

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. CB(4)1452/16-17  
(These minutes have been seen  
by the Administration)

Ref : CB4/PL/ED

**Panel on Education**

**Minutes of special meeting  
held on Monday, 15 May 2017 at 11:00 am  
in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex**

**Members present** : Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, JP (Chairman)  
Hon IP Kin-yuen (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, SBS, JP  
Hon CHAN Kin-por, BBS, JP  
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP  
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung  
Hon Claudia MO  
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP  
Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP  
Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP  
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen  
Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP  
Hon Dennis KWOK Wing-hang  
Hon Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung, SBS, JP  
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung  
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan  
Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, JP  
Hon Alvin YEUNG  
Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP  
Hon SHIU Ka-chun  
Hon Wilson OR Chong-shing, MH  
Hon Tanya CHAN  
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, JP  
Dr Hon CHENG Chung-tai  
Hon Nathan LAW Kwun-chung  
Dr Hon LAU Siu-lai

**Members absent** : Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung  
 Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP  
 Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, GBS, JP  
 Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP  
 Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yea, GBS, JP  
 Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, JP  
 Hon CHAN Han-pan, JP  
 Hon Martin LIAO Cheung-kong, SBS, JP  
 Hon CHU Hoi-dick  
 Hon HO Kai-ming  
 Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding  
 Hon HUI Chi-fung  
 Hon LAU Kwok-fan, MH

[According to the Judgment of the Court of First Instance of the High Court on 14 July 2017, LEUNG Kwok-hung, Nathan LAW Kwun-chung, YIU Chung-yim and LAU Siu-lai have been disqualified from assuming the office of a member of the Legislative Council, and have vacated the same since 12 October 2016, and are not entitled to act as a member of the Legislative Council.]

**Public Officers attending** : Agenda item I

Mr Kevin YEUNG, JP  
 Under Secretary for Education

Miss Sharon KO  
 Principal Assistant Secretary (Higher Education)  
 Education Bureau

Miss Winnie WONG  
 Deputy Secretary-General (1)  
 University Grants Committee Secretariat

Agenda item II

Mr Kevin YEUNG, JP  
 Under Secretary for Education

Ms Kathy NG  
 Project Manager (School Building)2  
 School Building Section  
 Infrastructure & Research Support Division  
 Education Bureau

**Attendance by  
Invitation** : Agenda item I

The University of Hong Kong

Dr Steven J CANNON  
Executive Vice-President (Administration & Finance)

Professor CHAN Ying-shing  
Associate Dean (Development and Infrastructure)  
Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine

Mr K L TAM  
Director of Estates

AD+RG

Mr Bernard V LIM  
Principal

**Clerk in  
attendance** : Ms Angel WONG  
Chief Council Secretary (4)4

**Staff in  
attendance** : Mr KWONG Kam-fai  
Senior Council Secretary (4)4

Miss Mandy NG  
Council Secretary (4)4

Ms Sandy HAU  
Legislative Assistant (4)4

---

**I. 8063EG – Academic Building at No. 3 Sassoon Road, University of Hong Kong**

(LC Paper No. CB(4)1009/16-17(01) -- Paper provided by the Administration)

The Chairman drew members' attention to Rule 83A of the Rules of Procedure which provided that a Member shall not move any motion or amendment relating to a matter in which he had a pecuniary interest, whether direct or indirect, or speak on any such matter, except where he disclosed the nature of that interest. She reminded members to declare interests, if any, in the matter under discussion.

ActionBriefing by the Administration

2. The Under Secretary for Education ("US(Ed)") briefed members on the proposed capital works project ("proposed project") for The University of Hong Kong ("HKU") to construct a new academic building ("new building") at No.3 Sassoon Road for its Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine, details of which were set out in the Administration's paper [LC Paper No. CB(4)1009/16-17(01)]. Mr Bernard V LIM, Principal, AD+RG then gave a PowerPoint presentation on the project design. The Administration planned to seek the endorsement of the Public Works Subcommittee ("PWSC") and the funding approval of the Finance Committee ("FC") in mid-2017.

*(Post-meeting note: The PowerPoint presentation materials were issued to members via LC Paper No. CB(4)1034/16-17(01) on 15 May 2017.)*

Discussion*Cost of the proposed project*

3. While expressing support for the proposed project, Dr LAU Siu-lai asked about the need for incorporating various green features, such as sky gardens and vertical greening with climbers, in the new building and the cost for adopting these features. Mr K L TAM, Director of Estates, HKU advised that the Southern District Council ("Southern DC") members, when being consulted, had encouraged greening in the proposed project. The cost of vertical greening was about \$2 million. In fact, the estimated project cost of \$840.1 million was on the low side as compared with other similar projects. HKU planned to upgrade the environmental features in the new building for the public benefit and cover the expenses through fund-raising activities.

4. The Deputy Chairman supported the proposed project. He noted that the project costs of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University's ("PolyU") Innovation Tower and The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology's ("HKUST") Research and Academic Building had been shared between the Government and the institutions concerned, but the Government would provide full funding support to the proposed project. He enquired about the criteria for determining the cost-sharing arrangement and the percentage of cost-sharing. Ms Claudia MO, who supported the proposed project, shared the Deputy Chairman's concern and enquired about HKU's reserve for campus development.

5. Mr K L TAM, Director of Estates, HKU advised that HKU had been supplementing the cost of various public works projects through fund-raising activities. Although the Government would fund the proposed project in full, HKU would be responsible for the cost of enhanced building features and

Action

teaching facilities therein. US(Ed) added that in principle, the Government would pay for the full cost of construction of teaching facilities. However, expenses for additional works required by universities, such as extra items in the project or upgrading of part of the building features that went beyond the standards of publicly-funded works projects, would have to be met by the institutions concerned. As regards the proposed project of HKU, given that no extra works items or upgrading of building features would be involved, the Administration would fund the project in full in accordance with the established policy. At members' request, US(Ed) agreed to provide information on the cost-sharing arrangement for the public works projects of PolyU and HKUST as mentioned in paragraph 4.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's written response was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(4)1129/16-17(01) on 31 May 2017.)*

6. Mr Wilson OR said that Members of the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong welcomed the proposed project. He asked whether the Administration had evaluated the risks of project cost overrun and estimated the additional cost required in case of project delay. Ms Claudia MO concurred with Mr OR that a projection of cost overrun should be conducted. Dr LAU Siu-lai enquired about the track record of the contractor of the proposed project.

7. US(Ed) advised that based on information provided by HKU and barring any unforeseeable circumstances, the Administration was confident that the proposed project would be completed on schedule and within budget if FC approved the proposed project within this legislative council session. At this stage, the Administration was not aware of any unforeseeable factors that might lead to cost overrun (e.g. difficult geological conditions). In case of cost overrun, approval of supplementary provisions would be sought from PWSC and FC in accordance with the established procedures. Given HKU's past successful experiences, Mr K L TAM, Director of Estates, HKU assured members that construction works and project costs would be closely monitored to avoid project delay or cost overrun. Mr Bernard V LIM, Principal, AD+RG added that in comparison with foundation works, building works as in the proposed project would have less risk of cost overrun owing to unforeseeable factors. Relevant technical feasibility assessments had been conducted to ensure expenditure control of the proposed project. Regarding the contractor, Mr K L TAM, Director of Estates, HKU advised that as the tendering exercise had yet to be completed, the name of the contractor could not be disclosed.

Action*Accessibility and facilities of the project*

8. Mr Wilson OR asked whether Southern DC members had during the consultation raised any concerns about the proposed project. Mr K L TAM, Director of Estates, HKU responded that Southern DC had requested HKU to incorporate various green features in the new building to soften its outlook and complement surrounding environment. The connectivity and pedestrian circulation of the HKU campus and Queen Mary Hospital ("QMH") was another concern. Hence, the new building would be connected to the existing pedestrian bridge to QMH by a link bridge so as to provide a safe and convenient access for the users of the new building and QMH.

9. Mr SHIU Ka-chun expressed support for the proposed project. He enquired whether there would be gender-friendly toilets and changing rooms in the new building. Dr LAU Siu-lai sought information on the design of the gender-friendly toilets. Mr K L TAM, Director of Estates, HKU advised that the new building was most likely to be the first university building in Hong Kong with gender-friendly toilets on each floor. Mr Bernard V LIM, Principal, AD+RG supplemented that apart from male, female and accessible toilets, a total of 41 gender-friendly toilets would be provided in the new building. Gender-friendly toilets would comprise different compartments with full-height partitions.

Summing up

10. Concluding the discussion, the Chairman said that the Panel supported the Administration's submission of the proposal to PWSC.

## **II. 3352EP – A 30-classroom primary school at Tonkin Street, Cheung Sha Wan**

(LC Paper No. CB(4)1009/16-17(02) -- Paper provided by the Administration)

Briefing by the Administration

11. US(Ed) briefed members on the proposal to construct a primary school at Tonkin Street, Cheung Sha Wan for the reprovisioning of Pak Tin Catholic Primary School ("the School"), as set out in LC Paper No. CB(4)1009/16-17(02). The Administration planned to submit the funding proposal to PWSC and FC for approval in May and June 2017 respectively.

Discussion*Reprovisioning of schools in public housing estates*

12. The Deputy Chairman expressed support for the reprovisioning of the School. He said that in view of the poor physical conditions of the School, the Principal had expressed the need for redevelopment in 2013. However, the School would not be rebuilt together with the redevelopment of Pak Tin Estate and the to-be-vacated school premises might be re-allocated for school use. The Deputy Chairman questioned the rationale for not taking this opportunity to rebuild the School and the practicality in re-allocating the sub-standard to-be-vacated premises for another school. Ms Claudia MO shared similar concerns. US(Ed) advised that to his understanding, a site had been reserved for a new primary school under Pak Tin Estate Development Programme. The construction of the new school would be subject to various factors such as the projected demand for primary school places in the district. The Government planned overall provision of school places on a school net basis and it might not be feasible to have a school in each public housing estate. Further, the School would remain in the same school net after reprovisioning. In accordance with the central house mechanism, the to-be-vacated premises would be returned to the Government once it was confirmed not required for school or other educational uses.

13. Responding US(Ed)'s reply, the Deputy Chairman said that according to the Education Bureau ("EDB")'s information provided in 2010, there should be two primary schools at Pak Tin Estate upon completion of redevelopment. In other words, one would be the new school mentioned by US(Ed) and the other would be the to-be-vacated sub-standard premises. He considered the arrangement undesirable and called on the Administration to explore alternative(s) to follow up with the redevelopment needs of sub-standard school premises, including the formulation of a policy to include these school premises when planning the redevelopment of respective housing estates. US(Ed) explained that the information in 2010 might not be up to date with the changes in student population as well as the demand and supply of school places. Upon reprovisioning of the School and the phased completion of the redevelopment of Pak Tin Estate, EDB would consider the latest projections and factors that might affect the demand for school places before deciding the number of primary schools in the Estate. Although the redevelopment plan of individual housing estates should be considered on its own merit, he agreed in principle that when planning for the redevelopment of housing estates, sub-standard schools in the housing estates should be taken into account as well. The Deputy Chairman requested the Administration to provide the impact of population projections on the demand for primary school places in the school net of the School.

Action

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's written response was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(4)1136/16-17(01) on 1 June 2017.)*

*(At about 12:00 noon, the Chairman informed members that the meeting would be extended for 10 minutes to 12:10 pm.)*

*School Allocation Exercise*

14. The Deputy Chairman noted that there had been 13 applications for the allocation of the new school premises at Tonkin Street. He sought information on the criteria for assessing applications under this School Allocation Exercise ("SAE"). US(Ed) explained that it might not be appropriate to disclose the assessment result of individual school. In principle, once a new school premises was confirmed to be required for allocation for school use, EDB would normally invite applications from all eligible applicant bodies in the territory through SAE on a fair and competitive basis. Proposals of the concerned applications were assessed by the School Allocation Committee ("SAC") comprising official and non-official members. Education quality was the prime consideration of SAC when making recommendations on school allocation. Other factors, including the operation track record of the school sponsoring body ("SSB"), mission of the school, school performance, conditions of the existing premises and school net, etc. would also be considered. US(Ed) undertook to provide in detail the selection criteria for considering applications under SAE.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's written response was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(4)1136/16-17(01) on 1 June 2017.)*

15. Dr Helena WONG considered that the Administration should enhance the transparency of the selection criteria under SAE. Dr LAU Siu-lai asked about the major considerations for assessing the performance of schools under SAE and whether the results of the Territory-wide System Assessment ("TSA") would be taken into account. US(Ed) advised that performance indicators included teaching and learning, internal management, school ethos and support for students, etc. and TSA result was not an indicator.

16. The Chairman opined that EDB should consider informing unsuccessful SAE applicants of individual assessment results. As it was difficult to quantify the assessment results under current SAE, she suggested the Administration to adopt a marking scheme for assessing applications. New or vacant school premises would be awarded to applicant bodies with the highest total scores.

17. The Deputy Chairman and Dr Helena WONG enquired about the timetable for reprovisioning and/or redevelopment of sub-standard school premises, including the unsuccessful applicant bodies. US(Ed) advised that

Action

reprovisioning of these schools hinged on the availability of appropriate school sites/premises in the territory and public resources. SAE would be launched from time to time and eligible SSBs would be invited to apply. The Deputy Chairman requested EDB to explain how the issues of insufficient space and facilities of sub-standard school premises would be addressed when submitting the funding proposal to PWSC and FC for approval.

Summing up

18. Concluding the discussion, the Chairman said that the Panel supported the Administration's submission of the proposal to PWSC.

**III. Any other business**

19. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 12:10 pm.

Council Business Division 4  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
24 July 2017