

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. PWSC 74/06-07
(These minutes have been
seen by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/F/2/2

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

**Minutes of the 9th meeting
held in the Conference Room A of Legislative Council Building
on Wednesday, 9 May 2007, at 8:30 am**

Members present:

Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai, SBS, S.B.St.J., JP (Chairman)
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC (Deputy Chairman)
Hon Fred LI Wah-ming, JP
Hon Mrs Selina CHOW LIANG Shuk-yee, GBS, JP
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon CHEUNG Man-kwong
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP
Hon Jasper TSANG Yok-sing, GBS, JP
Hon LAU Kong-wah, JP
Hon Miriam LAU Kin-yee, GBS, JP
Hon CHOY So-yuk, JP
Hon Andrew CHENG Kar-foo
Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, JP
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon LEE Wing-tat
Hon LI Kwok-ying, MH, JP
Hon Daniel LAM Wai-keung, SBS, JP
Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming, SBS, JP
Prof Hon Patrick LAU Sau-shing, SBS, JP
Hon TAM Heung-man

Member absent:

Hon CHAN Yuen-han, JP

Members attending:

Dr Hon YEUNG Sum
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung

Public officers attending:

Mr Joe C C WONG	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) ³
Mr MAK Chai-kwong, JP	Permanent Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works (Works)
Mrs Rita LAU, JP	Permanent Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands)
Ms Anissa WONG, JP	Permanent Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works (Environment)
Mr Davey CHUNG	Principal Assistant Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) (Works)
Miss Annie TAM Kam-lan, JP	Deputy Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands) ¹
Mr Philip YUNG Wai-hung, JP	Deputy Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works (Transport) ¹
Mr John S V CHAI, JP	Director of Civil Engineering and Development
Mr MA Lee-tak, JP	Project Manager (Hong Kong Island and Islands), Civil Engineering and Development Department
Miss Ophelia WONG Yuen-sheung, JP	Director of Planning (acting)
Mr LAU Ka-keung, JP	Deputy Commissioner (Planning and Technical Services), Transport Department
Mr WAN Man-lung, JP	Principal Government Engineer (Railway Development), Highways Department
Dr Louis NG Chi-wa	Assistant Director (Heritage and Museums), Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Mr LAM Sair-ling	Senior Property Services Manager (Eastern and Antiquities), Architectural Services Department
Miss WONG Yuet-wah	Principal Assistant Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands) ²
Mr KWAN Chi-wai	Chief Engineer (Tai Po and North), Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr C H YUE, JP	Director of Architectural Services
Mr Eddy YAU, JP	Assistant Director (Leisure Services) ³ , Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Mr Daniel SIN Pak-wing	Assistant Secretary for Home Affairs (Recreation and Sport)

Mr Peter KAN Tat-sing	Chief Executive Officer (Planning) ² Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Ms Margaret HSIA, JP	Assistant Director (2), Home Affairs Department
Mrs Anna MAK CHOW Suk-har	Assistant Director (Family and Child Welfare) Social Welfare Department
Mrs Rosa HO	Chief Architect (2), Housing Department
Mr Sammy FUNG	Senior Executive Officer (2) ² , Home Affairs Department
Ms Ferna Y W SHUM	Senior Architect (7), Housing Department
Ms Carol YUEN	Deputy Secretary for Security (2)
Mr Charles WONG	Principal Assistant Secretary for Security (B)
Mr Matthew LEUNG Shiu-hong,	Deputy Chief Ambulance Officer, Fire Services Department
Mr CHEUNG Hing-wah	Assistant Director (Youth and Corrections), Social Welfare Department
Ms Doris CHOW Man-yee	Chief Property Manager (Site Utilisation), Government Property Agency
Ms Heidi CHAN Yuet-mei	District Planning Officer (Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon), Planning Department
Mr CHOY Man-wai	Senior Property Manager (Site Utilisation) ² , Government Property Agency

Clerk in attendance:

Ms Rosalind MA	Senior Council Secretary (1) ⁸
----------------	---

Staff in attendance:

Ms Pauline NG	Assistant Secretary General 1
Mr Anthony CHU	Council Secretary (1) ²
Ms Alice CHEUNG	Senior Legislative Assistant (1) ¹
Mr Frankie WOO	Legislative Assistant (1) ²

Action

Head 707 - New Towns and Urban Area Development

PWSC(2007-08)15 728CL Preservation of Queen's Pier

The Chairman advised members that the Panel on Planning, Lands and Works (PLW Panel) had deliberated on the proposal at three of its meetings, namely 23 January, 27 March and 23 April 2007.

2. Prof Patrick LAU, Deputy Chairman of the PLW Panel, reported that at the Panel meeting on 23 January 2007, members discussed with the Administration and deputations on matters related to the preservation of the Queen's Pier (the Pier). The Panel discussed the subject further with the Administration at the meetings on 27 March and 23 April 2007, and invited written submissions from deputations on the four preservation options as well as the Administration's plan to adopt the option of preserving the above-ground structure of the Pier and reassembling in close proximity to its original location or at other appropriate location. Panel members had detailed deliberations on the four preservation options, including their feasibility, costs and impact on the Central Reclamation Phase III project. Members had different views on dismantling of the Pier structure and the location for reassembling. Some members were of the view that the Administration should consult the public on the preservation options first and should not submit its funding proposal to the Public Works Subcommittee (PWSC) in such a hasty manner. After voting, the Panel supported that the Administration could put forward the funding proposal to PWSC for consideration.

3. Dr KWOK Ka-ki expressed regret that the Administration had submitted the current funding proposal to PWSC despite the fact that a number of concerns related to the preservation options had not been fully addressed at the PLW Panel meeting on 23 April 2007. Moreover, Dr KWOK was gravely concerned that as the Antiquities Advisory Board (AAB) had scheduled to re-assess the historical value of the Pier at a meeting to be held in the afternoon on the same day, PWSC's decision on the funding proposal for taking forward the option of dismantling of the Pier for later reassembly at this stage might pre-empt the decision of AAB. Dr KWOK criticized the Administration for the illogical meeting arrangements which had in effect demonstrated its lack of respect for the Legislative Council (LegCo), AAB and the public. He strongly requested the Administration to withdraw the proposal.

4. The Deputy Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands)1 (DS(P&L)1) referred to the reply dated 8 May 2007 from the Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (SHPL) to Prof Patrick LAU on the latter's request for the Administration to withdraw the funding proposal. DS(P&L)1 pointed out that preservation of the Pier had been discussed intensively in the LegCo in the past months. SHPL had explained to LegCo Members at the PLW Panel meetings and the Council meeting on 2 May during the Motion Debate on the preservation of the Pier that the current proposal was the most reasonably practical and effective way in preserving the Pier. As to the reassessment of the historical value of the Pier by AAB, the Assistant Director (Heritage and Museum), Leisure and Cultural Services Department (AD(H&M), LCSD) had advised members at the PLW Panel meeting on 23 April 2007 that AAB would make a reassessment at the meeting scheduled for 9 May 2007 but would not be involved in the choice of the preservation options. After discussion, the PLW Panel voted down a motion on the in-situ preservation of the Pier and supported the Administration's proposal to seek funding support of PWSC for taking forward the preservation of the Pier.

5. Miss TAM Heung-man did not subscribe to the Administration's explanation. She shared Dr KWOK Ka-ki's view that the Administration should withdraw the proposal as it was not appropriate for PWSC to vote on the funding proposal hastily without knowing the reassessment of AAB on the historical value of the Pier. Referring to the four preservation options examined by the Administration, Miss TAM queried whether the feasibility of in-situ preservation had been given a fair consideration and whether the option put forward by the Administration for dismantling and reassembling the Pier was the best and most practicable one. She was of the view that in examining the preservation options, the Administration had failed to respond to the strong public calls for in-situ preservation of the Pier and had not assessed the technical feasibility of in-situ preservation option in adequate detail.

6. In reply, the Permanent Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands) (PS(PL)) advised that the meeting arrangements for reassessment of the historical value of the Pier by AAB and consideration of the funding proposal by PWSC on the same day was a coincidence. She stressed that the Administration fully recognized AAB's important role in giving advice on the heritage value of historical buildings. Nevertheless, the Administration also endeavoured to proceed with the funding proposal for preserving the Pier according to the planned schedule. As to the feasibility of in-situ preservation of the Pier, PS(PL) advised that the option was considered not reasonably practical after detailed examination and consultation with professional bodies.

7. Dr YEUNG Sum also urged the Administration to withdraw the funding proposal and re-examine the preservation option to be adopted having regard to the reassessment of AAB at the meeting in the afternoon. Given the heightened public sentiment towards the preservation of heritage and historical buildings, Dr YEUNG said that he would not support the current proposal before AAB's reassessment was available. Dr YEUNG queried that if AAB classified the Pier as a Grade I historical building, the Antiquities Authority should seek the approval of the Chief Executive to declare the Pier as a monument under the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance (AMO) (Cap. 53), thereby rendering the current dismantle/reassemble option unlawful.

8. AD(H&M), LCSD explained that the grading system served as general heritage assessment guidelines for internal reference of AAB and the Government. A structure rated as a Grade I building was one of outstanding merit, which every effort should be made to preserve if possible. Nevertheless, the grading system had no statutory authority and a Grade I building was different from a declared monument under AMO.

9. Dr Fernando CHEUNG opined that the "coincidence" in the meeting arrangements had demonstrated the Administration's disrespect to AAB and the low priority accorded to heritage preservation. Dr CHEUNG was also dissatisfied that the grading system adopted by AAB for assessing the heritage value of historical buildings would not provide any statutory protection to the buildings

concerned, regardless of the grading given by AAB. He doubted the rationale for the Administration to seek funding support of PWSC before the reassessment by AAB.

10. PS(PL) explained that options to preserve the Pier had been discussed intensively in the LegCo and members of the PLW Panel had been briefed on the considerations as to why in-situ preservation was not technically feasible. The preservation option for dismantling the Pier structure for reassembly at a suitable location to be identified had been considered by the PLW Panel and the Panel had given its support to the proposal. PS(PL) pointed out that the exact location for reassembly of the Pier had not been specified in the current proposal and stressed that reassembly at the Pier's original location was one option the Administration would pursue.

11. Mr Alan LEONG commented that the meeting arrangements of AAB and PWSC on the same day should not be seen as coincidence as such illogical arrangements could have been avoided should the Administration make some efforts in this regard. Mr LEONG also expressed concern about the inadequate statutory protection for heritage buildings and criticized the Administration's lack of commitment to heritage preservation. He considered the public consultation on the preservation of the Pier under the Central Reclamation Urban Design Study (the Study) was only window dressing consultation as the option of in-situ preservation would not be available for public consideration.

12. AD(H&M), LCSD reiterated that the grading system was adopted by AAB for reference in assessment of the historical value of buildings but was by no means statutory. While every effort should be made to preserve a Grade I building if possible, the option of preserving the structures for reassembly at suitable locations was permissible under the law. By way of illustration, AD(H&M), LCSD said that the Tin Hau Temple in Chap Lap Kok which was moved to Tung Chung for the airport project and the Murray House reconstructed in Stanley were Grade I buildings.

13. Mr LEE Wing-tat expressed great dissatisfaction that the Administration's response had shown that it did not attach any importance to preserving historical buildings classified by AAB as Grade I nor to public views on heritage preservation, as these buildings could be demolished and moved to other locations subject to the Administration's wishes.

14. AD(H&M), LCSD clarified that his earlier response to members was a factual account of the difference between the grading system and the statutory provision on declared monuments under AMO and should not be taken as the Administration's disrespect for the decisions of AAB. Mr LEE Wing-tat maintained his view that the Administration did not demonstrate any commitment to heritage preservation in taking forward the preservation of the Pier. Mr LEE considered that further discussion on the proposal would not be fruitful and indicated that he would consider moving a motion that discussion on this item be adjourned in accordance with paragraph 33 of the PWSC Procedure after other

members had given their views on the proposal. Mr Albert CHAN disagreed and pointed out that discussion of the item should be allowed for members to express their views and seek clarifications from the Administration. Mr LEE Wing-tat agreed to consider moving the motion for adjournment after all interested members had expressed their views.

15. Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming pointed out that the preservation options of the Pier had been discussed at length by the PLW Panel which had given its support to the Administration to submit funding proposal to PWSC. Referring to SHPL's explanation at an earlier PLW Panel meeting that the preservation option proposed by the Administration would not rule out the possibility of reassembling the Pier at its original location, Mr CHEUNG sought confirmation from the Administration in this respect.

16. In reply, PS(PL) reiterated that reassembly at the Pier's original location was one option that the Administration would pursue in taking forward the public consultation which had been launched recently. Where there was a clear public request for reassembly of the Pier at its original location, the Administration would endeavour to carry out necessary works towards this direction, including the realignment of Road P2.

17. Prof Patrick LAU referred to his letter dated 8 May 2007 to SHPL, in which he had set out evidence gathered from the project architect responsible for the construction of the City Hall complex that the Low Block and the main entrance of the City Hall was designed to orientate in line with the Pier. As such, Prof LAU was of the view that preservation of the Pier should be examined in the context of its spatial relation with other landmarks including the City Hall and the Edinburgh place as a group. Prof LAU also referred to the preservation of a historical building in Guangzhou by rolling at a cost of only RMB 3 million yuan and queried the high cost estimate of HK\$50 million for the proposed preservation option for the Pier. He was of the view that the option of in-situ reinstatement by rolling the Pier's superstructure away for construction of the underground infrastructures and rolling it back upon completion of the construction should be further examined. Prof LAU expressed dissatisfaction that SHPL's reply did not give any direct response to the above queries.

(Post-meeting note: the letter dated 8 May 2007 from Prof Patrick LAU to SHPL and the reply from SHPL on the same date were tabled at the meeting and circulated to members vide LC Paper No. PWSC65/06-07 on 10 May 2007.)

18. The Project Manager (Hong Kong Island and Islands), Civil Engineering and Development Department (PM(HKI&I),CEDD) explained that the preservation of the historical building in Guangzhou by rolling involved a building of smaller size and of different structural form to that of the Pier. The Administration had examined the option of rolling of the Pier but decided not to pursue this option due to the high construction risk of damaging the Pier structure and the safety concerns in separating the above-ground structure of the Pier from

its foundation. The Senior Property Services Manager (Eastern and Antiquities), Architectural Services Department (SPSM(E&A), ArchSD) supplemented that the feasibility and lower costs incurred for the rolling of the historical building in Guangzhou was mainly attributable to its structural design which allowed the installation of four to five railings underneath the load bearing walls for rolling of the whole building structure. Nevertheless, tremendous difficulties and risks of damaging the structure of the Pier were anticipated in rolling of the 34 concrete columns and the roof of the Pier with most parts being a flat-slab construction. Prof Patrick LAU enquired if the Administration had given due consideration to the linear relationship between the Pier, the City Hall entrance and the Edinburgh Place as shown in the original design. SPSM(E&A), ArchSD said that the Administration's study did not show a clear axial relationship between the three structures/site, as the concept of an axial approach was neither found in the design of the City Hall nor the Edinburgh Place. Prof LAU reiterated that he was referring to the linear relationship and not axial relationship which was irrelevant in the present case.

19. Miss CHOY So-yuk considered it prudent to take into account views expressed by the public at the hearing convened by AAB and AAB's decision on the grading of the Pier in the afternoon before giving support or otherwise to the Administration's current funding proposal. Pointing out that the dismantling works of the Pier structure could not be reverted once implemented, Miss CHOY did not see any urgency and/or rationale for seeking funding approval for the relevant works at this meeting and urged the Administration to allow more time for the public to give views on the subject.

20. Mr Albert CHAN pointed out that following the demolition of the Star Ferry and its clock tower, there was clearly an increased public demand for heritage preservation and heightened public sentiment on the protection of structures that carried collective memory. To address public concern, the Administration should take forward its capital works projects with due regard to heritage preservation and provide for public consideration comprehensive information on the implications of different preservation options on costs, project delivery, other infrastructure works and contractual obligations which might result in claims from contractor etc. Mr CHAN expressed great dissatisfaction to the Administration's illogical arrangements for submitting funding proposal to the LegCo for dismantling and reassembly of the Pier before the reassessment of the historical value of the Pier by AAB. He strongly criticized the Administration for such an unreasonable act and requested the Administration to withdraw the proposal for re-submission after AAB's reassessment of the Pier was available.

21. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong cautioned that in giving funding approval to the Administration for the preservation of the Pier, LegCo Members should secure the undertaking from the Administration that the Pier would be reassembled at its original location and Road P2 would be realigned for this purpose, instead of only getting the Administration's confirmation that this would be a possible option to be considered. Mr CHEUNG said that he would support Mr LEE Wing-tat's suggestion of adjourning the discussion of the item if the Administration could not

give the above undertaking. Mr James TO also doubted whether the Administration would pursue reassembly at the Pier's original location under the current proposal. Mr TO was of the view that it was unreasonable for the Administration to expect LegCo Members to give support to the current funding proposal before the decision of AAB on the historical value of the Pier would be announced in the afternoon.

22. DS(P&L)¹ referred to the Administration's paper and pointed out that the Administration had clearly set out the necessary works to be undertaken (including realignment of Road P2) if the Pier was to be reassembled at its original location. She stressed that the Administration had indicated in the current proposal that reassembly at the Pier's original location was one option which the Administration would pursue.

23. PS(PL) appreciated members' concern about the examination of different preservation options and recapped that the subject had been discussed intensively at meetings of the PLW Panel as well as the Council. As regards Mr Albert CHAN's concern about the provision of information on the implications of different preservation options, PS(PL) advised that detailed information in this respect had been provided to the LegCo and made available to the public through the Government's website. She however pointed out that emphasis had not been put on the financial implication, particularly the possible claim by the contractor, having regard to LegCo Members' concern that this might bias the judgment of the public on the preservation options. PS(PL) further explained that the Administration had noted that there were the divided views in the community on the location for reassembly of the Pier. While some preferred the original location, some accepted a location near the original one and some favoured the new waterfront. The Administration therefore had not specified the exact location for reassembling the Pier in the current proposal. The issue would be carefully examined in the Study having regard to public views on the preferred location collected during the public consultation in progress. If the community showed a clear preference for reassembly of the Pier at its original location, the Administration would make necessary arrangement to take forward the option as it had clearly undertaken in the paper.

24. Dr KWOK Ka-ki was gravely concerned that the work of AAB in grading historical buildings would be meaningless if the Administration would insist in dismantling of the Pier regardless of the reassessment of AAB in the afternoon. Dr KWOK enquired whether the Administration would re-consider the preservation option taking into account the assessment of the historical value of the Pier by AAB. Pointing out that the public participation programme had yet to be completed, Dr KWOK queried whether the current proposal would pre-empt the choice of the public and turn out to be a replica of the demolition of the Star Ferry Pier and its clock tower. Dr YEUNG Sum expressed similar concern and requested the Administration to re-consider the preservation option if AAB graded the Pier as a Grade I building.

25. PS(PL) said that the Administration would not attempt to speculate the decision of AAB at this stage. She nevertheless reiterated that the Administration had made its conclusion on the most practically feasible option for preservation of the Pier after intensive discussions with LegCo Members and professional bodies. The conclusion was presented to the LegCo and the public clearly in the Administration's paper, setting out the consideration on technical feasibility, time and financial implications of the various options examined. PS(PL) stressed that the Administration attached importance to the public consultation and reiterated its plan to gauge public views on reassembly of the Pier at the original location or at another location during the consultation. She pointed out that it would neither be fair nor acceptable to members of the public if the Administration would make a decision on the location for reassembly at this stage when public consultation had just been launched.

26. Ms Miriam LAU appreciated the need for gauging public views on the preservation of the Pier as an earlier survey conducted by the Liberal Party had recorded rather split views of the respondents on the preferred location for reassembly of the Pier. She nevertheless noted with concern that as reassembling at the Pier's original location was one option the Administration would pursue which would then require the realignment of Road P2, the Administration should provide strong justifications for dismantling the Pier structure first for later reassembly. Prof Patrick LAU expressed similar concern that if the Pier might be reassembled at the original location, dismantling the structure for construction of infrastructures underneath would not be justifiable.

27. PS(PL) advised that after examining the various preservation options, the Administration had concluded that the in-situ preservation option was not reasonably practical. PM(HKI&I),CEDD said that the location of the Pier was in conflict with three planned infrastructures, including the proposed Airport Railway Extended Overrun Tunnel (AR EOT), the stormwater drainage box culvert (the drainage culvert) and Road P2. Whilst realignment of Road P2 could be considered if reassembly of the Pier at the original location would be taken forward, AR EOT and the drainage culvert could not be realigned to avoid the Pier location and dismantling of the Pier structure would be required for their construction.

28. Whilst noting members' concern about the reassessment by AAB in the afternoon, PS(PL) pointed out that the Administration had been taking forward the proposed works for preservation of the Pier in accordance with the established procedures. Endorsement by PWSC at the meeting today would be subject to approval by the Finance Committee (FC) at a later meeting, by then the decision of AAB would have been available. That said, PS(PL) said that the Administration decided to withdraw the item having regard to members' strong views against the consideration of the funding proposal at this stage.

29. The item was withdrawn by the Administration.

PWSC(2007-08)11 460CL Tai Po development - formation and servicing of Areas 12 (part) and 39, phase 2 remaining works

30. The Chairman advised members that an information paper on the project had been circulated to the Panel on Planning, Lands and Works on 24 April 2007.

31. The item was voted on and endorsed.

Head 703 – Buildings

PWSC(2007-08)12 402RO District open space in Area 9, Tsing Yi

32. The Chairman advised members that an information paper on the project had been circulated to the Panel on Home Affairs on 12 March 2007.

33. Referring to the views he had expressed at previous PWSC meetings that thematic designs should be adopted in tree-planting for parks and open spaces, Mr Albert CHAN asked whether a theme for tree-planting had been adopted for the proposed works, and if so, details of the tree species to be planted.

34. The Assistant Director (Leisure Services)3, Leisure and Cultural Services Department (AD(LS)3, LCSD) said that the Administration had endeavoured to adopt thematic designs in tree-planting for parks to reflect the characteristics of different parks. The Director of Architectural Services (D Arch S) added that the proposed district open space was designed along the theme of a ship given its waterfront location. The site would be divided into four zones for planting trees of different species so that the district open space would have different vegetation flourishing in different seasons.

35. Mr Albert CHAN commented that given the small site area, a simple design with unique characteristics should be adopted instead of the proposed design which would divide the small site into four different zones. He requested to put on record his disagreement with the proposed design, which was unnecessarily complicated and might incur higher cost for planting. Echoing Mr CHAN's view, Prof Patrick LAU also considered that a simple and unique design should be adopted for the project.

36. Noting the amount of greening in the Administration's design for the open space, Mr Daniel LAM expressed support to the design and was of the view that the planting of suitable tree and plant species would beautify the environment.

37. AD(LS)3, LCSD responded that the Administration would work out the detailed design for the project with the landscape architects having regard to members' view on the choice of tree species.

38. Referring to the drawing of the proposed district open space at Enclosure 1 to the Administration's proposal, Prof Patrick LAU opined that instead of using a central axis concept under which pedestrian walkways would all lead to the central part of the open space, walkways should be so designed to bring visitors to the waterfront promenade. In response, D Arch S appreciated Prof. LAU's view about facilitating visitors' accessibility to the waterfront promenade and advised that this would be taken into consideration in the detailed design of the project. Responding to Mr LEE Wing-tat's enquiry, D Arch S confirmed that the waterfront promenade would be connected to the adjoining promenade near Ching Tai Court.

39. Pointing out that the traffic was busy on the Tam Kon Shan Road outside the entrance of the open space, Mr LEE Wing-tat was concerned about the size of the cycling/skateboarding area and the safety of children and youth who would play in the area, in the event that they cycled outside the boundary of the open space onto the busy road.

40. AD(LS)3, LCSD said that the cycling/skateboarding area in the proposed project comprised a cycling path of 700 metres long, a cycling area for children and a kiosk for bicycle rental. For the safety of the cyclists and other road users, the Administration would remind the public not to cycle outside the cycling/skateboarding area. In response to Mr LEE Wing-tat's further enquiry, AD(LS)3, LCSD advised that the public could choose to bring their own bicycles to the cycling/skateboarding area or use the rental services of the bicycle kiosk.

41. Mr Albert CHAN expressed concern about the quality of the artificial turf for the soccer pitch. In reply, AD(LS)3, LCSD said that the Administration had been using "third generation" artificial turf for soccer pitches and had received positive feedbacks from the public. The artificial turf was of higher quality and about four times more resistant to wear and tear compared with natural turf.

42. Mr TAM Yiu-chung supported the project and urged the Administration to expedite the works to facilitate early provision of the facilities for the enjoyment of local residents. Mr TAM was of the view that facilities in the open space should cater for the need of the residents of different age groups. Noting that a fitness corner for the elderly would be provided, Mr TAM enquired whether facilities like pebble path would be provided in the fitness corner. He also requested the Administration to provide adequate rain shelters in the open space. Mr Albert CHAN and Ms Miriam LAU also expressed concern about the provision of adequate benches and shelters for users of the open space.

43. AD(LS)3, LCSD said that facilities to be provided in the fitness corner for the elderly would include foot massage tile. Plastic beads of regular size and shape would be used for the foot message tile, which would make it more comfortable for users compared with pebbles. As to members' view on the provision of shelters and benches, AD(LS)3, LCSD advised that the Administration would take these into consideration in the project design, including the provision of shelters with an improved design to better protect users from sun and rain.

44. Ms Miriam LAU relayed Mrs Selina CHOW's concern that local residents had been longing for the facilities of the open space. The Administration should expedite the implementation of the project and try its best to cater for the different needs for facilities of all age groups without causing delay to the project.

45. The item was voted on and endorsed.

PWSC(2007-08)13 191SC Community hall and integrated family service centre at Tung Tau Estate phase 9, Wong Tai Sin

46. The Chairman advised members that an information paper on the project had been circulated to the Panel on Welfare Services and the Panel on Home Affairs on 12 and 13 April 2007 respectively.

47. While stating support for the project, Mr CHAN Kam-lam expressed concern about the long project duration with commencement in January 2008 and completion in December 2010. He noted that as the proposed community hall (CH) would be built within the site boundary of the public housing development (PHD) in Tung Tau Estate Phase 9, the construction of the proposed project would be entrusted to the Housing Department. He was of the view that the proposed project should require a shorter time for completion given the small floor area of the CH. He urged the Administration to expedite the process of the proposed works so as to meet the needs of local residents at an earlier date.

48. In response, D Arch S said that the Architectural Services Department had discussed with the Housing Department on arrangements for construction of the CH and the PHD to facilitate a better interface of the works having regard to factors such as construction costs, project programme and site constraints. The Chief Architect (2), Housing Department (CA(2), HD) added that the proposed CH would be built within the site boundary of Tung Tau Estate Phase 9 PHD under which two public housing blocks would be constructed. Given the limited working area within the tight site, proper coordination of the construction works was crucial to ensure safety during construction. As such, engaging different contractors for the proposed CH and PHD would be impracticable as problems in coordination might arise, resulting in undesirable consequences such as increase in project costs and site safety hazards. As regards the project duration, CA(2), HD advised that the estimated duration of 35 months would include 13 months for foundation works, one month for preparatory works and 21 months for building works.

49. Mr CHAN Kam-lam remained concerned about the long duration for the proposed works, in particular the foundation works which would take 13 months to complete. He queried whether the project duration of the proposed CH would be reduced if arrangements would be made for the contractor to start the building works immediately upon completion of the foundation works for the CH, instead

of after completion of all the foundation works on the site.

50. CA(2), HD advised that the site for the development of the CH and the PHD was a difficult one with deep bedrock and working within an extremely small area that necessitated the deployment of the percussive piling method. While the piling for the proposed CH constituted only 10% of the piling for all of the developments in the project site, percussive piling works could only be undertaken at specified hours of the day to minimize the noise impact on the residents nearby. She nevertheless advised that the Administration would endeavor to compress the project duration to 32 months at an additional estimated cost of \$2 million for implementing additional safety measures.

51. Noting that only one conference room would be provided in the proposed CH, Mr Albert CHAN enquired whether more conference facilities and/or function rooms could be incorporated in the CH design to meet the increasing demand of the residents for these facilities. In this connection, he also asked whether the multi-purpose hall could be partitioned into smaller rooms for the purpose of smaller scale functions organized by different user groups at the same time.

52. In response, CA(2), HD advised that while division of the multi-purpose hall into smaller function rooms by moveable partitions was possible, the provision of additional conference/function rooms in the CH would involve additional cost. Mr Albert CHAN supported the provision of more conference/function rooms in the proposed CH and requested the Administration to take into account the demand for conference facilities in the design of future CH projects.

53. The item was voted on and endorsed.

PWSC(2007-08)14 180GK Government complex at Mei Lai Road, Mei Foo, Lai Chi Kok

54. The Chairman advised members that an information paper on the project had been circulated to the Panel on Home Affairs, Panel on Security and Panel on Welfare Services on 19 March 2007.

55. Referring to the perspective view of the Government Complex at Mei Lai Road (the Complex) at Enclosure 2 to the Administration's paper, Mr LEE Wing-tat expressed appreciation of the design of the Complex, which was an improvement over the traditional designs of existing government buildings. Mr LEE was concerned that while the Complex was situated in the Sham Shui Po district, it was within walking distance for residents of a number of housing estates in the Kwai Tsing district, such as Lai Yan Court, Wah Lai Estate and Chung Shan Terrace. Pointing out that the Complex would be more convenient for the residents of these housing estates compared with the community facilities at Lai King which were at a distance of 15-minute ride from their homes, Mr LEE opined

that these residents should be potential users of facilities in the Complex. He doubted whether the needs of these residents had been taken into account in the planning of the Complex and if not, the usage rate of the proposed facilities might become saturated shortly after their commissioning.

Admin

56. The Assistant Director (2), Home Affairs Department (AD(2), HAD) said that the Administration had consulted the Sham Shui Po District Council on the proposed project. Responding to Mr LEE Wing-tat's further enquiry on consultation with the Kwai Tsing District Council (K&TDC), AD(2), HAD advised that while no formal consultation had been made with K&TDC, the Administration had taken into consideration the needs of residents for community facilities in housing estates in the vicinity of the Complex during project design and planning. At the request of Mr LEE Wing-tat, the Administration undertook to seek the views of residents in the Kwai Tsing district on the proposed project before the relevant FC meeting, including the relevant Area Committee and K&TDC, particularly on the community hall facilities to be provided in the Complex, and considered providing additional facilities to cope with the demand of residents in the neighbouring housing estates having regard to the views obtained from the consultation.

(Post meeting note: The Administration advised that after further discussion with Mr LEE Wing-tat, it was agreed that the Administration should consult local bodies including the relevant Area Committee and K&TDC members on the facilities in the Complex.)

57. Prof Patrick LAU commended the Administration for the improvement in the design of the Complex, in particular the extension of the footbridge across Kwai Chung Road Flyover linking the Mei Foo Bus Terminus area to connect with the Complex. He enquired whether direct access to the Complex premises would be provided through the footbridge.

58. D Arch S answered in the affirmative and advised that the footbridge extension was a merit of the project design as it would facilitate public access to the Complex. He added that a consultant had been commissioned to work out the project design and the Administration would endeavour to make better use of private expertise for future project designs.

59. The item was voted on and endorsed. Mr LEE Wing-tat requested that the item be voted on separately at the relevant FC meeting.

60. The meeting ended at 10:35 am.