

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. PWSC36/07-08  
(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 4<sup>th</sup> meeting  
held in the Chamber of Legislative Council Building  
on Friday, 30 November 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 Mrs Selina CHOW LIANG Shuk-ye, GBS, JP  
Hon James TO Kun-sun  
Hon Bernard CHAN, GBS, JP  
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP  
Hon Jasper TSANG Yok-sing, GBS, JP  
Hon Howard YOUNG, SBS, JP  
Hon Miriam LAU Kin-ye, GBS, JP  
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP  
Hon Andrew CHENG Kar-foo  
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, JP  
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

**Members absent:**

Hon Fred LI Wah-ming, JP  
Hon CHAN Yuen-han, SBS, JP  
Hon SIN Chung-kai, SBS, JP  
Dr Hon Philip WONG Yu-hong, GBS

Hon LAU Kong-wah, JP  
Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBM, GBS, JP  
Hon CHOY So-yuk, JP  
Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, GBS, JP  
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip  
Hon LEE Wing-tat  
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki

**Public officers attending:**

Mr Joe C C WONG, JP	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) <sup>3</sup>
Mr MAK Chai-kwong, JP	Permanent Secretary for Development (Works)
Mr Raymond YOUNG, JP	Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)
Ms Anissa WONG, JP	Permanent Secretary for the Environment
Mr Davey CHUNG	Principal Assistant Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) (Works)
Mr Francis HO Suen-wai, JP	Permanent Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport)
Mr Philip YUNG Wai-hung, JP	Deputy Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport) <sup>1</sup>
Mr Clement LEUNG Cheuk-man, JP	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) <sup>2</sup>
Mr WAI Chi-sing, JP	Director of Highways
Mr WAN Man-lung, JP	Principal Government Engineer (Railway Development), Highways Department
Mr Malcolm GIBSON	Chief Design Manager, MTR Corporation Limited
Ms Maggie SO	External Affairs and Government Relations Manager, MTR Corporation Limited
Mr WONG Hang-chi	Deputy Project Manager (Major Works) <sup>1</sup> , Highways Department
Mr Elvis AU Wai-kwong, JP	Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment), Environmental Protection Department
Mr Danny SUNG Wai-kwok	Assistant Secretary for Home Affairs (Recreation and Sport) <sup>1</sup> (Acting), Home Affairs Department
Mr YUE Chi-hang, JP	Director of Architectural Services
Mr Herman CHO Chun-wah, JP	District Officer (Eastern), Home Affairs Department
Miss Olivia CHAN Yeuk-oi	Assistant Director (Leisure Services) <sup>2</sup> , Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Mr LEE Yuk-man	Assistant Director (Libraries and Development), Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Mrs YUEN CHAU Oi-wah	Chief Executive Officer (Planning) <sup>1</sup> , Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Mr Sammy FUNG Kwok-hung	Senior Executive Officer (2) <sup>2</sup> , Home Affairs Department

**Clerk in attendance:**

Ms Rosalind MA Senior Council Secretary (1)8

**Staff in attendance:**

Ms Pauline NG Assistant Secretary General 1  
Mr Noel SUNG Senior Council Secretary (1)4  
Mr Anthony CHU Council Secretary (1)2  
Ms Alice CHEUNG Senior Legislative Assistant (1)1  
Mr Frankie WOO Legislative Assistant (1)2

---

Action

**Head 708 – Capital Subventions and Major Systems and Equipment**

**PWSC(2007-08)59 11YD Mass Transit Railway West Island Line - funding support**

The Chairman advised that the Subcommittee on Matters Relating to Railways (the Railway Subcommittee) under the Panel on Transport was consulted on this proposal on 9 November 2007.

2. Ms Miriam LAU, Chairman of the Railway Subcommittee, apprised the meeting that members supported in principle the proposed funding support to the MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) to cover the design phase expenditure of the West Island Line (WIL) project at an estimated cost of \$400 million, but were concerned that the Government might have to provide funding support of around \$6 billion to MTRCL for the capital cost of WIL. The Railway Subcommittee requested the Administration to revert on the following issues which required further study -

- (a) the Administration's policy in giving funding support to listed companies in the interest of the public;
- (b) the conditions to be attached to funding support for the WIL project, e.g. the Government's participation in the determination of the fares for the railway line; concessionary fares; and/or setting-up of a "Fare Stabilization Fund" with part of its profits so as to reduce any pressure on an upward adjustment of railway fares; and
- (c) assessment on the impact of WIL on other modes of public transport.

3. Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming said that Members of the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong supported the WIL project. Mr CHEUNG however expressed concern that storage of explosives should not exceed the amount required for construction of the railway line. Moreover, he

considered that precautions should be taken in handling of explosives to eliminate threats to the safety of nearby buildings and residents. In reply, the Permanent Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport) (PS(T), THB) said that the relevant Government departments and MTRCL would work very closely to ensure that the storage and handling of explosives for the construction of WIL would comply with the safety standards and would not cause any hazards to the neighbouring buildings and residents.

4. Noting from the Administration's paper that the proposed funding support for the design phase did not require any land acquisition, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming doubted the need for a provision of \$40 million for pre-land resumption costs under the current proposal. In reply, PS(T), THB advised that the \$40 million covered the costs for preparatory work before land resumption. Cost for land acquisition would be worked out at a later stage. The Deputy Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport)<sup>1</sup> added that the construction of the Sai Ying Pun Station of WIL would involve, on a very small scale, resumption of private buildings and the preparatory work would commence at an earlier stage despite that the required land would not be resumed during the design phase of WIL.

5. Prof Patrick LAU asked whether public lavatories would be provided at the WIL stations. PS(T), THB responded that while the provision of public lavatories would not be examined in detail under this initial stage of the WIL project, the Administration was keenly aware of members' views about the provision of public lavatories at MTR stations and MTRCL had been giving positive thoughts to this. Ms Emily LAU pointed out that the issue had been repeatedly raised by members on previous occasions. She considered that MTRCL should undertake to provide new MTR stations with public lavatories and to gradually retrofit the existing stations with such facilities. In response, the Chief Design Manager, MTRCL confirmed that public lavatories would be provided at the WIL stations. At the request of Ms Emily LAU, PS(T), THB agreed that the Administration could confirm the provision of such facilities at the relevant meeting of the Finance Committee (FC) if members so wished.

6. Pointing out that this was the first time such a grant was proposed to be given to a listed company operating under commercial principles, Ms Emily LAU cautioned that clear and objective criteria should be provided to safeguard the proper use of public money. In this connection, Ms LAU noted that the Administration had provided the criteria in paragraph 14 of its paper and expressed particular concern about the criterion in paragraph 14(b), i.e. "the project in question should be a major infrastructure which is expected to bring about significant social and economic benefits to the public in line with the policy objectives of the Government, but is projected to be financially not viable to the organization in question". She asked how the social and economic benefits of a project could be quantified as "significant" to justify the provision of public funding support, and whether there were any objective criteria, e.g. in terms of the project estimates, to define "a major infrastructure project".

7. In reply, PS(T), THB advised that objective criteria for considering capital grants for non-government projects had been set out in paragraph 14 of the Administration's paper. He pointed out that funding support by the Government might be necessary for some major infrastructure projects the implementation of which involved substantial capital investment but were projected to be financially non-viable to the organization concerned. In the case of the WIL project, it would bring about significant transport and economic benefits to the community but given the funding gap between the estimated revenue derived from WIL and the capital cost for its implementation, the proposed funding support would provide incentive for MTRCL to embark on the project which it would otherwise not undertake given the financial non-viability. PS(T), THB stressed that whether a project was "a major infrastructure project" and was expected to bring about "significant social and economic benefits" would be subject to objective assessment on a case-by-case basis having regard to the scale, nature and benefits of the project. The form and extent of Government funding support would be considered on the merits of individual cases. He nevertheless pointed out that setting theoretical thresholds or indicators for the assessment of the scale of the infrastructure project or its social and economic benefits might not be desirable and practicable. As all funding proposals for capital grant for non-government projects would be subject to approval by FC, PS(T), THB said that the use of public money would be under prudent oversight.

8. Ms Emily LAU did not subscribe to the Administration's explanation and reiterated her view that objective indicators for the assessment of social and economic benefits to be brought about by the project should be provided instead of simply making the assessment against the criteria in paragraph 14 on a case-by-case basis. She remarked that given the possible impact of the WIL project on other modes of public transport e.g. taxis, the absence of objective indicators for the assessment of the provision of funding support to a listed company might give rise to public concern about a level-playing field in the provision of transport services.

9. Ms Miriam LAU drew members' attention that when the funding proposal was considered at the meeting of the Railway Subcommittee, members had raised concerns about a number of related issues, including the impact of WIL on other modes of public transport. She pointed out that the Administration was requested to provide to the Railway Subcommittee in due course the relevant information and responses to address members' concerns for follow-up discussions by the Subcommittee. Ms Emily LAU remained concerned whether the required information would be provided before the relevant FC meeting.

10. While reiterating that theoretical thresholds or indicators set for the assessment of all infrastructure projects across-the-board were neither desirable nor practicable, PS(T), THB agreed to provide, before the relevant FC meeting, written response to Ms Emily LAU's concerns as far as practicable. As to the impact of the WIL project on other modes of public transport, PS(T), THB advised that the question had been examined in the past years with the development of the railway system as the backbone of Hong Kong's public transport system. He

Admin pointed out that the impact of WIL on other modes of public transport could be mitigated by proper rationalization such as consolidation and re-organization of the routes and services of different modes of public transport after the commissioning of WIL. Noting Ms Emily LAU's concern, he agreed to provide written response in this regard before the relevant FC meeting.

11. Mr Andrew CHENG stressed that whilst members supported the construction of WIL, they were concerned about the provision of Government funding support to a listed company for an infrastructure project. Mr CHENG opined that the Administration should draw up clear criteria for provision of funding support for non-government projects as there were a number of major railway projects in the pipeline of which capital grant from the Government might be sought. Mr CHENG queried the application of the criterion in paragraph 14(c) of the Administration's paper after the merger of the two railway companies with effect from 2 December 2007, when there would not be any other alternative organizations to operate the railways. Mr CHENG further highlighted the following concerns for the Administration's response:

- (a) the Administration should provide information on the assumed level of patronage and corresponding fare revenue arising from WIL for determination of the funding gap amount;
- (b) whether the Administration would request MTRCL to use part of the profits from the operation of WIL to set up a "Fare Stabilization Fund" to relieve the pressure on upward adjustment of railway fares; and
- (c) in view of the large sum of capital grant from the public pocket, whether the Government would consider granting the right of operation of WIL to MTRCL for a fixed period of time.

12. In response, PS(T), THB advised that while rough estimates of the patronage and fare revenue of WIL were made for determining the funding gap amount at this initial stage, the commercial risks associated with the construction and operation of WIL could not be ascertained simply by making reference to those of the existing railway lines and therefore the estimated figures might deviate from the actual revenue upon the commissioning of WIL. To facilitate members' consideration of the funding proposals, the Administration had adopted a two-stage approach for seeking funding from the Legislative Council (LegCo) to cover the design phase expenditure and subsequently the funding gap arising from the construction, operation and maintenance of WIL. The current proposal was the first stage funding support of \$400 million for the design phase expenditure. Independent consultants and relevant Government bureaux/departments would participate in assessing the total funding for the project in detail. A more accurate estimate would then be formulated for seeking approval from FC for further provisions in stage two for the construction of WIL. He pointed out that arrangements for operation of WIL were made in accordance with the Government's prevailing policy, namely the "ownership approach" (under which

MTRCL would fund, construct and operate the new railway) for natural extensions of existing MTR railway lines. As to Mr CHENG's concern about the "Fare Stabilization Fund", PS(T), THB advised that the proposal had been deliberated in detail at other forums such as during the scrutiny of the Rail Merger Bill.

13. Mr Andrew CHENG disagreed that the proposal of setting up a "Fare Stabilization Fund" had been deliberated in detail and recalled that the then Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works had agreed to consider the proposal but had not reverted to LegCo on this. Mr CHENG therefore requested that the Administration should provide, before the relevant FC meeting, information on whether it would request MTRCL to set up a "Fare Stabilization Fund" under the WIL project and if not, reasons for not putting up the request. On the period of operation of new railways, Mr CHENG opined that given the small area of Hong Kong, most new railways could be regarded as natural extension of the existing railway lines and hence the "ownership approach" would always be applicable. He urged the Administration to examine its policy for providing funding support to railway projects in this regard. He also reiterated his concern about the assumed level of patronage and fare revenue arising from WIL for determination of the funding gap amount and requested the Administration to provide information before the relevant FC meeting. Noting Mr CHENG's concern, PS(T), THB agreed to provide written response to address concerns in paragraph 11(a) and (b) above as requested.

Admin

14. Ms Miriam LAU advised that a number of the concerns raised by Members were shared by members of the Railway Subcommittee at the meeting on 9 November 2007 and she had reported at the beginning of the meeting that the Administration had been requested to revert to the Railway Subcommittee for follow-up discussion. Interested members could participate in the discussions at the Railway Subcommittee meeting when the Administration had provided the required information. Ms LAU recapped the content of the Railway Subcommittee's report for members' information and drew members' attention that the current funding proposal was the first stage to cover the design phase expenditure of the WIL project. Mr Howard YOUNG opined that members should focus on the funding proposal of granting \$400 million for the design phase expenditure of WIL at this Public Works Subcommittee (PWSC) meeting and leave other issues related to the construction, operation and maintenance of WIL to the Railway Subcommittee for follow-up discussion.

15. Mrs Selina CHOW shared Mr Howard YOUNG's view on the need of a focused discussion of the meeting. Mrs CHOW added that funding support for the design phase of WIL was essential for defining, in greater detail, the project scope and ascertaining more accurately the project cost for determination of the amount of Government funding in the second stage. In this connection, she enquired about the timeframe for submission of the second stage funding proposal to LegCo. In response, PS(T), THB advised that the Administration aimed to submit the second stage funding proposal around the first quarter of 2009. He assured members that before making the funding submission to PWSC, the Administration would provide for the consideration of the Railway Subcommittee, details on the

financial implications of the WIL project as well as response to concerns raised by members of PWSC and the Railway Subcommittee.

16. The Chairman stated that PWSC members should have the opportunity to seek clarifications or further information on issues related to the funding proposal in the Administration's paper. The Administration might wish to consider the information to be presented in its paper to facilitate a more focused discussion at PWSC meeting. Ms Emily LAU echoed the Chairman's view and opined that for the purpose of the current funding proposal, the Administration should provide, before the relevant FC meeting, written response to address members' concerns raised at this meeting notwithstanding that the Railway Subcommittee would arrange further discussions to follow-up similar issues and/or concerns in due course.

17. Mr Abraham SHEK stated that he supported the current proposal and considered the funding support of \$400 million for the design phase expenditure of the WIL project reasonable and necessary for the construction of the railway line.

18. Mr James TO noted that the Government had in the past mainly relied on granting property development rights as the means for providing financial support to bridge the funding gap for most of the railway projects but similar financial support could not be made for WIL due to lack of suitable sites along or adjacent to the WIL alignment. Mr TO was of the view that to facilitate members' consideration of the alternative method of providing capital grant to MTRCL for the WIL project under the current proposal, the Administration should provide information on the estimated additional revenue from land premium that would possibly be generated from Government sites in the vicinity of the alignment of WIL with the increased value derived from the ease of access to a railway line.

19. In response, PS(T), THB advised that the information required by Mr TO would have to be derived after detailed examination of the whole range of issues involved in determining the availability as well as the value of the Government sites. While WIL was expected to provide the impetus for the rejuvenation of the Central and Western District as there were likely to be more economic activities and redevelopment with the improvement in traffic conditions, there were only a few Government sites in the vicinity which might be redeveloped (such as the existing sites of the former abattoir and incinerator) and the land use of these sites would be subject to changes, e.g. to cope with local demand for community facilities in the district. As such, the provision of information on land premium of the Government sites in the vicinity of the WIL alignment at this early stage might not be of much reference value to members.

20. Mr James TO maintained his view that the required information could facilitate members' consideration of the funding proposal. Referring to the estimated time savings of about \$44 billion over 40 years of operation of WIL provided by the Administration in paragraph 8 of its paper, Mr TO considered that the Administration should be able to work out an estimated figure on the additional revenue from land premium of the Government sites even at this early



Admin

stage. In response, PS(T), THB said that in the light of Mr TO's concern, the Administration would try to examine the availability of Government sites in the vicinity of the WIL alignment and provide a written response to PWSC before the relevant FC meeting.

21. The item was voted on and endorsed.

### **Head 706 – Highways**

#### **PWSC(2007-08)58 800TH Retrofitting of noise barriers at Kwun Tong Bypass**

22. The Chairman advised members that the Panel on Environmental Affairs (EA Panel) was consulted on this proposal on 25 June 2007. Panel members in general welcomed the proposal to reduce the nuisance caused by traffic noise to the nearby residents. Given that about 200 dwellings still could not benefit from the retrofitting project, some members considered that the Administration should implement additional measures, including the installation of double-glazed windows, to reduce the noise level. Panel members were also concerned about the traffic impact of the closure of one traffic lane during the construction of the noise barriers, which might increase the traffic volume to capacity ratio to a maximum of 1.36 for the worst situation. Panel members considered that the Administration should work out other temporary traffic measures to alleviate traffic congestion and requested the Administration to further explain the revised temporary traffic measures to be taken in the PWSC submission.

23. Mr CHAN Kam-lam supported the proposal. He however expressed concern about the adverse traffic impact of the closure of the traffic lane on the Kwun Tong Bypass (KTB), in particular on traffic from Tseung Kwan O during peak hours, as KTB was a major access road for Tseung Kwan O. Mr CHAN enquired about details of the traffic arrangements during the works period and called on the Administration to devise appropriate measures to mitigate the traffic congestion. Mr CHAN also urged the Administration to reduce the long project duration.

24. The Director of Highways (DHy) advised that in response to EA Panel members' concerns about the temporary traffic diversion proposal of closing one traffic lane in the westbound carriageway of KTB during construction, the Administration had re-evaluated the situation and revised the proposal. Under the revised proposal, the existing number of traffic lanes would be maintained for public use in the westbound carriageway of KTB during rush hours (i.e. from 7:00 am to 10:00 am and from 4:00 pm to 8:00 pm). To achieve these, the Administration would erect falseworks at ground level on Wai Fat Road to form working platforms and provide adequate space for construction activities along that section of KTB. In response to Mr CHAN Kam-lam's further enquiry, DHy confirmed that working platforms would not be formed within the boundary of the Laguna Park.

25. Responding to Ms Emily LAU's request for further elaboration of the revised traffic arrangement, DHy advised that to minimize the need for lane closure in the westbound carriageway of KTB, working platforms would be formed on one of the two lanes at Wai Fat Road up to the level of KTB to provide room for construction activities. Such arrangement would require the closure of one lane on Wai Fat Road during the works period while keeping all lanes in the westbound carriageway of KTB open during the aforesaid rush hours. The temporary traffic arrangement would be stipulated in the works contract.

26. Ms Emily LAU noted with concern that the proposed noise barriers would only benefit about 1 100 among the 1 300 dwellings adjacent to the section of KTB near Laguna City. As the remaining 200 dwellings adjacent to that section of KTB would not benefit from the proposed works and the 1 100 dwellings would only benefit by a reduction of traffic noise levels by one to four decibels, Ms LAU doubted the adequacy of the noise mitigation effect of the proposed noise barriers. She was of the view that other noise mitigation measures such as installation of double-glazed windows for the affected dwellings and re-surfacing KTB with low-noise road surfacing materials should be examined.

27. In response, DHy advised that installation of noise barriers on KTB was subject to technical constraints such as the structural capability of the flyover in bearing the additional loading of the noise barriers. As such, some of the dwellings adjacent to the section of KTB concerned would not be able to benefit from the proposed works. He nevertheless pointed out that the proposed noise barriers would bring about considerable benefit to the majority of dwellings adjacent to that section of KTB. The Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment), Environmental Protection Department (AD(EA), EPD) added that the Administration's policy was to mitigate traffic noise for existing roads at source as far as practicable. Upon completion of the proposed works, 900 dwellings would benefit from a reduction in traffic noise level of more than two decibels among which 600 dwellings would have a reduction of more than three decibels. AD(EA), EPD pointed out that reduction in traffic noise level of two to three decibels represented quite significant improvement which would be equivalent to a 50% reduction in the traffic volume.

28. As to measures to alleviate the impact of traffic noise on the remaining 200 dwellings, AD(EA), EPD advised that the Administration would continue to explore feasible means in this regard. He further advised that the section of KTB in question had been resurfaced with low-noise road surfacing materials for some time and the traffic noise had been reduced by two to three decibels. As the materials would be subject to wear and tear over time, the Environmental Protection Department and the Highways Department would monitor the noise mitigation performance of the low-noise road surfacing materials and arrange for re-surfacing, where necessary. AD(EA), EPD pointed out that low-noise road surfacing materials were used for all new expressways under the prevailing standard. As to Ms Emily LAU's view on the provision of double-glazed windows, AD(EA), EPD said that the dwellings provided with these windows could only

benefit from traffic noise reduction by keeping the windows closed. He reiterated the Administration's policy of mitigating traffic noise at source and therefore the provision of facilities such as double-glazed windows would not be consistent with this policy.

29. Ms Emily LAU disagreed with the Administration's policy of not providing double-glazed windows for dwellings which were exposed to excessive traffic noise. She opined that the affected residents should be given the choice of other noise mitigation facilities. As about 800 dwellings would still be suffering from traffic noise level exceeding the 70 decibels limit even after the completion of the project, Ms LAU called on the Administration to re-consider the provision of double-glazed windows for traffic noise mitigation.

30. AD(EA), EPD reiterated that double-glazed windows were not effective noise mitigation facilities as they could only block out traffic noise when residents kept the windows closed. The Chairman enquired whether the Administration would take into consideration relevant factors such as energy conservation in formulating its policy on traffic noise mitigation. In response, AD(EA), EPD advised that factors such as energy conservation and good air circulation for residents' health had been taken into consideration in working out the appropriate measures for traffic noise mitigation.

31. Responding to Ms Emily LAU's enquiry on the comparison of the performance of vertical and cantilevered noise barriers, AD(EA), EPD confirmed that cantilevered noise barriers could reduce traffic noise more effectively than vertical ones. Nevertheless, the technical feasibility of retrofitting cantilevered noise barrier on existing roads would hinge on the capacity for additional loadings of the flyovers/roads concerned. Under the present proposal, single-leaf cantilevered noise barriers would be retrofitted along the central divider where there was adequate loading capacity and vertical noise barriers would be retrofitted on the verge of the carriageway.

32. Ms Emily LAU called on the Administration to install cantilevered type of noise barriers where practicable in order to achieve the best noise mitigation effect, in particular for roads at-grade where loading capacity should not be a consideration. The Administration took note of Ms LAU's view.

33. The item was voted on and endorsed.

### **Head 703 – Buildings**

#### **PWSC(2007-08)53 47RG Siu Sai Wan Complex**

34. The Chairman advised members that an information paper provided by the Administration on the project had been circulated to the Panel on Home Affairs (HA Panel) in October 2007.

35. Ms Emily LAU supported the project. Given the increasing public demand for indoor heated pools in the territory, Ms LAU noted with concern that there were only two public heated pools on Hong Kong Island. She therefore called on the Administration to expedite project delivery to meet the increasing public demand for heated pool facilities and enquired whether standards had been set for the provision of such facilities.

36. The Assistant Director (Leisure Services)2, Leisure and Cultural Services Department (AD(LS)2, LCSD) advised that LCSD had provided a total of 16 heated pool facilities in the territory. According to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, one swimming pool complex should be provided for a population of 285 000 but there was no specific planning standard for the provision of heated pool facilities. She advised that the Administration was well aware of the public demand for all-weather pool facilities and had been designing all new pool facilities indoor and with heating provisions, including the proposed pools under the current proposal and the project in the next item on the agenda i.e. **PWSC(2007-08)54**. In response to Ms Emily LAU's concern about the size of the Island East Swimming Pool, AD(LS)2, LCSD said that given the limited size of the project site, only one 25-metre training pool and a small leisure pool could be provided in the swimming pool complex.

Admin

37. Ms Emily LAU urged the Administration to consider setting a planning standard for heated pool facilities in the light of changes in public demand. In response, AD(LS)2, LCSD agreed to consider, in consultation with the Planning Department, the inclusion of standard provision for heated pool facilities in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines and report on the outcome in due course.

38. In response to Prof Patrick LAU's enquiry about the timeframe for this project, the Director of Architectural Services (D Arch S) said that subject to funding approval, the Administration planned to commence works in April 2008 for completion in November 2010. The proposed timeframe, including the foundation works, was a compressed one when compared with other similar projects.

39. Ms Emily LAU appreciated the uniqueness of the project design and enquired whether consultants were engaged for the design. She opined that the Administration should encourage creative and innovative design for all capital works projects. In reply, D Arch S said that pursuant to prevailing policy, around 90% of the works under the purview of the Architectural Services Department including the design works, were outsourced to the private sector. Given the prominent location of the proposed complex and the large number of service targets in the surrounding schools and residential estates, the Administration had engaged a consultant well-recognized of high professional standard for the project design. He drew members' attention to the special element of the design with a central semi-indoor atrium between the two building blocks of the complex, which would facilitate cross ventilation and reduce energy consumption for air-conditioning and lighting. Other environmentally friendly measures, such as

green rooftop and renewable energy would also be implemented under this project.

40. Ms Emily LAU enquired whether the consultants would be required to meet any requirements on creativity of the design and the additional costs incurred for creative designs, if any. In reply, D Arch S advised that in general, creative and innovative designs would have little, if any, cost implication but could bring about a number of benefits, such as savings in the recurrent expenditure by using energy saving facilities like motion sensors for lighting control. As regards requirements on consultants in project design, D Arch S advised that consultants had to comply with energy efficiency codes published by the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department (EMSD), having regard to individual circumstances of the project site and the nature of the buildings concerned. Responding to Ms Emily LAU's further enquiry about details of the use of renewable energy in the proposed complex, D Arch S said that photovoltaic panels would be installed on the main building block to produce renewable energy, for purposes such as heating water for use in the changing rooms. Other energy saving facilities such as a system to collect rainfall for irrigation would also be provided on the rooftop of the complex.

41. Ms Emily LAU supported the adoption of environmental friendly measures for government buildings. Ms LAU was of the view that apart from these measures, the Administration should also encourage innovative designs for government buildings. D Arch S appreciated Ms LAU's view and pointed out that the Administration had allowed flexibility for the consultants in coming up with creative project designs. By way of illustration, recycled materials would be used for the exterior of the main building block of the proposed complex as recommended by the consultant.

42. The item was voted on and endorsed.

**PWSC(2007-08)54 412RO Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park and Swimming Pool Complex**

43. The Chairman advised members that an information paper provided by the Administration on the project had been circulated to the HA Panel in October 2007.

44. Prof Patrick LAU supported the provision of more open space for local residents, which was long overdue to meet the shortfall in provision. He relayed the complaints of some local residents about the difficulty of access to the temporary recreational facilities in the Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park (the Park) and asked whether the Administration had plans to implement measures to enhance the accessibility to the Park.

45. AD(LS)2, LCSD said that while the Park was located by the waterfront at some distance from the residential areas, the public could still have easy access to the Park through means such as the footbridges connecting the Park and Des Voeux Road West and eastbound buses which stopped within walking distance of

the Park. Drivers could also park their cars in the 15 parking spaces in the Park, the number of which would be increased to 30 with additional parking spaces for coaches to be provided upon the completion of the current project. As evidenced by the utility rate of the indoor sports centre located next to the Park (average rate of 70% and over 80% for peak hours), the public should not have great difficulty in accessing the Park. To enhance the accessibility of the Park, LCSD was examining the feasibility of the provision of a continuous footpath along the harbourfront between the eastern entrance of the Park and the Shun Tak Centre in consultation with the relevant works departments.

46. Prof Patrick LAU welcomed the proposed footpath. Ms Emily LAU expressed similar view and enquired about the progress of the discussion between LCSD and the works departments concerned on the provision of the proposed footpath.

47. D Arch S advised that the Drainage Services Department (DSD) would undertake another works project along the harbourfront between Shun Tak Centre and the Park and discussion with DSD for necessary interface between the proposed footpath and DSD's project delivery was underway. At the request of Ms Emily LAU, the Administration agreed to report on the outcome of discussion with the works departments concerned on the provision of the footpath in due course.

Admin

48. Referring to Enclosure 1 to the Administration's paper, Prof Patrick LAU expressed concern about the narrow access path beside the Ventilation Building. In response, D Arch S advised that the Ventilation Building purposely built for the Western Harbour Crossing had imposed space constraints for provision of a wider access path as well as limitations in the provision of active recreational facilities due to concern about the air quality. Taking into account the findings of the Preliminary Environmental Review (PER) for the proposed project, greening works would be provided adjacent to the Ventilation Building and sports facilities such as soccer pitch and basketball courts would be provided further away.

49. Prof Patrick LAU was concerned whether the poor air quality near the Ventilation Building would give rise to health threats to the Park users and enquired about mitigation measures to improve the air quality. In response, D Arch S advised that the PER findings indicated that the operation of Ventilation Building would not bring about any significant impact on the air quality. Moreover, the provision of green areas near the Ventilation Building would help to improve the air quality in the Park.

50. Pointing out that the Central and Western District Council (C&WDC) strongly recommended that the design theme of the proposed Park should be to commemorate Dr SUN Yat-sen, Mr CHAN Kam-lam noted with concern that apart from a statue of Dr SUN on the memorial lawn, only leisure and sports facilities would be provided under the proposed project. He suggested that the Administration should consider other commemorative facilities such as exhibition galleries for the public to know more about Dr SUN. Noting that the statue of Dr SUN would be at the centre of the large lawn area in the Park, Mr CHAN

opined that footpath should be provided for visitors to get closer to the statue without walking on the lawn.

51. AD(LS)2, LCSD advised that in addition to the statue of Dr SUN, other features had been incorporated in the Park design to commemorate Dr SUN, such as a small pool near the memorial lawn representing the pool in which Dr SUN was baptized and design of the Children's Play Area with special features resembling those of the schools attended by Dr SUN. Plaques would be set up in the Park with descriptions of the life of Dr SUN in Hong Kong. The Administration had consulted and got the agreement of C&WDC on the proposed design. D Arch S added that names of fellows who were baptized together with Dr SUN would be displayed in the pool. Special features reflecting the educational values of the Central School was also incorporated in the design of the Park. These proposals were formulated having regard to views of historians, academics and members of C&WDC. D Arch S further advised that public access to the statue across the lawn could be properly controlled under the management of LCSD staff and the Administration would also consider providing pebble path for access to the statute.

52. Responding to Ms Emily LAU's concern about the incorporation of environmentally friendly concept in the project design, D Arch S advised that energy saving measures set out in EMSD's energy efficiency codes and renewable energy devices, such as motion sensors for lighting control and photovoltaic panels for water heating in the changing rooms would be implemented in the project where technically feasible.

53. The item was voted on and endorsed.

54. The meeting ended at 10:30 am.