

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(2)2646/04-05
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB2/PS/5/04

Panel on Home Affairs

**Subcommittee to Follow Up the Outstanding Leisure and
Cultural Services Projects of the Former Municipal Councils**

**Minutes of meeting
held on Tuesday, 28 June 2005 at 10:45 am
in Conference Room A of the Legislative Council Building**

- Members present** : Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP (Chairman)
Hon WONG Yung-kan, JP
Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBS, JP
Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, GBS, JP
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon Daniel LAM Wai-keung, BBS, JP
Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming, SBS, JP
Hon Patrick LAU Sau-shing, SBS, JP
Hon TAM Heung-man
- Member attending** : Hon WONG Kwok-hing, MH
- Member absent** : Hon CHOY So-yuk
- Public Officers attending** : Home Affairs Bureau
Ms Lolly CHIU, JP
Deputy Secretary for Home Affairs(3)

Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Ms Kitty CHOI, JP
Deputy Director of Leisure & Cultural Services
(Administration)

Mr Eddy YAU, JP
Assistant Director (Leisure Services)3

Mr LEE Yuk-man
Assistant Director (Libraries & Development)

Mrs Karen YUEN
Chief Executive Officer (Planning)1

Mr Peter KAN
Chief Executive Officer (Planning)2

Architectural Services Department

Mr Wilson LEE
Project Director 3

Mr Patrick HAU Hon-fai
Senior Project Manager 124

Clerk in attendance : Miss Flora TAI
Chief Council Secretary (2)2

Staff in attendance : Ms Joanne MAK
Senior Council Secretary (2)2

Action

I. Confirmation of minutes
[LC Paper No. CB(2)2041/04-05]

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 May 2005 were confirmed.

II. Meeting with the Administration
[LC Paper Nos. CB(2)2043/04-05(01) and (02), CB(2)2073/04-05(01)
to (13), CB(2)2105/04-05(01) and CB(2)2115/04-05(01)]

Provision of recreational and sitting-out facilities at district level

2. The Chairman referred to the Administration's reply to an oral question

Action

raised by Hon CHAN Yuen-han at the Council meeting on 15 June 2005 regarding community facilities in public housing estates which was tabled at the meeting. The Chairman pointed out that although the subject matter fell outside the purview of the Home Affairs Bureau (HAB), the Administration should strive to enhance the co-ordination among various policy bureaux and Government departments in the provision of recreational and sitting-out facilities at district level.

Consultation with District Councils

3. Members noted that a summary of views of District Councils (DCs) on the outstanding ex-Municipal Council leisure and cultural services projects (as at 27 June 2005) had been prepared by the Legislative Council (LegCo) Secretariat [LC Paper No. CB(2)2043/04-05(02)]. The Chairman informed members that only three DCs (Wan Chai, Southern and Tai Po) had no comments. In addition, Central and Western DC, Eastern DC and Yuen Long DC had expressed interest in sending representatives to attend a meeting of the Subcommittee to present views. Members also noted that the submission from Islands DC was tabled at the meeting [LC Paper No. CB(2)2138/04-05(02)].

Information on availability of LCS facilities in 18 districts

4. Referring to Annex 2 to LC Paper No. CB(2)2043/04-05(01), the Chairman suggested that the Administration should provide an assessment, based on the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, on the shortfall in leisure and cultural services (LCS) facilities in each of the 18 districts, i.e. a comparison of the standard provision and existing facilities. The Chairman considered that such information would facilitate members' deliberations on whether any districts had a more urgent need than others for particular types of LCS facilities. Deputy Director of Leisure & Cultural Services (Administration) (DDLCS(A)) agreed to provide the information.

Admin

34 projects which had either been completed, under implementation or with funding earmarked

5. In response to Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Project Director 3 (PD3) said that the Administration was making good progress with the "Indoor Recreation Centre (Type C) cum Library in Area 17 Tung Chung Lantau" project and its construction was expected to commence in December 2006 as scheduled.

Briefing on the outcome of review of the implementation schedules of the 25 priority projects [LC Paper No. CB(2)2043/04-05(01)]

6. DDLCS(A) said that, as coordinated by HAB, the Administration had completed reviewing the implementation schedules of the 25 priority projects recommended in the 2005 Policy Address. DDLCS(A) informed members that

Action

the implementation of 21 of these projects could be expedited. DDLCS(A) pointed out that the revised implementation programme was dependent upon the successful bidding of the necessary capital funding and findings of the necessary studies, e.g. environmental impact assessment. She added that the outcome of the current year's Resource Allocation Exercise (RAE) should be available in October 2005.

7. DDLCS(A) further said that owing to some interfacing and technical problems as well as the lead time required to seek necessary statutory approvals from the Town Planning Board and the need to conduct environmental and traffic impact studies, the Administration was not able to advance the implementation of the following four projects –

- (a) Open Space at Tai Kok Tsui Temporary Market [item no. 6 of Annex I to LC Paper No. CB(2)2043/04-05(01)];
- (b) Lung Mei Bathing Beach [item no. 11 of the same Annex];
- (c) Tin Shui Wai Public Library cum Indoor Recreation Centre [item no. 13 of the same Annex]; and
- (d) Ecological Park at Tso Kung Tam Valley [item no. 25 of the same Annex].

DDLCS(A) further briefed members on the reasons for the Administration not being able to advance the implementation of these four projects, as set out in the "Remarks" column of Annex I to LC Paper No. CB(2)2043/04-05(01).

8. Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming pointed out that the commencement and completion dates set out in the revised implementation schedules of the 25 priority projects were still much later than those originally planned by the former Municipal Councils (ex-MCs). For example, the construction of the Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park (Phase II) had been scheduled by the Provisional Urban Council (PUC) for commencement in March 2007 and for completion in 2009. However, the commencement date for this project was early 2009 now. Mr CHEUNG requested the Administration to provide the original implementation schedules of the 25 priority projects which had been drawn up by ex-MCs for comparison.

9. In response, DDLCS(A) explained that under the ex-MCs' capital works procedures, only projects which were in Stage I and Stage II of PUC capital works programme and only those which were in Category I of the Provisional Regional Council (ProRC) might be regarded as having been formally approved and funded by the respective Councils in the form they were intended to be constructed. The remainder were at various stages of planning and were subject to change, deferral or cancellation. Moreover, these projects had not

Action

yet received all the necessary approvals, including funding approval and approval of scope, for them to proceed to tendering and award of contract. DDLCS(A) pointed out that the implementation schedules of the relevant projects drawn up by ex-MCs before their abolition were only indicative timetables. She added that however, the present implementation schedules submitted to the Subcommittee had contained concrete details, including dates of milestones, which would facilitate members' monitoring of the implementation progress.

10. Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, however, remained of the view that the Administration should provide the original implementation schedules of the 25 priority projects which had been drawn up by ex-MCs so that the public could have a full picture of the development of the relevant projects.

11. Mr Albert CHAN pointed out that under the ProRC's capital works procedures, there were the five-year rolling programmes of capital works projects, which had enabled ProRC to monitor the implementation progresses of various projects. He said that there was also a coordinating mechanism under which members of ProRC could decide on the priorities of LCS projects, taking into account the pressing needs of individual districts. He pointed out that, however, after the abolition of ex-MCs, the Administration was making all the decisions and LegCo Members did not have any role to play in determining the priorities. He added that the "Local Open Space in Areas 25, 25A and 25B, Tin Shui Wai" project and the non-provision of any sports facilities in Tin Shui Wai north were examples of the Administration's failures to prioritise the relevant LCS projects in accordance with the urgent needs of local residents.

12. DDLCS(A) stressed that the Administration had all along been in close consultation with the respective DCs on the priorities of LCS projects, and the selection of the 25 priority projects had also been agreed to by the respective DCs.

13. Mr Albert CHAN, however, pointed out that DCs had certainly not accepted the implementation schedules of the 25 priority projects, which were all scheduled for commencement at such very late dates.

14. Mr LAU Wong-fat said that the delay in the implementation of the outstanding ex-MC LCS projects was regrettable. He also expressed dissatisfaction with the late commencement dates, ranging from 2007 to 2011, for implementing the 25 priority projects. Noting that the Administration had, as an interim measure, been using school facilities in Tung Chung and Tin Shui Wai for organising sports activities for local residents, he asked whether the Administration would consider adopting the same approach for resolving the shortfall in LCS facilities in other districts.

15. Assistant Director (Leisure Services)³ (AD(LS)³) responded that there

Action

were many leisure venues managed by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) throughout other districts and school facilities would also be considered for organising recreational and sports activities to meet exceptional demands. AD(LS)3 pointed out that schools had been enthusiastic in participating in sports promotional schemes. He further briefed members on the School Sports Programme which was an example of such schemes.

16. Mr Patrick LAU requested the Administration to explain why most of the 25 priority projects were scheduled for commencement in as late as 2009 or even later. DDLCS(A) explained that under the Public Works Programme (PWP), the 25 priority projects also had to go through a prescribed process of around two to three years before construction works could commence. She said that this involved the finalisation of the project scope, the drawing up of project definition statement and the conduct of technical feasibility study; consultation with the DCs concerned and relevant organisations on the scope, detailed design and implementation schedule of each project; bidding of earmarked capital and recurrent funding under the annual RAE; engagement of a consultant for the preparation of the detailed design and tendering documents; seeking of formal funding approval from the Public Works Subcommittee (PWSC) / Finance Committee (FC); and launching the tendering exercise to engage a contractor to carry out the construction works.

17. In response to concern expressed by Mr Albert CHAN about the late commencement date for implementing the “Tin Shui Wai Public Library cum Indoor Recreation Centre” project, DDLCS(A) explained that the site involved was currently zoned “Undetermined”. It would be necessary to seek the Town Planning Board’s approval on planning application for this project, and this procedure was expected to take about three to six months to complete. She explained that this project also involved plot ratio problems which had to be resolved. She said that although LCSD was not in time to meet the deadline of the current year’s RAE in submitting funding application for this project, LCSD would still try to make an in-year bid in order to expedite the implementation of this project.

18. PD3 said that the Architectural Services Department had resorted to various ways to expedite the implementation of the priority projects, such as by engaging a consultant even before the RAE procedures commenced, by compressing the process of preparation of the detailed design and tendering documents, and by allowing the time span for some procedures to overlap so as to speed up the overall process. PD3 pointed out that the conduct of the feasibility study and the tendering process each had to take about four months. He added that in some cases, in order to expedite the implementation of a capital works project, the Administration had launched the tendering exercise once the support of PWSC had been obtained and even before FC had granted its funding approval.

Action

19. PD3 further said that while the planning lead time was normally about two years, the “Tin Shui Wai Public Library cum Indoor Recreation Centre” project, which involved the procedure of seeking approval from the Town Planning Board, would take six months more for its preparation before construction works could commence.

20. Mr Patrick LAU asked whether it would be possible to streamline the PWP procedures for the 25 priority projects in order to expedite their delivery schedules to meet urgent needs. DDLCS(A) explained that the Administration had explored every possible way, such as by advancing the bidding of funds where possible, and, by so doing, it had been able to advance the implementation schedules of 21 priority projects.

Admin

21. The Chairman requested the Administration to provide a flow chart on the procedures involved and the time span for each procedure for reference of members. PD3 agreed.

22. Mr Patrick LAU further asked why the implementation of the “Indoor Recreation Centre in Area 28A Fanling / Sheung Shui” project [item no. 17 of Annex I to LC Paper No. CB(2)2043/04-05(01)] was scheduled for commencement in as late as mid-2010. DDLCS(A) responded that the Administration had yet to draw up the project definition statement and this procedure would involve consultation with the DC concerned.

23. In response to Mr WONG Kwok-hing’s enquiry, DDLCS(A) said that although the project scope for the “Swimming Pool Complex in Area 2, Tung Chung” [item no. 21 of Annex I to LC Paper No. CB(2)2043/04-05(01)] had yet to be drawn up, the Administration’s target was to construct it in early 2009 and to complete it in late 2011. DDLCS(A) supplemented that as the population size of Tung Chung did not justify the provision of a standard swimming pool complex, consensus had initially been reached with Islands DC that the Administration would first provide an indoor heated main pool and an open air swimming pool in Area 2, Tung Chung to meet local residents’ needs. Mr WONG Kwok-hing requested the Administration to provide the supplementary information in writing.

Admin

Outstanding ex-MC projects under further review

24. Referring to the “District Open Space Area 3 Tsuen Wan” project [Project no. 245LS in Annex 2(16) to LC Paper No. CB(2)2043/04-05(01)], Mr Albert CHAN said that it was unacceptable that all the details of the project, such as proposed facilities, which he had discussed with the Administration ever since 1998 had all been deleted.

25. DDLCS(A) responded that the “District Open Space Area 3 Tsuen Wan” project would be subject to further review by the Administration, on a

Action

regular basis, in consultation with the DC concerned. She said that details of the project that had been worked out prior to 2000 could still be retrieved when it was decided that the project should be proceeded with.

26. Referring to page 13 of the summary of views of DCs (as at 27 June 2005) [LC Paper No. CB(2)2043/04-05(02)], the Chairman asked why the Administration had not added the “Improvement to the facilities in Approach Beach” and the “District Open Space Area 2 Tsuen Wan” projects to the list of the priority projects, as these two projects were also recommended by Tsuen Wan DC for priority implementation. Mr Albert CHAN supplemented that during the recent meeting of Tsuen Wan DC held to discuss the priorities of LCS projects, many DC members had strongly recommended that the “District Open Space Area 3 Tsuen Wan” project should also be given priority.

27. DDLCS(A) responded that the Administration would review the remaining some 70 ex-MC projects in the light of the views of DCs. She explained that given limited resources, the Administration had to set priorities for the implementation of various LCS projects. She pointed out that by the time that the implementation of the 25 priority projects was finished, it would be 2013, and this had far exceeded a five-year works programme. DDLCS(A) reiterated that the Administration would continue to review the remaining some 70 ex-MC projects on a regular basis in consultation with the respective DCs. DDLCS(A) explained that the Administration would consider whether to proceed with these projects having regard to the movement of population, the changing needs of the community, the existing level of provision of LCS facilities in the respective districts and their utilisation rates.

28. DDLCS(A) further said that whenever there were new and justified projects, the Administration would also carefully consider them in the context of the established procedures under PWP. DDLCS(A) informed members that this year, LCSD would also bid for funding, under the minor works programmes, for the implementation of 30 to 40 items of minor works for all districts.

29. In response to the Chairman, DDLCS(A) said that the way forward of the “Civic Centre for North District” project [Project no. 007CE in Annex 2(12) to LC Paper No. CB(2)2043/04-05(01)] would be subject to the Administration’s decision on whether or not it would adopt the “Private Sector Finance” approach to implement LCS projects. At present, this project was put under further review.

30. Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming expressed strong dissatisfaction with the delay in the implementation of some projects, such as the “Civic Centre for North District” and the “Tai Po New Civic Centre” projects [Project no. 009CE in Annex 2(15) to LC Paper No. CB(2)2043/04-05(01)], for which the DCs concerned had demanded for many years. Mr CHEUNG suggested that the

Action

Admin Administration should explain whether it was due to resources constraints or changes in policies that the Administration had decided to put on hold the some 70 outstanding ex-MC projects. The Chairman requested the Administration to provide the information.

31. Miss TAM Heung-man asked whether the Administration would provide a timetable for its review of the some 70 outstanding ex-MC projects. DDLCS(A) responded that the Administration was not able to provide such a timetable, as the implementation of the outstanding ex-MC projects would be subject to the outcome of the Administration's regular review and consultation with the respective DCs concerning these projects' priorities. She pointed out that with the implementation of the 25 priority projects as well as the many minor works programmes to be undertaken each year, the Administration considered that the needs of local residents for LCS facilities would, to a large extent, be satisfied. She further pointed out that, in fact, the Audit Commission had earlier expressed concern about the low utilisation rates of some sports stadiums and it was necessary for the Administration to carefully consider the justifications of LCS projects, as substantial capital costs and recurrent expenditure would be incurred by such facilities.

Admin 32. Miss TAM Heung-man expressed dissatisfaction with the Administration's reply as it implied that residents of districts concerned would have to wait for an indefinite period of time for the implementation of the some 70 outstanding ex-MC projects. She considered that the Administration should make an effort to complete the review and brief the Panel on the outcome within the next few months. The Chairman requested the Administration to take note of Miss TAM's comments

Allocation of funding for LCS capital works projects

33. Mr Albert CHAN said that the Administration should provide the following information for future discussion –

- (a) the ex-MCs' spending per year on LCS capital works projects for the five-year period prior to 2000; and
- (b) the Administration's spending per year on LCS capital works projects, for the five-year period after the establishment of LCSD and for the coming five years.

Admin Deputy Secretary for Home Affairs (3) invited members to note that the Government had to exercise financial constraint after the Asian financial turmoil and during the SARS period. The Chairman suggested that the Administration could also list out the percentages constituted by annual total spending on LCS capital works projects of the Government's annual total revenue.

Action

Admin

34. DDLCS(A) agreed to provide the requisite information as far as possible. She pointed out that however, there might be difficulty for the Administration to provide information on its annual spending on LCS capital works projects for the coming five years as it would be subject to the outcome of the annual RAE to be held in each of the next five years. Mr Albert CHAN said that if this was the case, the Administration could provide an estimate of its annual spending on LCS capital works projects for the coming five years. He emphasised that such information was very important to members in monitoring the provision of LCS facilities. Mr WONG Kwok-hing expressed support for Mr Albert CHAN's suggestion. DDLCS(A) said that she would seek the advice of the Treasury on this point.

Date of next meeting

Clerk

35. Mr Albert CHAN suggested that representatives of the 18 DCs should be invited to attend the next meeting of the Subcommittee to present their views on the priorities of the outstanding ex-MC projects and on the mechanism for determining such priorities. Members agreed that the next meeting be held on 19 July 2005 at 4:30 pm to meet with DC representatives.

36. The meeting ended at 12:30 pm.

Council Business Division 2
Legislative Council Secretariat
29 September 2005