

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. PWSC125/07-08
(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 13th meeting
held in the Chamber of Legislative Council Building
on Monday, 2 June 2008, 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 CHAN Yuen-han, SBS, JP
Hon Bernard CHAN, GBS, JP
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP
Hon SIN Chung-kai, SBS, JP
Dr Hon Philip WONG Yu-hong, GBS
Hon Jasper TSANG Yok-sing, GBS, JP
Hon Howard YOUNG, SBS, JP
Hon LAU Kong-wah, JP
Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBM, GBS, JP
Hon Miriam LAU Kin-ye, GBS, JP
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP
Hon CHOY So-yuk, JP
Hon Andrew CHENG Kar-foo
Hon LEE Wing-tat
Hon LI Kwok-ying, MH, JP
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
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 Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, GBS, JP
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, JP
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon Daniel LAM Wai-keung, SBS, JP

Public officers attending:

Mr Joe C C WONG, JP	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) ³
Mr MAK Chai-kwong, JP	Permanent Secretary for Development (Works)
Ms Anissa WONG, JP	Permanent Secretary for the Environment
Mr Raymond YOUNG, JP	Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)
Miss Sandra LAM	Principal Assistant Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) (Works)
Mrs Agnes ALLCOCK, JP	Deputy Secretary for Home Affairs (2)
Ms Janet WONG Chin-kiu	Principal Assistant Secretary (Recreation and Sport), Home Affairs Bureau
Ms Olivia CHAN Yeuk-oi	Assistant Director (Leisure Services) ² , Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Mr CHAN Wing-tak	Chief Technical Adviser (Subvented Projects), Architectural Services Department
Professor CHAN Kai-ming, JP	Vice Chairman, Hong Kong Sports Institute Limited
Mr WONG Shiu-kwan	Member, Hong Kong Sports Institute Redevelopment Project Steering Committee
Dr Trisha LEAHY	Chief Executive, Hong Kong Sports Institute Limited
Mr Godwin FUNG	Director, Corporate Services, Hong Kong Sports Institute Limited
Mr Kevin YIP	Project Manager, Hong Kong Sports Institute Limited
Miss Amy YUEN	Principal Assistant Secretary (Planning and Lands) ² , Development Bureau
Mr John CHAI Sung-veng, JP	Director of Civil Engineering and Development
Mr Alex YEUNG Wing-tsan	Chief Engineer (Tseung Kwan O and Sai Kung), Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr Damian LEE Kwok-hung	Assistant Secretary (Recreation and Sports) ¹ , Home Affairs Bureau
Mr YUE Chi-hang, JP	Director of Architectural Services
Mr Victor YIU Man-wai	Chief Executive Officer (Planning) ¹ , Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Ms Bernadette LINN Hon-ho, JP Deputy Secretary for Education (2)
Ms Mable CHAN Principal Assistant Secretary (Infrastructure
and Research Support), Education Bureau

Clerk in attendance:

Ms Rosalind MA Senior Council Secretary (1)8

Staff in attendance:

Mrs Constance LI Assistant Secretary General 1
Mr Noel SUNG Senior Council Secretary (1)4
Ms Angel SHEK 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(2008-09)13 15QJ Redevelopment of the Hong Kong Sports
Institute**

The Chairman advised members that the Panel on Home Affairs (HA Panel) was consulted on this proposal on 11 April and 9 May 2008. Miss CHOY So-yuk, Chairman of the HA Panel, said that at the meeting on 11 April 2008, Panel members expressed grave concern about the substantial cost increase from the estimated amount of \$1,263.2 million in May 2007 to \$1,707.5 million in the current proposal. At the Panel's request, the Administration explained to members at the meeting on 9 May 2008 the difference of the original and the updated estimated cost of the main works as well as the additional recurrent financial implication of the project. Some members queried the need of providing 9% for contingencies under the project estimates. The Administration was also requested to ensure that the project design would comply with the latest requirements of the Design Manual for Barrier Free Access 1997. While the HA Panel indicated no objection to the project, members requested the Administration to provide supplementary information on the contingencies, construction unit cost and the tender price escalation between 2006 and 2007.

2. Ms Emily LAU noted with concern that the Administration had only provided clarifications on the reasons for the substantial increase in the estimated project cost upon the request of HA Panel members. She called on the Administration to set out details of the differences in cost estimates in future funding proposals to the Legislative Council (LegCo). Miss CHOY So-yuk said that Members belonging to the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong supported the proposal. Miss CHOY nevertheless shared

Ms LAU's views that the Administration should provide a clear account of the cost differences to LegCo.

3. Ms Emily LAU asked whether the Government had a policy on the education and career development of athletes, as part of its policy on sports development. Mr LEE Wing-tat also expressed concern about the higher education opportunities available to retired athletes and enquired about the support and flexibility offered by education institutions in this regard.

4. The Deputy Secretary for Home Affairs (2) (DS(2), HAB) responded that it was Government's sports development policy to promote sports in the community, to develop elite sports, and to make Hong Kong a major location for international sports events. She advised that additional funding of about \$40 million had been provided since 2007/2008 for elite sports development, and resources had been allocated for education and career development for retired athletes. The Administration had obtained support of the eight higher education institutions funded by the University Grant Committee to facilitate athletes to pursue higher education in Hong Kong, including exercising flexibility in admission and facilitating elite athletes in participating in games during their studies in these institutions.

5. Ms Emily LAU enquired whether the high standard sports facilities to be provided in the redeveloped Hong Kong Sports Institute (HKSI) complex would be open to the public apart from being used for training of athletes. DS(2), HAB said that it had been the practice to maximize the utilization of the sports facilities of HKSI. This practice, not only would provide an additional source of income for the Hong Kong Sports Institute Limited (HKSIL) to support its operation, but also provide high quality sports facilities for public use (e.g. swimming pool and tennis courts). She added that these facilities were charged at reasonable fees when the facilities were not being used for elite training purpose.

6. Mr LEE Wing-tat questioned whether, in taking forward the redevelopment plan for HKSI, the Administration/HKSIL had given due consideration to the possible options of refurbishment and rebuilding before deciding to pursue the former option. Mr LEE was concerned that the Administration had only presented in its paper the merits of the refurbishment option without setting out clearly a comparison of the two options in terms of cost implications and the overall planning of HKSI.

7. DS(2), HAB advised that the reasons for refurbishing instead of rebuilding HKSI were set out in paragraph 9 of the Administration's paper. She pointed out that apart from cost-effectiveness and environmental friendliness, the tight timeframe for implementation of the project was one of the major considerations. Rebuilding the HKSI sports complex would take around 25 months, while refurbishing the existing complex would only take around 11 months. As such, if rebuilding was to be pursued, it would not be possible to meet the target of resuming HKSI's operation in Fo Tan around the third quarter of 2009, so as to return the Wu Kwai Sha Youth Village to YMCA by December 2009 for

the latter to host the World Council of YMCAs in 2010. DS(2), HAB pointed out that under the refurbishment proposal, amongst others, a new nine-storey multi-purpose building would be constructed and there would be significant increase in the construction floor area of the HKSI complex. Mr LEE Wing-tat was concerned that given the tight timeframe for project implementation, there was in fact little room for the Administration/HKSIL to pursue the rebuilding option.

8. Ms Emily LAU expressed concern about the provision of barrier-free access in the redeveloped HKSI and enquired the design of the proposed facilities.

9. The Chief Executive, HKSIL responded that one of the guiding principles of the project design was that the whole complex should be barrier-free, including athletes' residence, sports facilities and access to the facilities. Examples of the facilities included: ten rooms in the hostel for athletes using wheelchairs; rooms which could be flexibly adapted for athletes with other disabilities; a boccia court and fencing area designated for athletes with disabilities; ramp for access to the swimming pool area and a new elevated and covered walkway connecting the new nine-storey multi-purpose building with other key facilities of HKSI for safe access of all athletes in any kinds of weather.

10. Ms Emily LAU was of the view that information on measures to ensure barrier-free access for building projects, such as details of the facilities and their costs, should be included in the paper for the Public Works Subcommittee (PWSC), as in the case of energy conservation measures and environmental implications. She said that PWSC would need to know whether additional cost would be incurred for provision of barrier-free access. Miss CHOY So-yuk expressed similar views.

11. The Permanent Secretary for Development (Works) (PS(W), DEVB) advised that similar concern had been raised at previous PWSC meetings. He pointed out that the Sub-committee on Access set up under the Rehabilitation Advisory Committee provided recommendations to the Administration on the provision of barrier-free access in government facilities and community venues. Moreover, designs of government facilities were guided by the requirements of the Design Manual for Barrier Free Access 1997 as well as those stipulated in Regulation 72 of the Building (Planning) Regulations (Cap. 123F). PS(W), DEVB advised that the Administration had to ensure compliance with a number of statutory requirements in project delivery. With these mandatory requirements, it would not be necessary to set out details of all the facilities or design elements which were incorporated to ensure compliance with various requirements. He advised that the provision of barrier-free access would only constitute a small portion of the total project estimates.

12. As to Miss CHOY So-yuk's concern about measures to promote energy efficiency in buildings, PS(W), DEVB advised that the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department (EMSD) had developed codes of practice for energy efficiency of building services installations. The Administration would comply

with the stipulated standards in the design of new government buildings as far as practicable.

13. Miss CHOY So-yuk further enquired whether energy efficient features such as light-emitting diode type exit signs would be adopted for all public and subvented building projects. Ms Miriam LAU expressed concern about the cost-effectiveness of the energy efficient features and enquired about the amount of savings in recurrent cost for energy contributed by the features proposed in the Administration's paper. Noting that solar panels would be adopted for the project for showers and water heating, Ms LAU enquired whether solar energy generated by the panels would be available for other purposes such as lighting.

14. The Project Manager, HKSIL (PM, HKSIL) responded that HKSIL would try to incorporate, as far as practicable, various forms of energy efficient features with reference to the codes of practice developed by EMSD. He advised that the proposed energy efficient features would contribute to annual savings of over \$370,000 in energy cost. PM, HKSIL pointed out that according to the report of HKSIL's project consultant, the proposed use of the solar panels to generate renewable energy for showers and water heating was an optimal arrangement in terms of energy efficiency.

15. The item was voted on and endorsed.

Head 707 – New Towns and Urban Area Development

PWSC(2008-09)21 717CL Tseung Kwan O further development - site formation and infrastructure works at Pak Shing Kok, Tseung Kwan O

16. The Chairman advised members that an information paper on the project was circulated to the Panel on Development on 17 April 2008.

17. Ms Emily LAU noted that there were signs of land contamination in parts of the site formation area. She was concerned whether the polluter(s) could be identified and held responsible for the remedial treatment in accordance with the polluter pay principle.

18. The Director of Civil Engineering and Development (DCED) responded that the contaminated soil would require treatment by an appropriate remediation method prior to backfill on site. As the site area had been leased to different users under short term tenancies, it might not be easy to identify whether any users should be held responsible for the contamination. If the polluters could be identified, the Administration would ask the polluters to pay the cost for remediation works. The Chief Engineer (Tseung Kwan O and Sai Kung), Civil Engineering and Development Department (CE(TKO&SK), CEDD) added that part of the site formation area was being occupied under short term tenancies and the Lands Department would follow up with the existing users to ensure proper

clearance before they vacate the site. For previous users, more time would be needed to investigate the case.

Admin

19. Ms Emily LAU remained concerned that the Administration should take necessary actions in land administration to ensure that the polluter pay principle would be observed. She called on the Administration to identify, where possible, any existing or previous users of the site who should be held responsible for the land contamination and for the cost of remediation works. PS(PL), DEVB noted Ms LAU's concern and advised that users of government sites under short term tenancies were subject to the terms and conditions of the tenancy agreements in the use and maintenance of the site. He agreed to liaise with the Lands Department to examine records on leasing of the site under short term tenancies, in order to advise, before the relevant meeting of the Finance Committee, on whether the existing or any previous users of the site should be held responsible for the land contamination and the remedial treatment or the cost for such treatment.

20. Ms Emily LAU noted that some of the construction waste generated by the proposed works would be disposed of at landfills. She was concerned about measures to ensure proper disposal of construction waste by the contractor and to prevent fly-tipping. CE(TKO&SK), CEDD advised that the project would generate about 134 000 tonnes of construction waste in total. Of these, about 120 000 tonnes of inert construction waste would be reused on site and 14 000 tonnes of non-inert construction waste would be disposed of at landfills. As a normal practice for all public works projects, the Administration would require the contractor to submit for approval a waste management plan, which would include appropriate measures to reduce and reuse inert construction waste. The resident site staff would oversee the compliance of contractor with the approved plan in day-to-day operation and control the disposal of construction waste to landfills through a trip-ticket system. Ms Emily LAU called on the Administration to monitor closely compliance of public works contractors with measures for disposal of construction waste, and also take necessary enforcement actions to prevent fly-tipping by contractors of private projects.

21. Ms Emily LAU referred to paragraph 8 of the Administration's paper on the financial implications of the project and noted that provisions had been made for contingencies and price adjustment. She doubted whether there was overlapping between the two expenditure items. DCED responded that contingency and price adjustment were for different purposes. Contingency was provided to cater for unforeseeable changes and construction risks factors of the project during the works contract, while price adjustment was to meet possible increase in tender price. He advised that in some projects, part of the provision for contingency might be used to cover the escalated tender price which had exceeded the provision for price adjustment.

22. Prof Patrick LAU noted the Administration's plan of developing Pak Shing Kok into a low to medium density residential area together with school development, and enquired about details of the plan. CE(TKO&SK), CEDD advised that the initial plan was to develop Pak Shing Kok into a high quality low

to medium density residential area with about 2 000 private residential units for a population of about 5 000. Sites would also be reserved for two secondary schools to cater for the demand of the growing population of TKO.

23. Ms Miriam LAU appreciated the Administration's plan to complete the site formation and infrastructure works by 2012 so as to make available Pak Shing Kok for the planned residential and school development. She was however concerned about the timeframe for the planned development and its interface with the completion of the site formation and infrastructure works. Ms LAU opined that the planning and construction of the residential and school development should be taken forward concurrently with the site formation and infrastructure works, as the construction trucks for the planned development would damage the road surface and result in wastage of public resources.

24. CE(TKO&SK), CEDD noted Ms LAU's views. He advised that the Administration aimed to carry out site formation works, restoration works and provide associated infrastructure to serve the planned development at Pak Shing Kok concurrently under the project proposal. The proposed arrangement would avoid disturbance and nuisances caused by such works after the population intake in the residential development.

25. Ms Miriam LAU noted that three roads would be constructed under the current proposal and sought information on the configuration of the proposed roads. CE(TKO&SK), CEDD responded that road L781 and L782 were single carriageway local roads for public use with widths of 10.3m and 7.9m respectively. Road L783 was an access road to the service reservoir for restrictive use by staff of the Water Supplies Department undertaking maintenance duty. This access road would only have a width of 3.5m and designed with a number of passing bays along its length.

26. Ms Miriam LAU suggested the Administration consider standardizing the configuration of road L781 and road L782, so that road L782 would have a width of 10.3m to better cope with the anticipated traffic flow generated by the planned schools in the vicinity. In response, DCED advised that the configuration for road L781 and road L782 were worked out in accordance with the design standards of the Transport Department (TD), taking into account that road L781 was the key access road to Pak Shing Kok. At Ms LAU's request, DCED agreed to discuss with TD the feasibility of designing road L782 with the same width as road L781, i.e. from the proposed 7.9m to 10.3m.

Admin

27. Prof Patrick LAU noted that restoration works would be carried out for Area 108. He enquired about details of the landscaping works for the area, in particular, the planting proposals and the provision of lawns in the area. Miss CHOY So-yuk expressed similar concern. Miss CHOY said that LegCo Members had passed a motion recently urging the Administration to provide more lawns in Hong Kong for public enjoyment. She was of the view that the Administration should provide information on the provision of lawns in similar proposals to the Public Works Subcommittee in future.

28. CE(TKO&SK), CEDD advised that restoration works would be carried out for Area 108 to improve the landscape and visual quality other than for prevention of erosion. DCED added that as part of the restoration works for the previous borrow areas in Area 108, the Administration would plant 1 300 trees, 11 500 whip trees, 85 200 shrubs and 48 400 m² of grassed area. DCED nevertheless pointed out that as the previous borrow area in Area 108 was located on a hill, there was no proper road access for the public to get to the grassed area. The landscaping and planting works mainly aimed to restore the natural environment of the previous borrow area.

29. The item was voted on and endorsed.

Head 703 – Buildings

PWSC(2008-09)14 419RO Aldrich Bay Park

30. The Chairman advised the meeting that an information paper on the project had been circulated to the Panel on Home Affairs on 5 May 2008.

31. Mr Howard YOUNG remarked that he supported the project as it would provide more open space to the community in Eastern District, and the District Council (DC) had urged for early implementation of the project. Mr YOUNG, however, noted that since there were few driving ranges in the urban area, the existing driving range at the project site, which was leased out to the operator under a short-term tenancy, was quite popular and there were requests to retain the driving range in situ. Mr YOUNG asked whether consideration could be given to co-locating the driving range with the park at the site.

32. The Assistant Director (Leisure Services)2 (AD(LS)2), Leisure & Cultural Services Department (LCSD) responded that on consultation, the Eastern DC supported the provision of a park for passive activities at the site. The DC also requested that the park should incorporate the theme of traditional fishing village, vantage points of appreciation of the original fishing junks and lifestyle of the fishing community in Shaukeiwan area. AD(LS)2 pointed out that the driving range operator (the operator) submitted a proposal for co-location of the driving range with the park at the site to LCSD on 29 May 2008. However, the operator only proposed to release the car park of the driving range to merge with the nearby temporary sitting out area for building the Aldrich Bay Park which would not help allay the concerns of local residents regarding the nuisance caused by the noise, lighting and protection net of the driving range, and golf balls flying into residential units. The Government therefore considered the co-location proposal not feasible.

33. Mr LEE Wing-tat noted that there were few driving ranges in the urban area. He enquired whether LCSD had drawn up any planning standard for provision of driving ranges based on the size of population, similar to the

provision of swimming pools or football pitches. Mr LEE pointed out that the driving range operator submitted the co-location proposal in May 2008 probably because the existing short-term tenancy would expire by the end of 2008, and usually negotiation on renewal of such tenancies would not commence until the last quarter of the tenancy period. Mr LEE enquired about the number of complaints received by LCSD concerning nuisance caused by the noise and lighting of the driving range and golf balls flying into the nearby buildings.

34. AD(LS)2 responded that the Government did not have any planning standard for provision of driving ranges. She pointed out that on Hong Kong Island there was an outdoor driving range at South China Athletic Club and an indoor driving range in the Island East Sports Centre. AD(LS)2 explained that the short-term tenancy was granted by the Lands Department to the operator in 2004 for a period of two years which should have expired in May 2006. In response to the local residents' complaints to LegCo about the nuisance caused by the driving range, a case conference was held among LegCo members, relevant Government departments and complainants in 2005. As a result, the operator was offered the option to extend the short-term tenancy of the site up to end 2008 in exchange for its realigning the protection net further away from the nearby residential block and the site would be recovered by Government thereafter for open space development. The operator accepted the arrangement and hence should be fully aware that the short-term tenancy would not be renewed upon its expiry on 31 December 2008. AD(LS)2 said that in the past year, LCSD had not received any complaint regarding nuisance caused by the driving range.

35. Mr LEE Wing-tat expressed concern that LCSD and the media reports had exaggerated the extent of nuisance caused by the driving range. In fact, LCSD had not received any complaint in the past year concerning the driving range, although the Lands Department had received two complaints regarding the maintenance of the grass at the site. Mr LEE asked whether there was any documentary proof that the operator was advised in 2005 that the short-term tenancy would not be renewed upon its expiry on 31 December 2008.

36. AD(LS)2 replied that the short-term tenancy was granted to the operator by Lands Department, and LCSD had requested Lands Department to make available the site in early 2009 for development of a park. AD(LS)2 said that she did not have any information in hand to show that written notice had been given by the Lands Department to the operator concerning the non-renewal of the short-term tenancy by the end of 2008.

37. The Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands) (PS(PL)), DEVB, added that upon receipt of LCSD's request, the Lands Department should have advised the operator of the non-renewal of the short-term tenancy by the end of 2008. In response to Mr LEE Wing-tat's request, PS(PL) undertook to provide, before the relevant Finance Committee meeting, the notice given to Lands Department/the operator.

38. Miss CHOY So-yuk stated that the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong (DAB) supported the Aldrich Bay Park project. Miss CHOY pointed out that the complaint from local residents dated back to 2004. At that time, as the operator had already been granted the short-term tenancy, the residents eventually accepted that the driving range would only operate for four years, i.e. the two-year tenancy would be renewed for another two years so as to compensate the operator of the set-up costs. When the Eastern DC was consulted on the project in 2006 and 2007, members noted that there was no complaint against the driving range during the period. While the DAB noted the demand for driving ranges in Hong Kong, especially in the Eastern District, DAB considered that the co-location proposal could not allay the concerns of the local residents in view of the proximity of the driving range to the residential areas. DAB therefore supported the current proposal of building a park at the site concerned. However, the Government should consider providing a driving range in another area of Hong Kong Island to cater for the demand. Miss CHOY pointed out that Eastern District lacked open space, and Victoria Park should not be counted as part of the open space in Eastern District since the Park actually served the whole of Hong Kong.

39. Ms Emily LAU noted that Members had received a number of submissions from local residents requesting that the Government should not alter its plan in building the Aldrich Bay Park. Ms LAU said that since many members did not sit on the relevant Panels, the Administration should provide more background information on the proposal, and clarify whether the current proposal would be altered or the driving range had to cease operation as planned. Ms LAU opined that in view of the demand for driving ranges, the Government should take measures to meet the demand, and provide suitable sites for driving ranges to avoid causing nuisance to the nearby residents. Ms LAU asked whether some structures of the driving range, e.g. restaurant and offices, could be relocated to a site nearby.

40. AD(LS)2 responded that the Government had no plan to alter the current proposal for the Aldrich Bay Park project. AD(LS)2 pointed out that the Government had consulted the Eastern DC recently regarding the Park project and obtained its agreement to proceed with the project according to the original plan. The operator's submission on 29 May 2008 only proposed to release its car-park for the purpose of development of a park, and did not mention about the relocation of other facilities of the driving range to the open space next to Les Saisons.

41. Ms Emily LAU remarked that if the current proposal would not be altered, the Government should explain to the residents concerned to allay their worries.

42. Mrs Selina CHOW said that while she did not object to the Aldrich Bay Park project, she noted that some residents held different views. Mrs CHOW noted that there were few complaints against the driving range, and opined that the Government should draw up a balanced plan to meet the needs of the district.

Mrs CHOW asked whether the Government had assessed the level of popularity of the driving range at the site concerned, e.g. the number of users of the facility, with a view to providing such facilities to satisfy the demand. Mrs CHOW stressed that the needs of the niche group should also be looked after.

43. AD(LS)2 responded that while the Government recognized that the existing golf driving range on the site was serving a particular group of people, the Aldrich Bay Park project was proposed after full consultation with the DC concerned. With the recent development of the operator of the driving range appealing for assistance from the LegCo to pursue its co-location proposal, the Government had consulted the Eastern DC again which continued to support the implementation of the Aldrich Bay Park project according to its original scope and design.

44. Mr Alan LEONG remarked that the operator said that he had not been informed when the Eastern DC was consulted on the Aldrich Bay Park project proposal. Mr LEONG opined that it was unfair to the operator if he was not informed of the discussions of the proposed project at the Eastern DC, especially when over 3 000 people, six schools in the vicinity, and six consuls had expressed support for the continued operation of the driving range. Mr LEONG asked whether the operator had been informed when the Eastern DC was consulted on the Aldrich Bay Park project.

45. AD(LS)2 reiterated that the operator should be well aware that the short-term tenancy of the driving range would expire by end of 2008. The Eastern DC had also been informed of the situation of the driving range when consulted on the project. On 16 April 2008, the operator made a representation to the Complaints Division of LegCo and met with LegCo members on 8 May 2008. This showed that the operator was aware of the Government's plan to recover the site of the driving range for development by the end of 2008.

46. Mr Alan LEONG pointed out that since the operator had taken remedial actions in response to residents' concerns, there had not been any complaints about the driving range. The operator maintained that he was not aware of DC's deliberation on the use of the site when he sought assistance from LegCo in April 2008 to permit the continued operation of the driving range. Mr LEONG enquired whether the Government would defer the paper to a later meeting so that members and the DC could further consider the case. Mr LEE Wing-tat shared Mr LEONG's view and remarked that the Democratic Party did not object in principle to the proposed Aldrich Bay Park project. However, it would only be fair to the existing driving range operator, if he was given time to lobby members of the relevant DC and local organizations to support the continued operation of the driving range. Should the operator fail to canvass sufficient support for the driving range, he should accept the need to operate the driving range on an alternative site. Mr SIN Chung Kai concurred with Mr LEONG and Mr LEE that discussion on the current project proposal should be deferred for one or two weeks, so that the views from different groups of residents could be fully considered, and the Home Affairs Bureau (HAB) and LCSD could consider

devising measures to provide golf facilities for the players in view of the growing demand for such facilities.

Admin

47. Ms Emily LAU shared the views of the other Members and requested the Administration to provide a revised paper giving details on the background and developments of the controversy surrounding the driving range at the site, the views of the operator and the local communities, and the discussions held with the operator on the arrangements after the expiry of the short-term tenancy. She also requested the relevant bureaux/department to review its policy on provision of golf facilities for the community.

48. Mrs Selina CHOW said that while she agreed to defer consideration of the paper on the Aldrich Bay Park project, she considered that LCSD should come up with measures to solve the controversy on both short term and long term basis, e.g. by relocating the existing driving range to another site.

49. The Chairman asked whether the Administration would withdraw this item as requested by members. AD(LS)2 responded that she hoped the Subcommittee could consider this project so as to avoid delay to the implementation of the project, which was supported by Eastern DC and was scheduled to commence in February 2009.

50. Mr LEE Wing-tat said that deferring the item to a later meeting would not cause much delay to the project. Ms Miriam LAU shared similar view. Ms LAU expressed grave concern that the Administration had not responded to the demands of golf players though the sport had become increasingly popular in Hong Kong. She considered the Government should address the needs of the patrons of the golf range, as students from schools in the vicinity would be deprived of the opportunity to participate in the sport after the driving range had ceased operation. Ms LAU opined that when the Government planned to develop a park at the site concerned, it should also provide an alternative site for the driving range. Ms LAU asked whether an alternative site for the driving range could be identified between now and the end of 2008. She said that members should not be blamed for delaying the project because the Administration had not given sufficient thoughts to the proposed project.

51. AD(LS)2 responded that LCSD fully recognized the need for provision of golf facilities, and would liaise with the Lands Department to identify sites on Hong Kong Island suitable for use as driving ranges. However, the site in question had been designated for development as a park, with the support of the relevant DC. The driving range therefore had to cease operation on the site concerned when the tenancy expired at the end of 2008. PS(PL) supplemented that there were sites pending development which could be considered for use as driving ranges on a short-term tenancy basis. He added that in the absence of policy support for development of driving ranges, the Planning Department would not be in a position to designate sites for such developments.

Admin

52. Ms Miriam LAU remarked that the relevant policy bureaux should jointly review the policy for development of golf facilities to meet the demand of the public. Mr SIN Chung-kai shared Ms LAU's view that a comprehensive review on the overall demand for driving ranges in Hong Kong should be conducted. He pointed out that a considerable number of Hong Kong people had to travel to other places such as Shenzhen to play golf, and it was not conducive to environmental protection considering the substantial amount of fuel used for transportation.

53. The Assistant Secretary (Recreation and Sports)1 (AS(R&S)1), Home Affairs Bureau, responded that HAB would discuss with LCSD the need for identifying an alternative site on Hong Kong Island for the provision of golf facilities, and that the utilization rate of the existing driving ranges operated by LCSD would be a factor for consideration. AD(LS)2 supplemented that currently LCSD operated four driving ranges, two in-door and two out-door, with an average patronage rate of about 20%. Therefore, the existing facilities had sufficient capacity to cater for the need of golf players.

54. Mr CHAN Kam-lam opined that Aldrich Bay Park project had the strong support of the relevant DC and local residents, and the project should not be deferred. Nevertheless, the relevant policy bureaux should separately consider reviewing the policy on the provision of golf facilities in the territory.

55. Miss CHOY So-yuk pointed out that the site at issue had all along been designated for development of a park. However, as the site was not ready for development in 2004, despite strong objection from the local residents, a short-term tenancy was granted to the existing driving range operator on the understanding that the site would be recovered within two to four years for development of a park. Against this background, the relevant DC had unanimously supported the current Aldrich Bay Park proposal and termination of the driving range tenancy by the end of 2008. The Government should consider granting another site for providing the golf facility.

56. Mr LAU Wong-fat said that members of the Eastern DC and local organizations had made strong requests for the construction of the Aldrich Bay Park, in order to provide more open space and recreation area in the district.

57. AD(LS)2 suggested that if the current project proposal was endorsed by the Subcommittee, the Administration could provide the information requested by members before the relevant Finance Committee meeting.

58. Mr Alan LEONG stressed that the operator of the existing driving range should be allowed the chance to present his co-location proposal to the DC. He considered that the Administration should withdraw the item and re-submit it to the Subcommittee after the operator had met with the DC.

59. Miss CHOY So-yuk said that while she accepted that discussion of the item should be deferred for one to two weeks, she did not agree that LegCo

should impose on the relevant DC to hear the views of the operator.

60. AD(LS)2 pointed out that all DC meetings and the papers were open to the public. Although the operator had not been invited to attend the DC meetings, he should be aware that the short-term tenancy for the driving range would not be renewed upon its expiry at the end of 2008 as the site would be required for park development.

61. Mr LEE Wing-tat stated that if the Administration did not withdraw the item from the meeting, he would move a motion under Paragraph 33 of the Public Works Subcommittee Procedure to adjourn discussion of this item.

62. Having listened to the views of members, AD(LS)2 agreed to withdraw this item, so as to allow the operator to present his views to the relevant DC, on the understanding that the Subcommittee would be prepared to consider this item again within the current legislative session.

63. Ms Emily LAU said that it was members' intention to consider the item within the current legislative year, and arrangement should be made to include the item in the agenda of a Subcommittee meeting within June 2008.

64. Regarding the proposed theme on traditional fishing village for the leisure park, Ms Emily LAU expressed concern that given the small size of the site, the facility might not be attractive. She requested the Administration to revise the design, for example, by providing a lawn instead.

65. AD(LS)2 explained that the Eastern DC had been consulted on the proposed Park project, and the DC members suggested that some features showing that Aldrich Bay was originally a fishing village should be included in the project. A portion of the Aldrich Bay Park was therefore designed to include features of a fishing village, e.g. a pool with old fishing junks, and display panels showing the history of the Aldrich Bay.

66. Mr LEE Wing-tat expressed concern that the provision of a water pool in the Park might pose safety risk to children, while the provision of barriers at the pool would adversely affect the scenery. Mr LEE said that because of safety concerns, the Housing Authority had decided not to put water in the pools in the public housing estates. Mr LEE requested the Administration to provide information on the detailed design of the water feature in the proposed Park, and the measures to ensure safety and enjoyment of park users.

Admin

67. AD(LS)2 responded that many public parks under the management of LCSD were provided with water features, and there were measures to protect public safety, e.g. the water was relatively shallow, and there were safety features to discourage people from getting near to the pools. Regular patrols were also conducted by the management staff.

Admin

68. Ms Miriam LAU requested that in view of the popularity of the private driving ranges, the Government should examine the usage rates of existing golf facilities under the management of LCSD, identify the reasons for the low usage rates and consider measures to maximize utilization of these facilities such as inviting private sector participation in the management of the facilities. Ms LAU further requested the Government to provide the following information in respect of the proposed Park, in the revised paper to be re-submitted to the Subcommittee:

- (a) how the water feature would be maintained to prevent misuse;
- (b) the proposed use of the open plaza area and the Tai Chi court, and whether they would be designated for other exercising activities; and
- (c) details of the design and items to be provided for giving out scent in the scented garden.

Admin

69. Dr KWOK Ka-ki added that as the Council had recently passed a motion on the provision of more lawns for the public, the Administration should also provide information on the area of lawn to be provided for public enjoyment in the proposed Aldrich Bay Park.

70. The item was withdrawn by the Administration.

Head 708 - Capital Subventions and Major Systems and Equipment

PWSC(2008-09)19 88EB Redevelopment of Concordia Lutheran School at Tai Hang Tung Road, Sham Shui Po

71. Ms Emily LAU supported the provision of new building facilities for school premises which were under-provided by today's standard. She called on the Administration to allocate more resources and identify more suitable sites for implementation of the School Building Programme (SBP) in an expeditious manner. Ms LAU asked what factors would be taken into consideration in deciding whether the under-provided school facilities should be provided through in-situ redevelopment or reprovisioning at a new site.

72. The Deputy Secretary for Education (2) (DS(2), EDB) responded that in considering the redevelopment option for school buildings, the Administration would make reference to soft indicators of the school premises concerned as to whether: (i) the building was built over 30 years ago, (ii) the school occupied a small site area of below 3 000 m², and (iii) school improvement works had not been carried out for the school before. The Administration would also examine the circumstances of each school and the physical conditions of the school premises. The number of projects to be implemented under SBP each year would depend on

factors such as the availability of suitable sites in the districts concerned, given that an increasing number of school sponsoring bodies indicated their preference to continue operation of the school within their existing districts. DS(2), EDB advised that the Administration would exercise flexibility in undertaking school redevelopment projects such as taking forward redevelopment projects for schools which met only two of the above indicators, having regard to the availability of suitable sites and the needs of the school concerned.

73. Ms Emily LAU welcomed the provision of designated office for school social workers. She asked if this was a new provision and was concerned about the under-utilization of such offices if the school social workers had to provide services to a number of schools and would not station at any particular school. DS(2), EDB advised that similar offices had been provided for previous school projects and were categorized as offices for administrative and non-teaching staff and might not be specifically highlighted in previous submissions. DS(2), EDB added that the school social workers would need to use the office for counseling and interviewing students and thus the designated offices would not be under-utilized. In principle, each secondary school would have one school social worker but some schools might prefer additional outsourced services provided by workers of social services organizations.

74. The item was voted on and endorsed.

Items deferred

75. In view of time constraint, members agreed that items **PWSC(2008-09)20**, **PWSC(2008-09)16**, **PWSC(2008-09)15** and **PWSC(2008-09)18** scheduled for but not dealt with at this meeting should be deferred to the meeting to be held on 4 June 2008.

76. The meeting ended at 10:44 am.