

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. CB(2) 2616/99-00  
(These minutes have been seen by  
the Administration and cleared  
with the Chairman)

Ref : CB2/HS/2/99

**Subcommittee to follow up on the outstanding capital works projects  
of the two Provisional Municipal Councils  
for inclusion into the Government's Public Works Programme**

**Minutes of meeting  
held on Tuesday, 2 May 2000 at 4:30 pm  
in Conference Room A of the Legislative Council Building**

- Members Present** : Hon Fred LI Wah-ming, JP (Chairman)  
Hon HO Sai-chu, SBS, JP  
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan  
Hon Edward HO Sing-tin, SBS, JP  
Hon CHAN Yuen-han  
Hon WONG Yung-kan  
Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, SBS, JP
- Absent with Apology** : Hon LEE Wing-tat  
Hon James TO Kun-sun  
Dr Hon TANG Siu-tong, JP
- Invited to Attend** : Hon MA Fung-kwok (Member of Panel on Home Affairs)  
Hon Mrs Sophie LEUNG LAU Yau-fun, JP (Member of  
Panel on Home Affairs)
- Public Officers attending** : Mr Paul TANG  
Deputy Secretary for the Environment and Food (A)
- Miss Eva TO  
Principal Assistant Secretary for the Environment and  
Food (A) 3

Mr Arthur NG  
Deputy Secretary for Home Affairs (3)

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

Mr Johnny WOO  
Assistant Director (Leisure Services) 2  
Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Mr Michael MAK  
Assistant Director (Libraries & Development)  
Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Mr Robert CHONG  
Senior Staff Officer (Planning) 1  
Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Miss Janet WONG  
Deputy Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene  
(Administration and Development)

Mr James LI  
Assistant Director (Operations) 1  
Food and Environmental Hygiene Department

Mr Steve CHAN  
Chief Executive Officer (Planning) 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

**Clerk in Attendance** : Mrs Constance LI  
Chief Assistant Secretary (2)2

**Staff in Attendance** : Miss Mary SO  
Senior Assistant Secretary (2)8

---

Action

**I. Confirmation of minutes of meeting held on 14 January 2000**  
[LC Paper No. CB(2)1832/99-00]

The minutes of the meeting held on 14 January 2000 were confirmed.

**II. Progress of Tai Kok Tsui Complex, Hammer Hill Road District Park and Stanley Complex**  
[Paper Nos. CB(2)1821/99-00(01) and (02)]

2. Before inviting the Administration to brief members on the progress of the outstanding capital works projects of the former PMCs, the Chairman reminded the Administration that, although the current term of the Legislative Council (LegCo) would end on 30 June 2000, the Administration should not scrap or reduce the scope of works of any outstanding capital works during the period when LegCo was not in session.

Tai Kok Tsui Complex

3. Members noted from paragraphs 2-4 of the Administration's paper [LC Paper No. CB(2)1821/99-00(01)] that the Working Group of Yau Tsim Mong District Council had opted to retain the swimming pool facilities in the Tai Kok Tsui Complex, and had accepted the administrative measures proposed by the Administration to ensure order and public safety at all operational hours. The Administration now planned to seek the approval of the Public Works Subcommittee (PWSC) and the Finance Committee (FC) to upgrade the project to Category A of the Government's Public Works Programme (PWP).

4. In response to some members, Deputy Secretary for Home Affairs (DS(HA)) said that in view of the Yau Tsim Mong District Council's wishes, the Administration had agreed to proceed with the project although it would not be the best arrangement in the circumstances. The Administration would, however, consider taking administrative measures to alleviate the crowd control problems especially during peak hours. The Administration aimed to obtain the approval of PWSC and FC for the project before the end of the current session.

Hammer Hill Road District Park

5. Members noted that the Administration had forwarded the revised layout plan to Chi Lin and would consult Wong Tai Sin District Council on receipt of feedback from Chi Lin.

6. In reply to Miss CHAN Yuen-han, DS(HA) said that the Administration was open-minded on the design of the District Park so long as it was in harmony with the adjacent Chi Lin Nunnery Monastic Complex so that the

Action

entire area could become a landmark for tourism. He hoped to receive early comments from Chi Lin on the revised plan before deciding how the design could be further revised or otherwise prior to consulting Wong Tai Sin District Council.

7. Miss CHAN Yuen-han asked whether the Hammer Hill Road District Park would still be regarded as a "district park". DS(HA) replied that the most important thing was to improve the park to make it more in harmony with the Chi Lin Nunnery Monastic Complex. He considered that there was no irreconcilable conflict between matching the design of the park with that of Chi Lin and providing a district park for people in the district.

8. Miss Cyd HO enquired whether the Administration would retain the original plan of constructing an exhibition hall in the District Park.

9. DS(HA) replied that the reason for revising the original design of the District Park was to make it in harmony with the Chi Lin Nunnery Monastic Complex. As the Chi Lin Nunnery Monastic Complex already had an exhibition hall, it was necessary for the Administration to review the need for providing another exhibition venue in the District Park. DS(HA) pointed out that Wong Tai Sin area would not be deprived of a venue for organizing arts and cultural presentations as Ngau Chi Wan Civic Centre could serve as a district arts centre providing also exhibition hall facilities which were currently under-utilized.

10. Miss Cyd HO disagreed with DS(HA)'s view, pointing out that the exhibition hall in the Chi Lin Nunnery Monastic Complex would only display Buddhist statues or items related to Buddhism, whereas the proposed exhibition centre in the District Park could cater for other arts exhibitions. Moreover, the exhibition hall in the Chi Lin Nunnery Monastic Complex would sometimes be closed to celebrate Buddhist events/festivals. Miss HO further said that as the Chi Lin Nunnery Monastic Complex was run by a private body, it was uncertain whether outsiders would be allowed to hold arts exhibitions in Chi Lin's exhibition hall.

11. Miss Cyd HO asked whether the Administration could provide the record of discussion with Chi Lin, particularly the deliberations on the construction of an exhibition centre in the District Park. DS(HA) replied that no formal record of discussion was kept but the Administration would consider keeping formal records of meetings with Chi Lin in future.

12. Mrs Sophie LEUNG clarified that Chi Lin's discussion with the Administration only focussed on the compatibility of the design of the District Park with the Tang Dynasty architecture of the Chi Lin Nunnery Monastic Complex. She said that Chi Lin had not requested the Administration to scrap

Action

the construction of an exhibition centre in the park. Miss Cyd HO then queried why the Administration had previously proposed scrapping the exhibition centre from the project. DS(HA) responded that the Administration was still in discussion with Chi Lin on the design of the park. He reiterated that the Administration had not come to a view on whether an exhibition centre should be constructed in the park.

13. In response to Mr HO Sai-chu, DS(HA) said that while he shared Mr HO's concern that the project should commence as early as practicable, it was unlikely that the project could be upgraded to Category A of the PWP within the current term judging from the current progress.

14. Mr HO Sai-chu urged the Administration not to make any commitment on the design of the District Park without first consulting LegCo. He further asked whether the Administration should consider entrusting the project to Chi Lin, given Chi Lin's experience and wealth of knowledge in constructing historical buildings and landscaped gardens of very high standards. DS(HA) replied that the Administration had an open mind on any viable and cost-effective option which could develop the District Park in a style compatible with the Chi Lin Nunnery Monastic Complex.

15. Mrs Sophie LEUNG said that the design of the Chi Lin Nunnery Monastic Complex was in essence the fruition of a study of the Tang Dynasty architecture. She hoped that the Administration would not apply the same stereotype approach in the development of the Hammer Hill Road District Park, but rather set the goal of developing the Park as a landmark of Chinese heritage and culture.

16. The Chairman said that it was the unanimous view of members that the District Park should be developed into a landmark for tourism. In order to ensure that the park would be developed in a style compatible with Chi Lin Nunnery Monastic Complex, the Chairman suggested setting up a working group comprising representatives of the Architectural Services Department (Arch SD), the Home Affairs Bureau, Chi Lin Nunnery Management and outside experts.

17. DS(HA) responded that the Administration had been maintaining a close dialogue with Chi Lin over the District Park's design and construction. He considered that the setting up of a working group could be considered at a later stage when there were more concrete details.

18. The Chairman urged the Administration to expedite actions on the design of the District Park and revert to the Subcommittee at its next meeting.

Stanley Complex

Action

19. At the invitation of the Chairman, Deputy Secretary for Environment and Food (DS(EF)) briefed members on the progress of the Administration's review of the Stanley Complex project as detailed in paragraphs 2-6 of the Administration's paper [LC Paper No. CB(2)1821/99-00(02)]. DS(EF) said that the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD) had conducted a survey in March 2000 to assess the viability of the proposed wet and dry goods markets in the Complex. The findings showed that, regardless of the imminent opening of the superstore at Ma Hang, about two-thirds of some 630 Stanley residents interviewed supported the construction of the new market facilities in Stanley and indicated that they would patronize it when it opened. About half of the 200 tourists interviewed also indicated that they would buy dry goods in the new market facilities. However, a significant number (11 out of 18) of stall operators and almost all licensed hawkers (21 out of 24) interviewed were not optimistic about the viability of relocating their business into the Complex.

20. DS(EF) said that in view of the mixed responses during the survey, and the fact that the superstore at Ma Hang only started operation from mid April 2000, it might need more time to assess the full impact of the superstore and the long-term viability of the proposed markets. Moreover, population intake into the nearby Ma Hang Estate Phase II (planned population: 4 300) would not commence until June 2000. In the circumstances, the Administration considered it necessary to conduct a further assessment of the viability of the wet and dry goods markets in the Complex sometime later, probably in July/August 2000. As regards the provision of leisure and cultural facilities, DS(EF) said that Home Affairs Bureau and Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) were examining the feasibility of including in the Complex the indoor games hall and the community hall originally planned for the Ma Hang area, as well as the compatibility of these facilities with the market facilities. The Administration aimed to come to a final proposal for the Stanley Complex by October 2000.

21. The Chairman and Mr HO Sai-chu welcomed the Administration's survey in gauging the views of residents and parties affected by the project. The Chairman hoped the Administration would more frequently conduct opinion surveys on important projects.

22. Miss Cyd HO asked why the stall operators in the temporary wet market and the licensed hawkers in the hawker bazaar were not optimistic about the viability of relocating their business into the Complex. Assistant Director (Operations), FEHD replied that the existing temporary wet goods market was a one-level structure located near the seafront promenade, and was considered by stall operators and tourists to be of a more user-friendly and viable design than the proposed market inside the Stanley Complex. The licensed hawkers in the

Action

existing dry goods bazaar also had similar concern because the latter enjoyed good patronage due to its street-side location and unique character. DS(EF) supplemented that the Administration's initial assessment was that the new superstore in Ma Hang would likely take some business away from the temporary wet market. Although its impact on the hawker bazaar might be less noticeable, the Administration had doubts on the viability of relocating the licensed hawkers to the Complex as originally planned. DS(EF) further said that before taking a decision on the facilities to be included in the Stanley Complex, the Administration would also have to address the concerns expressed by various groups in the community about preserving the village-like character of Stanley as a major tourist attraction.

23. The Chairman was of the view that a superstore could not replace a wet market because of the different price range and types of food offered. DS(EF) agreed that this was true to some extent. Nevertheless, the opening of a superstore in Ma Hang would definitely have impact on the business of the existing temporary wet market which only comprised 24 stalls (25% were vacant) offering limited selection of food items.

24. Mrs Sophie LEUNG commented that the design of public markets would need improvements and modernization. She suggested that consideration should be given to contracting out the construction of Stanley Complex to private architects using the "design and build" approach. The Chairman remarked that the design of the Stanley Complex should also be compatible with the unique character of Stanley.

25. DS(EF) responded that the design and facilities for the Stanley Complex were constrained by the site. Deputy Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene (Administration and Development) (DD/FEH) supplemented that the proposed Complex would be a three-storey building with an open light well in the centre. In designing the Complex, consideration had been given to the comments received by the Town Planning Board that the proposed Stanley Complex should be compatible with the character of Stanley. Project Director 3, Arch SD added that while some 40% of Government building projects were contracted out, the Stanley Complex was an in-house project designed by Arch SD, and he would welcome any suggestions on the design of the project.

Admin

26. In concluding the discussion, the Chairman advised the Administration to brief LegCo Members on the proposed way forward of the Stanley Complex in October 2000 before taking a decision.

**III. The remaining capital works projects approved/committed by the two former Provisional Municipal Councils**

[Paper Nos. CB(2)1553/99-00(02) to (03), and CB(2)1821/99-00(02) to

Action

(03)]

Capital works projects of the two former PMCs that involved FEHD

27. Members noted paragraphs 7-8 of the Administration's paper [LC Paper No. CB(2)1821/99-00(02)] which reported the progress of the Administration's review of the 27 other capital works projects of the two former PMCs that involved FEHD.

28. Mr Edward HO expressed disappointment that only one out of the 27 capital works projects of the two former PMCs that involved FEHD (i.e. Kwai Chung Ambulance Depot with Fire Services Department Offices and Refuse Collection Point (RCP) at Hing Shing Road in Area 10B, Kwai Chung) would be included in the PWP as a Category C item, whereas the remaining 26 projects would be subject to further review. Mr HO enquired about the time frame for completing the review.

29. DS(EF) explained that of the 169 remaining capital works projects which had not received all necessary approvals from the two former PMCs, 30 involved FEHD facilities. At the last Subcommittee meeting on 3 April 2000, the Administration had undertaken that-

- (a) feasibility studies would immediately start in respect of the two projects recommended for inclusion in Category C of PWP, i.e. Redevelopment of existing Public Toilet at Ngong Ping, Lantau and Aldrich Bay Complex (with a revised scope); and
- (b) one project, i.e. Temporary Off-street RCP cum Public Toilet at Ma Tau Kok (with a revised scope), would proceed as a minor works item.

DS(EF) said that the total number of projects that involved FEHD facilities which would be proceeded with should therefore be four including the one referred to by Mr Edward HO. As for the remaining projects, DS(EF) advised that about ten projects were related to the retro-fitting of air-conditioning in public markets for which a review was underway. It was also necessary to review the need for the proposed cooked food centres (CFC) and public market facilities to ascertain that they would not have a viability problem due to change in demand and close competition with existing similar facilities in the vicinity. DS(EF) pointed out that some of the proposed CFCs were for industrial areas, and there had been a reduction in demand due to relocation of industries and existence of other food establishments in the vicinity. As regards some internal facilities such as the vehicle depot in Sai Kung, DS(EF) explained that following the dissolution of the two former PMCs on 1 January 2000, the vehicle fleet of the former PMCs had been allocated to FEHD and LCSD. For



Action

the FEHD vehicle fleet, a comprehensive review would be carried out to streamline the operation, and the possibility of contracting out the services would also be considered. The proposed depot was therefore pending the outcome of the review.

30. Mr Edward HO remarked that judging from the reasons put forward by the Administration in Annex I of the Administration's paper on the review of the 27 projects, it appeared highly unlikely that these projects would be implemented. He inquired whether the review was simply to justify reducing expenditure on capital projects for municipal services. Citing Tung Chau Street Complex as an example, Mr HO pointed out that the Administration had used the low utilization rate of existing facilities in the vicinity to justify non-provision of new facilities, despite the fact that there was a shortfall of such facilities in the district according to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG). Mr HO asked whether this implied that HKPSG no longer suited present day circumstances and should be revised. The Chairman commented that although the utilization rates of the five indoor games halls in Sham Shui Po District averaged between 55% and 75%, it should not be taken to mean that there was no demand for more indoor games halls as most people tended to use these facilities after office hours.

31. DS(EF) assured members that the Administration had not abandoned its commitment to implement the remaining projects of the former PMCs. He explained that the Administration would have to review the circumstances of each case to ascertain the need for the project. Now that the current term of LegCo was coming to a close, the Administration planned to revert to Members on the results of the review in the next legislative session.

32. Mrs Sophie LEUNG hoped that the Administration would take a more comprehensive review on the facilities. For example, reference could be made to the Singapore experience in developing CFCs as an outlet for selling those delicacies which were becoming increasingly hard to find in Hong Kong. DS(EF) responded that the sites currently proposed for the construction of CFCs were not suitable for the purpose as suggested by Mrs LEUNG. However, he considered Mrs LEUNG's suggestion worth pursuing from the viewpoint of promoting local culinary culture.

33. Responding to Mr Edward HO's concern, DD/FEH explained that the review of the remaining projects was necessary and should not be construed as a pretext for non-implementation. Citing Siu Sai Wan Complex as an example, DD/FEH explained that the Department had to review the need for the proposed market and public toilet facilities in the Complex. She pointed out that there was already a market in the nearby Siu Sai Wan Estate and supermarkets were also planned for the private developments in the vicinity. Moreover, public toilet facilities were available in Siu Sai Wan Shopping Centre which was very

Action

close to the project site. As regards the project on Local Open Space, Public Area and RCP in Area 40, Tuen Mun, DD/FED said that as Area 40 was a new industrial area not yet fully developed, the Department would review the need for public toilet and refuse collection facilities in the area at a later stage.

34. The Chairman asked whether the Administration would consult the District Councils concerned on those projects which were considered unnecessary after the review. He said that it would be useful if the Administration could conduct a survey similar to the one conducted for the Stanley Complex before coming to a view as to whether a project should be aborted.

35. DS(EF) replied that the Administration would consult the District Councils concerned and considered all views received before taking a decision on the projects. DD/FEH added that the Administration would consider conducting a survey if the information needed was not readily available or apparent.

Admin

36. In concluding the discussion, the Chairman urged the Administration to expeditiously consult the District Councils concerned. He advised that unless the Administration had very strong justifications, the outstanding projects of the former PMCs should be implemented as originally planned.

Capital works projects of the two former PMCs that involved LCSD

37. Members noted the Administration's paper [LC Paper No. CB(2)1821/99-00(03)] which described the present status of projects under the purview of LCSD.

38. Mr WONG Yung-kan queried why two capital works projects which were in Category II of the former Provisional Regional Council (ProRC), i.e. one Recreation Centre and one Leisure Centre in Area 33, Tai Po had not been recommended for inclusion into the PWP as Category C items.

39. Senior Staff Officer (Planning), LCSD (SSO(P)) replied that the Administration was currently reviewing the need for these projects to ascertain that the proposed facilities met present day requirements. Moreover, the plot ratio of the project site of the Leisure Centre in Area 33 Tai Po had yet to be resolved. Assistant Director (Leisure Services), LCSD supplemented that there was no imminent need for an additional recreation centre in Tai Po, as the current utilization rates of the four existing indoor recreational centres in Tai Po only averaged about 65%. While it was conceded that more indoor leisure centres could be provided in Tai Po, the shortfall of leisure centres in Tai Po was relatively less serious than the other districts. Deputy Director of Leisure and Cultural Services (Administration) (DD/LCS(Admin)) advised that the

Action

Administration would also need to evaluate the impact of the indoor recreation centre in the new Tai Po Complex, after its opening in 2002, on the leisure and recreational needs of Tai Po.

40. In reply to the Chairman, SSO(P) said that according to the HKPSG, there was a shortfall of 18 hectares of open space for the provision of leisure facilities in Tai Po area. He added that due to changes in socio-economic and demographic structure and changes in leisure activities in recent years, the Administration intended to review the current planning standards and guidelines to better reflect the needs of the community. To this end, a paper would be provided for the relevant Panel in due course.

41. The Chairman expressed concern that the Administration appeared to use the review to revise the requirements for the provision of leisure facilities. In this connection, he was concerned that the Administration would in future consider constructing new facilities only on the basis of utilization rates of existing facilities. Miss Cyd HO echoed the same concern. She considered that the Administration should not seek to change the current planning standards and guidelines unless there were strong justifications. Miss HO commented that utilization rate was not a reliable yardstick to assess the need for a facility as the demand could not be evenly spread out during the operational hours. She said that there was definitely greater demand during holidays and after office hours, with a lower demand during weekdays and office hours. She was of the view that the provision of leisure and recreational facilities should be planned on the basis of known and forecast developments rather than to await information on the actual utilization of new facilities under construction.

42. In response to members' concerns, DS(HA) explained that Government had assumed the responsibility for the provision of leisure and cultural facilities following the dissolution of the two former PMCs on 1 January 2000. It was incumbent upon Government to ensure a balanced development of these facilities in all 18 districts. While the HKPSG and the planning standards of the two former PMCs provided the basis for planning such facilities, there were other practical considerations such as the availability of suitable sites and existence of similar facilities provided by other government departments, non-government organizations and private sector in the vicinity. It was also necessary to align the differences among the HKPSG and the planning standards of the two former PMCs to ensure that these met present day needs. In essence, DS(HA) advised that the provisions under the HKPSG were not mandatory. They were intended to be applied with a degree of flexibility, having regard to factors such as local requirements, site availability, the density and socio-economic structure of the population, usage patterns and resources available.

Action

43. In reply to the Chairman, DD/LCS(Admin) said that the Department had just completed an internal review on the planning standards and guidelines, and would consult the Planning Department (PD) before submitting a paper to the relevant Panel before the end of this year.

Admin

44. Miss Cyd HO considered that the Sports Development Board and the Culture and Heritage Commission should also be consulted on the review of the planning standards. DS(HA) agreed to follow up as appropriate.

Admin

45. At the request of the Chairman, DD/LCS(Admin) agreed to provide a paper setting out the three different sets of planning and guidelines for the provision of leisure and cultural facilities for discussion at the next meeting.

46. The Chairman enquired whether there was also a set of standards and guidelines for the provision of food and environmental hygiene facilities; and if so, whether a review on such standards and guidelines would be conducted. Assistant Director (Operations), FEHD replied that the Administration so far had no plan to conduct a review on the current standards and guidelines for the provision of food and environmental hygiene facilities. DS(EF) supplemented that while the HKPSG had laid down some guidelines on the provision of environmental hygiene facilities, it had always been the practice to take into account other factors in assessing the viability of the projects.

**IV. Any other business**

47. Members agreed that the next meeting be held at 9:00 am on 7 June 2000.

48. Members noted that three District Councils (DC), namely, Eastern DC, Central & Western DC and Sham Shui Po DC, had written to the Subcommittee expressing concern about certain planned projects in their districts. The Chairman suggested and members agreed that representatives of these DCs might be invited to attend the next meeting of the Subcommittee to give their views/concerns on the projects. The Chairman added that as the LegCo Members' meeting with Eastern District Council members would be held on 8 June 2000, the DC members might also wish to raise the subject for discussion at that meeting.

49. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 6:25 pm.