

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. PWSC75/05-06  
(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 9<sup>th</sup> meeting  
held in the Conference Room A of Legislative Council Building  
on Wednesday, 10 May 2006, at 8:30 am**

**Members present:**

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

**Members absent:**

Hon Daniel LAM Wai-keung, BBS, JP  
Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming, SBS, JP

**Public officers attending:**

Mr Joe C C WONG	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) <sup>3</sup>
Mr Y C LO, JP	Permanent Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works (Works)
Mrs Rita LAU, JP	Permanent Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands)
Mr K K KWOK, JP	Permanent Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works (Environment)
Mr Davey CHUNG	Principal Assistant Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) (Works)
Mr C K WONG, JP	Director of Drainage Services
Mr K K CHAN	Chief Engineer of Drainage Services (Drainage Projects)
Dr M J BROOM	Assistant Director of Environmental Protection (Water Policy)
Mr K W MAK	Chief Engineer of Drainage Services (Consultants Management)
Miss Patricia SO	Assistant Commissioner for Tourism (2) Economic Development and Labour Bureau
Mr John S V CHAI, JP	Director of Civil Engineering and Development
Mr N P TONG	Chief Engineer (Special Duties (Works)), Civil Engineering and Development Department
Miss CHEUNG Siu-hing	Deputy Secretary for Security (1)
Mr C H YUE, JP	Director of Architectural Services
Mr Timothy TONG, JP	Commissioner for Customs and Excise
Mr TAM Yiu-keung, C.M.S.M	Assistant Commissioner for Customs and Excise (Intelligence and Investigation) (Acting)
Mr David CHOW	Customs Civil Secretary, Customs and Excise Department
Mr LO Fu Wai, JP	Assistant Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene (Operations) <sup>1</sup>
Ms Maisie CHAN	Principal Assistant Secretary for Education and Manpower (Infrastructure and Research Support)
Ms Bernadette LINN	Deputy Secretary for Education and Manpower (2)
Mr Francis LEUNG	Chief Technical Advisor of Architectural Services (Subvented Projects)

**Clerk in attendance:**

Mr Paul WOO

Senior Council Secretary (1)3

**Staff in attendance:**

Ms Pauline NG

Assistant Secretary General 1

Mr Anthony CHU

Council Secretary (1)2

Ms Alice CHEUNG

Senior Legislative Assistant (1)1

Mr Frankie WOO

Legislative Assistant (1)2

---

Action

**HEAD 704 – DRAINAGE**

**PWSC(2006-07)12 127CD Drainage improvement in Northern Hong Kong Island – Sheung Wan stormwater pumping station**

The Chairman advised members that an information paper on the project had been circulated to the Panel on Planning, Lands and Works on 14 November 2005.

2. Noting that \$4 million was earmarked for landscaping works under the project estimate, Mr Patrick LAU urged the Administration to further expand the scope of the greening works. Referring to Enclosure 2 to the paper provided by the Administration, he suggested that more greening works should be undertaken at the promenade along the waterfront near the proposed stormwater pumping station.

3. The Director of Drainage Services responded that the greening works for this project would be planned in conjunction with the Greening Master Plan for Central. He explained that the photomontage at Enclosure 2 to the paper presented only a preliminary outlook of the proposed pumping station and the surrounding areas, and the plan would be finalized after further consultation with the Subcommittee on Harbour Planning Review of the Harbour-front Environment Committee and the Central and Western District Council. The Permanent Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works (Works) (PS(W)) added that as stated in paragraph 27 of the paper, the Administration would incorporate planting proposal as part of the project, including the planting of 110 trees, 20 270 shrubs and 525 square metres of grassed area within the reinstated works site in the open space.

4. The item was voted on and endorsed.

**PWSC(2006-07)13 61DR Northeast New Territories village sewerage, phase 2**

5. The Chairman advised that the Administration had explained the proposal to increase the approved project estimate of **61DR** from \$107.0 million by \$38.0 million to \$145.0 million to the Panel on Environmental Affairs at its meeting on 24 April 2006. The Panel supported in principle the project to construct sewers for the 16 areas in North East New Territories (NENT) without public sewerage facilities to improve the village environs and sanitary conditions.

6. Mr Patrick LAU noted in many town planning applications that villagers in many areas in the New Territories were prohibited from constructing small houses unless such houses could be connected to the public sewerage facility. In this connection, he enquired whether the present project would improve the coverage of the public sewers so that more small village houses could be developed in the area.

7. The Chief Engineer/Consultants Management, Drainage Services Department (CE/CM, DSD) replied that the requirement of town planning approval for constructing small houses might or might not apply, depending on the land zoning in question. The requirement did not apply to land within the village type development zone. For areas outside the village type development zone, the Administration would assess the applications for small house construction individually, taking into consideration the special situation of the case, and might require the houses to be connected to nearby public sewerage system. He further advised that as far as the project was concerned, after its completion, more than 13 kilometres of sewers would be constructed for 16 villages, covering an area of about four square kilometres. This would facilitate the necessary connection of future small houses to the public sewerage system.

8. Mr LI Kwok-ying stated support for the project, which was welcomed by the rural community as an enhancement of the village sewerage system. He commented that the overall planning for small houses in the New Territories was unsatisfactory, resulting in inefficient use of land. The completion of the project would facilitate a better planning for the development of small houses. Noting that the completion date for the project was originally scheduled for February 2006 but revised to early 2007 due to disruption to the progress of works during construction, Mr LI urged the Administration to speed up the project.

9. In response to Mr Patrick LAU's enquiry, CE/CM, DSD advised that Ta Kwu Leng was not a water catchment area and hence the project would not affect the water quality upon completion.

10. The item was voted on and endorsed.

## **HEAD 705 – CIVIL ENGINEERING**

### **PWSC(2006-07)14 349DS Redevelopment of the Ocean Park – complementary public works on sewerage upgrading**

11. The Chairman advised members that the Panel on Economic Services was consulted on the proposal at its meeting on 24 April 2006. The Panel supported the project. Given that a number of other development projects would be carried out in Wong Chuk Hang, the Panel had requested the Administration to provide supplementary information on the overall sewerage upgrading plan for the Wong Chuk Hang area. The information was issued to the Panel vide LC Paper CB(1)1398/05-06.

12. PS(W) and Mr Patrick LAU declared interest as members of the Board of Directors of the Ocean Park Corporation.

13. The item was voted on and endorsed.

## **HEAD 703 – BUILDINGS**

### **PWSC(2006-07)11 65KA Customs headquarters building at Tin Chiu Street, North Point**

14. The Chairman advised members that the Panel on Security was consulted on the proposal at its meeting on 4 April 2006. At the Panel's request, the Administration had provided information on how the general facilities in the proposed Customs Headquarters Building (CHB) compared with those in the headquarters buildings of other disciplinary forces. Members of the Panel were generally supportive of the project.

15. Mr Patrick LAU stated support for the CHB project to co-locate some of the existing dispersed offices of the Customs and Excise Department (C&ED) in order to enhance the operational efficiency of C&ED and achieve more effective resource deployment. Noting that the project would be developed as a design-and-build (D&B) contract, he sought justifications from the Administration on adopting such an approach. Citing the example of the headquarters building of the Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC) in North Point, which was also being implemented as a D&B project, Mr LAU said that to his understanding, the ICAC had expressed concern that the adoption of the D&B approach would limit the ICAC's participation in the design of the project.

16. The Director of Architectural Services (D Arch S) said that the D&B approach had been used for a number of government works projects and the results were found to be satisfactory. He clarified that the D&B approach would not restrict the relevant user departments from contributing to the design of the projects, taking into account their operational needs. He explained that under the

established procedure for D&B projects, the tenderers' bids would include their respective design proposals, which would then be assessed by a tender committee. The views and suggestions of the user departments would be considered during the evaluation process to select the successful bidder as well as in the subsequent finalization of the project design after the contract was awarded. He pointed out that the ICAC headquarters building project had been implemented successfully through the D&B approach.

17. PS(W) and D Arch S further explained that the D&B approach had certain distinct advantages, such as:

- (a) The D&B approach was suitable for projects where the scope could be clearly defined in advance, leaving little room for uncertainty. It could therefore be used as a fast-track means for implementing urgent and time-critical projects;
- (b) Under this approach, the detailed design for the project could be reviewed, refined and finalized in tandem with the undertaking of the necessary advanced infrastructure works, such as ground investigation and site formation, hence shortening the timeframe for completion of the project; and
- (c) As the selected contractor was responsible for both the design and construction, the approach enabled the selected contractor to work in close collaboration with the architect in working out the design and implementation plan for the project, with enhanced creativity.

18. Mr Patrick LAU said that one of the drawbacks of the D&B approach was that each of the tenderers was required to submit a proposed design for the projects, and this would incur a very high cost for the unsuccessful tenderers. He suggested that for major works projects, the Administration should consider organising design competitions so as to tap the expertise of the professionals. He further pointed out that in the Mainland, bidders of a works project were entitled to a design fee regardless of whether they were awarded the contract. In Australia, the bidder who was awarded the contract was required to contribute towards the costs incurred by the unsuccessful bidders. Mr LAU said that the Administration might consider adopting similar practices.

19. PS(W) and D Arch S replied that for D&B projects, the number of contractors actually participating in the tender exercise would not be great. In practice, only a few (about three to four) pre-screened contractors would be invited to submit tenders, together with a proposed design for the project. Therefore, the resources utilized by the tenderers as a whole would not be significant. Regarding the payment of compensation to the unsuccessful tenderers, PS(W) said that the matter would have to be considered in the light of the principle of fair competition.

20. On Mr Patrick LAU's suggestion of organizing design competitions for major works projects, the Chairman invited the Administration to take note of the

view and follow up with Mr LAU where appropriate. Mrs Selina CHOW said that she did not support holding a design competition for the CHB as it would delay the completion of the project.

21. Mr LAU Kong-wah and Mr CHAN Kam-lam said the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong (DAB) supported the project. Mrs Selina CHOW also indicated support of the Liberal Party for the project. In their view, the construction of the CHB, which had received wide community support, had been delayed for a long time as the project was initially proposed as early as 1998. The delay had seriously hampered the operation of C&ED and efficient provision of services to the public.

22. Referring to paragraph 3 of the paper, which stated that the construction works would commence in April 2007 for completion by September 2010, Mrs Selina CHOW queried why the Administration had derived the estimated cost in money-of-the-day (MOD) prices based on forecast of price changes for the period 2007 to 2013, suggesting that payments might be made in 2013 prices when the project would have already been completed in 2010.

23. D Arch S clarified that the MOD estimate was derived on the basis of the Government's latest forecast of trend rate of change in the prices of public sector building and construction output. As there was the possibility that the project might be subject to unforeseen delay and some of the accounts would be finalized after testing of the completed works, the MOD estimates were derived on the basis of forecast price variations for the period 2007 to 2013. In regard to Mrs Selina CHOW's query, D Arch S confirmed that even some payments for the project would be made after project completion, the payments would be calculated on the basis of prices during the construction period, not in prices after the project had been completed.

24. Mr CHAN Kam-lam stressed the importance of good planning to ensure that the CHB, upon completion, would raise the operational efficiency of the C&ED and provide enhanced services to members of the public who needed to access Customs services in person. He enquired about whether the plan for the proposed CHB had taken into account the need for future expansion of the C&ED services.

25. The Commissioner for Customs and Excise (CCE) responded that the C&ED was always alert to the need to achieve the objective of constructing the CHB. He said that relocating the dispersed offices to the CHB would enable more effective and efficient command and control. Pooling resources together would also eliminate unnecessary duplication of common facilities and enable adjustments to be made more efficiently and economically when operational expansion was called for. He added that the proposed project had made provisions to allow for service expansion in the CHB.

26. Mr CHAN Kam-lam pointed out that apart from the C&ED, some other Government departments also had offices scattering in different locations and

districts. He expressed the view that the Administration should conduct a general study on re-organization and relocation of the offices to enhance operation and provision of more convenient services to the public.

27. Mr Albert CHAN enquired whether the Administration had considered locating the proposed CHB at the Kai Tak area under the South East Kowloon Development (SEKD) instead of North Point so as to affirm its commitment, as reported by the media, to take heed of DAB's suggestion to centralize government offices buildings, in particular regional headquarters, in SEKD. Otherwise, the Administration would be perceived to have misled the public.

28. CCE responded that the Administration had carefully considered the choice of site for the CHB. Eight different locations had been examined in detail and the site at Tin Chiu Street was considered most suitable for the proposed CHB, taking into account all factors including operational needs and public convenience. He reiterated that the project had been in discussion for many years with extensive consultation, including twice consulting the Eastern District Council (EDC) in October and December 2005. The EDC supported the proposal.

29. The Permanent Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands) (PS(PL)) refuted Mr Albert CHAN's comment that the Administration had misled the public. She said that having completed two stages of bottom-up public consultation and engagement, a consensus on the future development of Kai Tak was emerging. Adequate provision of "government, institution and community" facilities would be incorporated in the overall development plan. In this connection, a review on the current provision of government offices in Kowloon especially those operating in scattered and leased premises would be undertaken with a view to relocating some if not all to Kai Tak. PS(PL) further informed members that a Preliminary Outline Development Plan for Kai Tak was expected to be released in late June 2006.

30. Mr Albert CHAN maintained the view that the Administration had misled the public because the outline zoning plan for SEKD had not included setting up central government offices buildings as advocated by DAB. Mr James TO expressed the view that as C&ED had close operational relationship with many other Government departments, its offices, many of which were now scattered in different locations and operating in leased premises, might be centralized in a headquarters building in SEKD, if there were plans to construct central government offices buildings in SEKD. He agreed with Mr Albert CHAN's view that that SEKD was an option for locating the proposed CHB.

31. PS(PL) commented that the proposed CHB had gone through a long process of public consultation and had received strong support from LegCo members. Its implementation should be proceeded without further delay. It would not be appropriate to consider other alternative sites for the construction of the CHB. CCE added that C&ED currently had more than 5 000 staff, and the proposed CHB could only accommodate about 1 800. Some local formations still had to be situated in different locations for operational reasons. For example, the



Trade Control Branch, which was working in close collaboration with other agencies such as the Trade and Industry Department, was still located in Mong Kok.

32. Mr CHAN Kam-lam and Mr TAM Yiu-chung said that the DAB considered that the current situation of many C&ED offices operating in different locations, some of them in commercial leased premises, should be improved. The DAB supported the CHB project as it would enhance the operation of the C&ED. The proposed location for the CHB in North Point had been discussed and supported by the EDC. Mr CHAN Kam-lam further clarified that the DAB had not in fact proposed that there should be a cluster of governmental regional headquarters buildings in SEKD. What the DAB had proposed was that the Government should re-organize the existing scattered offices of Government departments with a view to raising operational efficiency. In so doing, consideration could be given to including in the SEKD the establishment of Government services centres to provide a wide range of centralized services for the convenience of the public. He said that the DAB's support for the construction of the CHB in North Point did not contradict with its proposal on the SEKD. Mr TAM Yiu-chung remarked that Mr Albert CHAN could not speak on behalf of DAB and as such should not be in a position to interpret the DAB's stance on the SEKD.

33. While expressing support for the project, Ms Miriam LAU noted that the proposed CHB, upon completion, would not achieve savings in recurrent expenditure. Referring to paragraphs 12 and 13 of the paper, she pointed out that the estimated annual recurrent expenditure arising from the project was about \$38.2 million, while the current expenditure on rental, utility, maintenance and management services of the rented and government owned offices released as a result of relocation to the proposed CHB was about \$36.3 million. She sought the reasons for the increase and enquired whether the C&ED would implement measures to control increases in recurrent expenditure when the CHB became operational.

34. CCE admitted that the recurrent expenditure arising from the project would increase. He explained that due to increased facilities and enlarged areas in the CHB, utility expenses would increase. In particular, electricity charges, which were a major recurrent expenditure item, were expected to increase from the current amount of \$7.9 million to \$15.2 million. With regard to rental, he advised that the current recurrent expenditure of \$36.3 million included \$17 million for renting non-government owned premises for existing C&ED offices. This amount could be saved after the completion of CHB. The existing rented space and government owned office accommodation released after relocation of the offices to the CHB could then be used by other departments. CCE further pointed out that in the absence of the proposed CHB for centralizing the dispersed offices, anticipated service expansion of the C&ED would lead to higher rental costs, estimated to be in the region of \$20 million. He assured members that the C&ED would closely monitor and control the recurrent expenditure arising from the project.

Admin 35. Following up on Ms Miriam LAU's enquiry, Mr LEE Wing-tat requested the Administration to provide a detailed breakdown of the estimated annual recurrent expenditure arising from the project in comparison with the current expenditure, and to account in more detail the estimated increase in recurrent expenditure from \$36.3 million to \$38.2 million before the relevant Finance Committee (FC) meeting.

Admin 36. Mr LEE Wing-tat further expressed the view that provisions should be included in the tender documents for new D&B projects requiring the contractor to incorporate energy saving measures in the design. Details of the proposed energy saving measures should also be provided in the written submissions to the Public Works Subcommittee. D Arch S responded that environmental protection proposals would be taken into account in selecting the successful contractors. At Mr LEE's request, the Administration agreed to provide a summary of the energy efficiency measures to be adopted in this project before the relevant FC meeting.

37. In reply to Mr LEE Wing-tat's enquiry on the plot ratio and height of the proposed building, D Arch S said that as the site was for the purpose of constructing a government building, no rigid plot ratio had been specified. For the present project, the plot ratio was 14.9, which was close to that of 15 for other buildings in the vicinity. The height of the building would be 131.5 metres above Principal Datum (mPD), which met the limit set by the Planning Department (PD). Mr LEE Wing-tat considered that as the site was close to the harbour front, a height of 131.5 mPD would have a visual impact on the ridge line and the harbour. He urged the Administration to take this into consideration when considering the design of the building.

38. Mr James TO considered that the proposed 32-storey building with 131.5 mPD height was too high and the upper floors would likely obstruct the view of the residents overlooking the harbour from Braemar Hill and the nearby areas. He suggested that the Administration should consider reducing the height of the building.

Admin 39. In response, D Arch S explained that the CHB was designed to meet the operational requirements of the C&ED, subject to site constraints. The building was more than 80 metres from the harbour front. In view of the concern about the visual impact of the building on the surrounding environment, the Administration had conducted a visual impact assessment on the project. The findings concluded that no significant adverse visual impact would be caused. At the request of Mr James TO, the Administration agreed to provide the results of the assessment before the relevant FC meeting.

40. Mr Albert CHAN expressed concern that the proposed CHB would create a screening effect which would aggravate the air circulation and hence worsen the air quality in the area. D Arch S reiterated that due to site constraints, the building was designed with a plot ratio that would enable the site, which was a relatively small one, to be optimally utilized. Notwithstanding this, the design would take

into account the need to comply with the requirements of the PD and the possible impact of the building on the environment. The design would include a podium and a high block not exceeding 65% of the total area, with the remaining 35% of the area being open space. Moreover, as the site was located next to a playground, the air ventilation would not be adversely affected by the building.

41. Mrs Selina CHOW enquired about the need for engaging consultancy services on soft landscape works. D Arch S replied that due to site constraints and the construction works, a total of 14 trees would need to be transplanted. Moreover, as the proposed CHB was a multi-storey building, it was desirable to incorporate environmental enhancement measures and soft landscaping in the project design, including greening works of the building.

42. Mr James TO supported the proposed reprovisioning of the existing Marble Road refuse collection point within the site as an integral part of the CHB. Noting that the site was located near a park and a temporary refuse collection point would be in operation during the construction of the building, Mr TO enquired whether special measures would be implemented to mitigate the impact of the construction work and the temporary refuse collection point on the users of the park.

43. In response, D Arch S advised that as the construction work would last for a few years, the temporary refuse collection point would be in operation until after the refuse collection point within the site had been commissioned. During the period, mitigation measures, including high efficiency air filtration ventilation system and a water scrubber system, would be used to remove the unpleasant odour coming from the temporary refuse collection point. He assured members that the Administration would undertake all the necessary measures to minimize the adverse impact and nuisances caused by the project.

44. Responding to Ms Miriam LAU's enquiry on the provision of barracks, CCE said that at present there were no facilities for customs staff who had worked long hours to take a brief rest in the office premises. The barracks in the proposed CHB would consist of four rooms with a total area of 250 square metres and bunkers sufficient for use by 50 officers. The barracks would be utilized by officers who needed to work for a long period of time in the investigation formations, or who performed overnight or standby duties during contingency situations.

45. On the exhibition centre in the proposed CHB, CCE said that it would be of an area of around 200 square metres. He informed members that the current exhibition centre in the Customs Training School in Siu Lam was quite small and not as conveniently located as the proposed CHB. CCE added that the new exhibition centre would be open to the public for enhancing public education and awareness of the Department's work. Visits to the Centre would be arranged mainly through appointments to facilitate control of visitors' flow and security.

46. Mr James TO suggested that as far as practicable, the multi-purpose auditorium in the proposed CHB should also be made available for use by other departments. In response, CCE advised that in 2005, the C&ED had organized some 80 public activities. Similar activities could be held in future making use of the multi-purpose auditorium. With the expansion of liaison with the community, it was anticipated that more events would be organized. He agreed that where possible, the multi-purpose auditorium in the CHB could be made available to other Government departments for their use.

47. Citing the construction of the immigration tower in Tuen Mun, which had arouse considerable resentment from the local community as the residents were against the provision of detention facilities in the building and they were not informed during the consultation stage of such facilities, Mr Albert CHAN enquired whether the provision of detention rooms in the proposed CHB had been clearly made known to the EDC, and if so, the EDC's views on the matter. In response, CCE said that the provision of detention rooms in the CHB was specified in the Administration's paper. The EDC had been consulted on the project and its members had not expressed any opposing views. He explained that as a law enforcement agency, C&ED would need facilities in its major operations buildings for the detention and conveyance of arrested persons and seized goods. As opposed to the Correctional Services Department where the arrested persons would be detained for a relatively long duration, most of the detainees in the CHB would be kept for a period of about one to two days. There would be a total of 20 detention rooms in the proposed CHB to meet the needs of eight investigation divisions. CCE added that C&ED normally handled 50 to 60 offence cases daily, most of which were minor cases involving the offence of selling pirated optical discs and illicit cigarettes. Detention of the arrested suspects mostly lasted two hours to not more than 48 hours. CCE further advised that from the operational point of view, the provision of detention facilities in C&ED premises in multi-storey commercial buildings, such as the offices at Rumsey Street and Middle Road, was not an entirely satisfactory arrangement because of security considerations.

Admin

48. At Mr Albert CHAN's request, the Administration agreed to provide, before the relevant FC meeting, information provided to and notes of deliberations with members of the EDC on the proposed project; and advice on whether members of the EDC were aware of the provision of detention facilities in the CHB and whether they had objected to the provision of such facilities. Mr Albert CHAN also suggested and the Chairman agreed that the Secretariat should write to the EDC for its views on the project.

Clerk

49. The item was voted on and endorsed. Mr Albert CHAN requested that his abstention from voting be recorded.

## **HEAD 708 – CAPITAL SUBVENTIONS AND MAJOR SYSTEMS AND EQUIPMENT**

### **PWSC(2006-07)10 84EB Redevelopment of Pooi To Middle School at Inverness Road, Kowloon City**

50. The Chairman advised members that the Administration had consulted the Panel on Education on the recent review of projects under planning in the School Building Programme. The Panel supported the Administration's recommendation to proceed with six projects for redevelopment and reprovisioning purposes, including the current proposal.

51. Noting from the paper that there was a circular-shaped structure protruding from the main entrance to the school to the pavement on Inverness Road, Mr CHAN Kam-lam asked whether the structure would obstruct the pedestrian flow. Mr CHAN also enquired about the merits of the design which separated the teaching block from the assembly hall and the classrooms at different locations.

52. The Deputy Secretary for Education and Manpower (DS(EM)) replied that the circular-shaped structure would be at an elevated position above the pavement and therefore would not block the pedestrian flow. On the school design and the provision of facilities in the school, she advised that the school sponsor had been given an active role to play and it had also sought the views from the teachers and parents. The present design was accepted by the parties concerned.

53. Mr CHAN Kam-lam noted that the proposed running track was rather short. In his opinion, the design was not good for the students. He suggested that the track should be lengthened. If a straight extension was not possible, lengthening by the provision of a greater curvature might also be considered. Mr Albert CHAN opined that a running track of 60 to 100 metres would be ideal for the students, and there was scope for improvement in the present design. He further commented that the interests and benefits of the students should be of top priority and the school sponsors should not be given too much discretionary power in deciding on the provision of facilities and use of resources, as the school sponsors' decision might not be to the best advantage of the students. In his view, the Administration should play a proactive monitoring role in this regard.

54. In response, DS(EM) said that running track was not a standard school facility. However, the Administration had taken on board members' views expressed at previous discussions and had endeavoured to include running tracks for newly constructed schools wherever possible, having regard to factors such as site constraints. As far as the project was concerned, she undertook to further discuss with the school sponsor on the desirability and possibility of constructing a longer running track. She further informed members that the Administration had planned to consult major school sponsors within the next few months on the scope of standard school facilities for future school projects. The review might have implications on the cost of constructing new schools. The provision of running

tracks in schools would be considered during the discussion.

55. The item was voted on and endorsed.

56. The meeting ended at 10:18 am.

Council Business Division 1  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
7 June 2006