result in a waste of public money in terms of rental costs of the temporary library. He commented that the current arrangement was not cost-effective, and requested the Administration to provide information on the monthly expenses on the rental, management fees and electricity charges for air-conditioning in the operation of the temporary library.

Admin

28. DD/LCSD said that the proposed library building in Tin Shui Wai would include other facilities, and LCSD had to identify other user departments to optimise site utilisation, before taking forward the project. She further said that Yuen Long DC had been consulted on the relative priority of the projects in the district, and since a temporary library had been provided in Tin Shui Wai, Yuen Long DC had agreed to accord priority to the Yuen Long Library instead. DS(HA) advised that the provision of public libraries would be studied by the Culture and Heritage Commission. He added that the provision of public libraries in private buildings had proven to be successful in Singapore.

29. The Chairman advised that Yuen Long DC had expressed agreement to the relative priority for libraries in Yuen Long and Tin Shui Wai proposed by the Administration, having regard to the Administration's position that a permanent library would not be provided in Tin Shui Wai for the time being.

30. Mr Andrew WONG expressed concern about the proposed Tai Po Civic Centre. He said that residents in the district expressed grave dissatisfaction about the delay in the construction of the Centre. He said that as far as he knew, the design of Tai Po

Action

Civic Centre had been approved by the former ProRC and joint users for the centre had been identified already.

31. DS(HA) reiterated that the planning of district civic centres would be subject to the findings of the "Consultancy Study for the Provision of Regional/District Cultural and Performance Facilities in Hong Kong".

Commencement of projects under the Accelerated Programme

32. Mr Abraham SHEK noted that the earliest commencement date for projects in the Accelerated Programme would be October 2002. He queried why it would need one year to start the first batch of the 15 projects, which were mainly small projects such as the provision of open space and site formation was not required. Mr SHEK said that the Administration should provide explanation on the long lead time.

33. PD3/ArchSD explained that the 15 projects to be implemented in 2002-03 were now in Category B. His department was preparing documents for the engagement of consultants to carry out the projects. He expected that the consultants could be engaged by December 2001 and they could then start work on the sketch design, working drawings and tender documents. PWSC approval would be sought to upgrade these projects to Category A around June 2002, and the tender process would take about three months. He said that October 2002 was the earliest possible date to start the projects. He further said that as the projects had to go through the Central Tender Board and other necessary procedures, he did not see any further room for compressing the implementation timetable.

34. The Chairman said that members were not convinced of the long lead time to start the projects in the Accelerated Programme. He urged the Administration to critically examine ways to further shorten the planning lead time for these projects.

35. Mr Fred LI shared the concern expressed by Mr Abraham SHEK. He said that the Administration's paper only proposed slight improvements to the commencement dates of the projects. Mr LI further said that at the special meeting of PWSC on 14 November 2001, the Administration had advised that the tender procedures for capital works projects had been streamlined, for example, the tender notices would be published on the Internet. Mr LI was of the view that with the improved procedures, the lead time for these capital works projects could be further shortened. Mr LI also asked why consultants had to be engaged for open space projects as these were of a relatively straightforward nature.

36. PD3/ArchSD explained that although tender notices were published on Government website, the Administration would still need to allow time for the submission of tender and other preparatory work. He pointed out that according to the World Trade Organisation requirements, a six-week period had to be provided for

Action

invitation of tender for contracts of value above \$50 million. As regards the engagement of consultants, PD3/ArchSD said that it was Government policy to encourage private sector participation and to create more employment opportunities.

37. DS(HA) added that the implementation timetable for the Accelerated Programme was drawn up after careful consideration within Government. He stressed that there was not much room for further advancing the commencement dates of the projects as it would be undesirable to bypass the established procedures which were to ensure the quality of project delivery. Nevertheless, he would look into the possibility of expediting the construction after commencement of the project, and advancing any of the projects proposed for 2003-04 and subsequent years under the Accelerated Programme.

38. Mr Fred LI said that he supported the policy direction of contracting out more public works projects. He asked whether there was any difference in time for the preparatory work to be carried out by ArchSD and by consultants. PD3/ArchSD responded that the time required for the preparatory work would be more or less the same, and that consultants were to be engaged because his department did not have sufficient manpower to carry out so many projects at the same time.

39. Mr Fred LI noted that some projects were not recommended for advancement because the plot ratio had yet to be resolved. He asked to what extent the plot ratio was a problem in taking these projects forward. Mr Fred LI further asked whether the construction of the project would be deferred if joint users could not be identified.

40. Miss CHAN Yuen-han said that she had no objection to maximising the site utilisation. She urged that the Administration should not adopt a uniform design for all new building projects of a similar nature. She considered that individual buildings should have their own characteristics.

41. PD3/ArchSD responded that Government Property Agency (GPA) required that all capital works projects, except construction of parks, should optimise site utilisation, as it held the view that most sites for the existing Indoor Games Halls were under-utilised. To optimise site utilisation, it was necessary to identify joint users for the proposed buildings.

42. DS(HA) advised that the Administration would strike a balance between optimising site utilisation and expediting the implementation of these projects. He further said that the Administration also hoped that different buildings would have their own characteristics. In this connection, he pointed out that various buildings constructed by ArchSD had unique designs. He added that with private sector participation in the construction of capital works projects, more new ideas and designs could be tried out.

Action

43. Mr Andrew WONG said that the Administration should not delay the construction of these projects simply because joint users were yet to be identified in order to maximise the plot ratio. He was of the view that the construction of the project could start first, and any vacant space not taken up by government departments could be leased out. DS(HA) said that Mr WONG's suggestion would be considered with regard to the planning considerations, for example, whether buildings on GIC sites could be leased for commercial purposes.

44. Miss CHAN Yuen-han said she was dissatisfied with the lack of coordination within Government on these capital works projects, because at the PWSC special meeting held on the day before, representatives of the ArchSD seemed to be unaware of LCSD's proposal of further advancement of some projects.

45. Miss CHAN Yuen-han said that she appreciated the importance of adhering to the statutory procedures for taking forward and monitoring the capital works projects, to avoid a recurrence of the "short-piling" scandal. However, she considered that there was still room for further accelerating those projects scheduled to start in 2003-04 or subsequent years. She urged the Administration to make serious efforts to reduce the red-tapes, so that the projects could start early and more employment opportunities could be created as soon as possible as advocated by Government. The Chairman expressed support for Miss CHAN's views.

46. Miss CHAN Yuen-han asked whether the grouping of the 15 projects scheduled to start in 2002-03 in three batches was only to facilitate project management by ArchSD. PD3/ArchSD explained that it was just coincidental that the user requirements for these projects were received in three batches, and the relevant feasibility studies and funding approval were also completed at three different stages. These projects would therefore commence in three batches. He said that as the works agency, his department would make its best efforts to expedite the delivery of these projects once the user requirements were known and the plot ratio problem resolved.

47. Mr Albert CHAN said that the implementation timetable for the Accelerated Programme was unacceptable. He was of the view that the Administration had unduly delayed the implementation of most of the projects when compared to the implementation time-tables previously approved by the two ex-PMCs. Mr CHAN commented that the original start dates in the Annexes to the Administration's paper were misleading. He said that the Administration should provide information on the original project commencement dates approved by the two ex-PMCs for comparison with the dates proposed in the Accelerated Programme.

48. Mr IP Kwok-him and Miss CHAN Yuen-han also expressed reservation about the long lead time for starting the projects in the Accelerated programme. Mr IP pointed out that 12 out of the 15 projects included in the 2002-03 programme were

Action

open space projects which should be rather straightforward. He wondered why these projects could not start earlier.

49. Miss CHAN Yuen-han strongly urged the Administration to consider advancing more projects which were proposed to start after 2003 to an earlier date, particularly if the sites were already available. She said that the Administration should explain to the Subcommittee the reasons why these projects could not be further advanced.

50. The Chairman asked whether the Subcommittee should take a view on the Accelerated Programme proposed by the Administration.

51. Mr Albert CHAN said that it would be for the Administration to decide whether it should put forward the proposals in the Accelerated Programme to PWSC. For the 15 projects scheduled to start in 2002-03, he had no objection for them to be put forward to PWSC so that works could commence as early as possible. However, he considered that too few projects included in the 2002-03 programme and that they were mostly of a small scale. Miss CHAN Yuen-han and Mr IP Kwok-him agreed with Mr CHAN.

52. Responding to Mr Albert CHAN, DS(HA) said that he did not agree that the projects scheduled to start in 2002-03 were small-scale projects. He further said that for open space projects, time had to be allowed for diversion of underground services and utilities. DS(HA) added that the original project commencement and completion dates of the ex-PMCs were only an estimation. He advised that the Administration had already taken forward those ex-PMC projects which the PMCs had entered into contractual commitment or set aside funds for their implementation. The outstanding projects, including those proposed for the Accelerated Programme, were in various stages of planning, and some of them were only in the preliminary planning stage. He considered that it was only pragmatic to start work based on the Accelerated Programme which had been draw up after detailed discussion within Government.

53. Mr Albert CHAN disagreed with DS(HA)'s explanation. He said that some projects were previously scheduled by PMCs to start in 2001-02, and these projects had not yet been implemented. He added that the PMCs had examined all relevant factors before approving the start dates for its projects.

54. In concluding the discussion, the Chairman said that members were generally of the view that the Administration should make further efforts to advance the commencement and completion of projects included in the Accelerated Programme.

III. Progress of the Kowloon Bay Recreation Ground, Hammer Hill Road District Park and Stanley Complex
[LC Paper No. CB(2) 353/01-02(03)]

Stanley Complex

55. Mr Fred LI referred members to a letter from Dr YEUNG Sum tabled at the meeting, which requested the Administration to provide market facilities in the Stanley Complex. Mr LI said that the residents of Ma Hang Estate had carried out a survey in Ma Hang on the demand for market facilities. The survey findings revealed that over 90% of the respondents supported the provision of market facilities in the Stanley Complex, and that the provision of a superstore nearby could not substitute for a wet market in the vicinity. In view of the strong demand for a public market by local residents, Mr LI urged that the Administration should reconsider providing market facilities in the Stanley Complex.

(*Post-meeting note* : The letter from Dr YEUNG Sum was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(2) 396/01-01(01).)

56. DD(FEHD) responded that she was aware of the survey cited by Dr YEUNG Sum. She said that the Administration had conducted surveys in March and August 2000 to assess the impact of the newly opened superstore on the business of the existing temporary market and the need for providing a new market in the Complex. The survey findings revealed that there had been a marked change in the shopping habits of the Stanley residents and a substantial reduction of patronage of the existing temporary market. The Administration considered that the temporary market at the seafront could be retained and that a new market in the proposed Complex would not be necessary. DD(FEHD) further said that members of the Southern DC expressed support for the revised design of the Complex when consulted on 28 June 2001.

57. Mr Fred LI said that the low patronage of the existing temporary market was due to its irregular business hours and limited variety of goods on sale. He considered that the existing business turnover of the temporary market did not necessarily reflect the actual demand for a public market in the district. Mr Albert CHAN added that there was no car park for the temporary market and its location was not very convenient to consumers. He said that it was regrettable that the characteristics of the old Stanley market were not retained.

58. The Chairman pointed out that the revised scope of the Stanley Complex project had been discussed by the Subcommittee previously and members had not raised objection to the revised design which did not include a market. Mr Fred LI said that he had no objection for the policy on provision of public market to be followed up by the relevant panels. However, as a market was originally included in the original

Action

design of the Stanley Complex, he considered that it was not a policy matter of whether a new market should be provided for the Stanley residents. He said that some members of the Subcommittee did express reservations about the revised scope of the Stanley Complex although a motion was not moved at the previous meeting on whether the project should be supported in its revised form. He urged that the Administration should conduct a comprehensive review of the local need for a market in the Complex and provide a response to the Subcommittee at the next meeting.

59. Mr Albert CHAN said that he would not accept the revised scope of the Stanley Complex as the original design which included a public market was approved by the Provisional Urban Council. He considered that the Subcommittee should take a decision on whether it supported the changes proposed by the Administration.

60. Miss CHAN Yuen-han asked about the policy for the provision of new public markets. She said that new superstores could not substitute for the wet markets and small traders had also expressed concern about the keen competition from superstores. The Chairman advised that the policy on construction of new markets should more appropriately be dealt with by the relevant panel(s). Mr IP Kwok-him concurred with the Chairman. He said that the provision of new markets was a controversial issue which should be discussed by the relevant Panels instead of the Subcommittee which was tasked to follow up the outstanding projects previously approved by the ex-PMCs. Mr Andrew WONG remarked that the policy would also involve the Housing Authority which also provided market facilities in its estates.

61. Miss CHAN Yuen-han said that the Southern DC had discussed the Stanley Complex project and she asked whether the revised scope received the DC's unanimous support. Mr IP Kwok-him requested the Administration to provide the record of DC's discussion on the project for members' reference. Mr IP said that as the project had been discussed by the Subcommittee at length and members had not raised objection to the revised design, it would not be appropriate for the Subcommittee to re-open discussion of the project. He said that members could vote for or against the project when it was put forward to PWSC and FC for approval.

62. Mr Abraham SHEK said that even if there was a need for a public market in Stanley, it might not necessarily be provided within the Stanley Complex. He considered that there was a need for both public markets and private superstores and there should be a proper balance in formulating public policy in this respect. He considered that the implementation of the Stanley Complex should not be held up by arguments over whether it should include a public market as this could be dealt with as a separate exercise.

Admin

63. At the request of the Chairman, DD(FEHD) agreed to provide details of the discussion when the Southern DC was consulted on the revised scope of the Complex. DS(EF) said that in view of members' concern, she would review the need for a

Action

Admin market in the Stanley district in the light of the district's overall development. DS(HA) advised that if the scope of the Stanley Complex was to be revised again, its implementation would be further delayed. He added that the project scope was revised only to include more community facilities such as a community hall, a sports centre and a small library which were much needed by residents in the vicinity. He hoped that the project could be taken forward as early as possible.

Hammer Hill Road District Park

64. DS(HA) informed members that Chi Lin had forwarded a revised design proposal and the cost estimates to the Administration in September 2001. The Administration had been discussing with Chi Lin the design details, the technical constraints and project cost. The discussion was progressing satisfactorily, and the Administration would seek PWSC approval for upgrading the project to Category A after resolving the outstanding issues.

65. Miss CHAN Yuen-han urged the Administration to expedite its discussion with Chi Lin. She asked when the Administration planned to consult Wong Tai Sin DC on the scope of the project. Mr IP Kwok-him expressed similar concern. He said that the recent Report of the Working Group on District Councils Review pointed out that DCs strongly requested early consultation by the Administration on the provision of local facilities, and that it would not serve any meaningful purpose to consult DCs on the finalised designs.

66. DD/LCSD responded that the Administration would consult Wong Tai Sin DC as soon as agreement was reached with Chi Lin on the design and cost estimates of the project. She said that Chi Lin was revising the project design in view of some site constraints, such as the problem of loading on the drainage systems under the proposed artificial mount. She added that Chi Lin was discussing with the relevant departments the environmental impact, the design details and technical constraints, in particular the cost estimate as it had exceeded the original budget. She expected that these issues could be resolved shortly, and Wong Tai Sin DC would be consulted around early 2002.

Kowloon Bay Recreation Ground

67. DS(HA) said that as members had been informed at previous meetings, the design of the project was revised to avoid closing a section of Kai Lai Road which fell within the boundary of the project site. He further said that the Administration had been working on a new proposal to provide additional spectator capacity in the Kowloon Bay Recreation Ground. Kwun Tong DC had been consulted on the new proposal and expressed support. He added that the Administration aimed to submit the revised proposal to PWSC to upgrade the project to Category A in April 2002.

Action

Other issues

68. Mr Albert CHAN said that he had an impression that the Administration had not disclosed all information or considerations to the Subcommittee concerning the implementation of the ex-PMC projects. He personally was not convinced of the technical problems in taking the projects forward as presented by the Administration. To facilitate the Subcommittee's discussion, he requested the Administration to provide a paper setting out its policies, and whether there were changes, in the provision of municipal services after the dissolution of the two PMCs.

69. DS(HA) responded that the Administration had provided all relevant information to LegCo on the progress and developments in implementing the outstanding capital works projects of the ex-PMCs. As regards the planning of any regional or district performance facilities, he had advised members that this would be subject to the outcome of the current consultancy study.

70. Mr IP Kwok-him said that it would be useful if the Administration would provide the latest position of all the ex-PMC projects, together with the explanation for not proceeding with certain projects. Miss CHAN Yuen-han expressed support for the suggestion.
Admin

71. Members agreed to hold the next meeting in January 2002. The Clerk to the Subcommittee would inform members of the date after consulting the Chairman.

(*Post-meeting note* : The next meeting was scheduled for 10 January 2002 at 8:30 am.)

72. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 10:42 am.

Legislative Council Secretariat
12 April 2002