

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. PWSC183/17-18
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/F/2/1(18)B

**Public Works Subcommittee of the Finance Committee
of the Legislative Council**

**Minutes of the 17th meeting
held in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex
on Wednesday, 11 April 2018, at 8:30 am**

Members present:

Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, SBS, MH, JP (Chairman)
Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP
Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, GBS, JP
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, SBS, JP
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, BBS, JP
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP
Hon Claudia MO
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, SBS, JP
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH
Hon YIU Si-wing, BBS
Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen
Hon CHAN Han-pan, JP
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, SBS, MH, JP
Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
Hon Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung, SBS, JP

Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan
Hon Alvin YEUNG
Hon Andrew WAN Siu-kin
Hon CHU Hoi-dick
Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP
Hon HO Kai-ming
Hon LAM Cheuk-ting
Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding
Hon Wilson OR Chong-shing, MH
Hon Tanya CHAN
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, JP
Hon HUI Chi-fung
Hon LUK Chung-hung
Hon LAU Kwok-fan, MH
Dr Hon CHENG Chung-tai
Hon KWONG Chun-yu
Hon Jeremy TAM Man-ho
Hon Gary FAN Kwok-wai
Hon AU Nok-hin
Hon Vincent CHENG Wing-shun, MH
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS

Public officers attending:

Mr Raistlin LAU Chun, JP	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) ³
Miss Joey LAM Kam-ping, JP	Deputy Secretary for Development (Works) ¹
Ms Bernadette LINN, JP	Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)
Mr Elvis AU Wai-kwong, JP	Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1)
Ms Margaret HSIA Mai-chi	Principal Assistant Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) (Works)

Ms Doris HO Pui-ling, JP	Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)1
Mr Ivan CHUNG Man-kit	Principal Assistant Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)5
Mr LAM Sai-hung, JP	Director of Civil Engineering and Development
Mr LAU Wing-kam	Chief Engineer (West)1 West Development Office Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr Ricky CHONG Kwok-man	Principal Assistant Secretary for Innovation and Technology
Ms Annie CHOI Suk-han, JP	Commissioner for Innovation and Technology
Mr Ivan LEE Kwok-bun, JP	Deputy Commissioner for Innovation and Technology
Ms Maggie CHIN Man-yi	District Planning Officer (Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East) Planning Department
Mr Jack CHAN Jick-chi, JP	Under Secretary for Home Affairs
Ms Linda LAW Lai-tan	Principal Assistant Secretary for Home Affairs (Recreation and Sport)2
Ms Brenda AU Kit-ying	Head of Energizing Kowloon East Office Development Bureau
Mr Edwin WONG Kuo-yang	Deputy Head of Energizing Kowloon East Office Development Bureau
Mrs Sylvia LAM YU Ka-wai, JP	Director of Architectural Services
Mr Edward TSE Cheong-wo	Project Director (3) Architectural Services Department

Mr Raymond LAU	Senior Project Manager 332 Architectural Services Department
Mr LIN Wai-tung	Senior Project Manager 321 Architectural Services Department
Mrs Doris FOK LEE Sheung-ling	Assistant Director of Leisure and Cultural Services (Leisure Services)1
Mr Michael CHIU Yat-on	Chief Executive Officer (Planning)1 Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Mr LAM Kwok-fai	Chief Highway Engineer (Kowloon) Highways Department

Clerk in attendance:

Ms Doris LO	Chief Council Secretary (1)2
-------------	------------------------------

Staff in attendance:

Mr Raymond CHOW	Senior Council Secretary (1)6
Ms Christina SHIU	Legislative Assistant (1)2
Ms Christy YAU	Legislative Assistant (1)7
Ms Clara LO	Legislative Assistant (1)8

Action

The Chairman advised that there were five funding proposals on the agenda for the meeting, all of which were items carried over from the previous meeting. He reminded members that in accordance with Rule 83A of the Rules of Procedure ("RoP") of the Legislative Council ("LegCo"), they should disclose the nature of any direct or indirect pecuniary interests relating to the funding proposals under discussion at the meeting before they spoke on the proposals. He also drew members' attention to Rule 84 of RoP on voting in case of direct pecuniary interest.

Head 707 – New Towns and Urban Area Development

PWSC(2017-18)34 748CL Development of Lok Ma Chau Loop – land decontamination and advance engineering works

760CL Development of Lok Ma Chau Loop – Main Works Package 1

2. The Chairman advised that the proposal, i.e. PWSC(2017-18)34, sought to upgrade 748CL and part of 760CL to Category A at the estimated costs of \$517.6 million and \$268.3 million in money-of-the-day ("MOD") prices respectively, for carrying out land decontamination and advance engineering works at the Lok Ma Chau Loop ("the Loop") and engaging consultants to undertake the detailed design and site investigation for the site formation and associated infrastructure works of Phase 1 of the Loop development. The Subcommittee had commenced deliberation on the proposal at the meeting on 28 March 2018.

Development planning of the Lok Ma Chau Loop

3. Mr CHU Hoi-dick referred to the supplementary information paper provided by the Government for the Subcommittee ([LC Paper No. PWSC166/17-18\(01\)](#)) and pointed out that the study area of the Planning and Engineering Study on Development of Lok Ma Chau Loop ("the P&E Study") comprised three areas, including Area A and Area B which fell within the boundary of Hong Kong, and Area C (with an area of about 167 hectares) which abutted on the Loop and fell within the boundary of Shenzhen. Besides, under the Memorandum of Understanding on Jointly Developing the Lok Ma Chau Loop by Hong Kong and Shenzhen ("the MOU"), the Shenzhen side was planning to develop an area of about three square kilometres (i.e. about 300 hectares) at the north side of Shenzhen River and adjacent to the Loop into a Shenzhen Innovation and Technology Zone ("the SZ I&T Zone"). Mr CHU asked whether the governments of Hong Kong and Shenzhen had set up a communication platform on the future development of Area C, the location of the SZ I&T Zone, and whether the scope of the SZ I&T Zone and Area C would overlap. Mr CHU opined that the Government should urge the Shenzhen side to enhance the transparency of the planning of Area C and release more relevant information.

4. Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)1 ("DS(P&L)1/DEVB") explained that the study for Zone C was undertaken by the Shenzhen side and the Hong Kong side had not been provided with the final documentation of the study for Area C. On the other hand, she confirmed that the SZ I&T Zone within the boundary of Shenzhen as mentioned in the MOU encompassed the area of Area C. However, the

relevant development was a longer-term planning proposal of the Shenzhen side. At the current stage, the Joint Task Force on the Development of the Hong Kong-Shenzhen Innovation and Technology Park in the Loop ("the Joint Task Force") formed by the governments of both Hong Kong and Shenzhen under the MOU focused mainly on studying and negotiating major issues arising from the development of the Hong Kong – Shenzhen Innovation and Technology Park at the Loop. As regards the development of the SZ I&T Zone (including Area C), discussion could be held through the Joint Task Force in future depending on the circumstances.

Transport connection of the Loop with surrounding areas

5. Mr CHU Hoi-dick noted that according to the MOU, the Hong Kong side had agreed to take effective measures to facilitate the exit and entry of mutually approved personnel of the Shenzhen side. He enquired whether the measures referred to the construction of a pedestrian link to Hong Kong and the associated boundary-crossing facilities at the location of the proposed Fulin Station of Shenzhen Metro.

6. DS(P&L)1/DEVB responded that the proposal of constructing a pedestrian link with Shenzhen and the associated boundary-crossing facilities to the north of the Loop put forward in the P&E Study was a long-term plan. The proposal required further study.

7. As the contents of some questions put forward by members was beyond the scope of the agenda item (e.g. questions on the SZ I&T Zone developed by Shenzhen within its boundary), the Chairman reminded members that such questions should be raised at a relevant Panel or on other occasions.

Voting on PWSC(2017-18)34

8. There being no further questions on the item from members, the Chairman put PWSC(2017-18)34 to vote. At the request of members, the Chairman ordered a division. Sixteen members voted for and four members voted against the proposal. One member abstained. The votes of individual members were as follows:

For:

Mr Charles Peter MOK (Deputy Chairman)	Mr Abraham SHEK
Ms Starry LEE	Mr Frankie YICK
Mr WU Chi-wai	Mr YIU Si-wing
Mr MA Fung-kwok	Mr CHAN Han-pan
Mr LEUNG Che-cheung	Ms Alice MAK

Mr Christopher CHEUNG
Mr Holden CHOW
Mr Vincent CHENG
(16 members)

Mr HO Kai-ming
Mr LAU Kwok-fan
Mr Tony TSE

Against:

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen
Dr CHENG Chung-tai
(4 members)

Mr CHU Hoi-dick
Mr Gary FAN

Abstain:

Ms Tanya CHAN
(1 member)

9. The Chairman declared that the item was endorsed by the Subcommittee. Dr KWOK Ka-ki requested that this item, i.e. PWSC(2017-18)34, be voted on separately at the relevant meeting of the Finance Committee ("FC").

Head 703 – Buildings

PWSC(2017-18)32 436RO Avenue Park at Kai Tak
452RO Waterfront promenade adjacent to the Hong Kong Children's Hospital
466RO Improvement of Hoi Bun Road Park and adjacent area

10. The Chairman advised that the proposal, i.e. PWSC(2017-18)32, sought to upgrade 436RO, 452RO and 466RO (hereinafter collectively referred to as "the three proposed P/WP projects") to Category A at the estimated costs of \$321.9 million, \$82.2 million and \$186.7 million in MOD prices respectively. The Government had consulted the Panel on Home Affairs on 436RO and 452RO on 26 June 2017 and 26 April 2017 respectively, and had consulted the Panel on Development on 466RO on 23 May 2017. Panel members had no objection to the submission of the funding proposal to the Subcommittee for consideration. A gist of the discussion of the two Panels was tabled at the meeting.

The arrangement of including several separate works projects in one discussion paper

11. Ms Tanya CHAN enquired about the Government's justifications for including the above three separate projects in one discussion paper for consideration by the Subcommittee, whether the approach would become a

norm, and whether the three proposed P/WP projects could be voted on one by one at the FC meeting should members make such a request.

12. Mr Gary FAN opined that as members of the Subcommittee and FC were keen to endorse funding proposals relating to facilities for public benefit as soon as possible, it was not necessary for the Government to put several projects in one discussion paper for the sake of expediting the progress. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen expressed similar views.

13. The Chairman pointed out that previously, the Government had also submitted several projects of the same category in one discussion paper for consideration by the Subcommittee in one go. Members could still request that the proposed projects be voted on one by one at the meetings of the Subcommittee or FC if deemed necessary. However, as the three proposed P/WP projects did not arouse much controversy, he considered it unnecessary for the Subcommittee to vote on the projects one by one.

14. Under Secretary for Home Affairs ("USHA") explained that the three proposed P/WP projects were projects to develop new or improve existing sports and recreation facilities for which the design and consultation work (including consulting the relevant District Councils ("DCs") and LegCo Panels) had been completed. As such, the Government included the three projects in the same discussion paper for consideration by the Subcommittee in one go, so that the construction works could commence early. The Government undertook to provide a written response to Ms Tanya CHAN's enquiries after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: The written response provided by the Government was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC180/17-18\(01\)](#) on 2 May 2018.)

Cost and schedule of works

15. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen requested the Government to provide a breakdown of the expenditure on external works (\$62.9 million) in the capital cost of the proposed improvement to Hoi Bun Road Park and its adjacent area (i.e. 466RO).

(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Government was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC180/17-18\(01\)](#) on 2 May 2018.)

16. Mr Vincent CHENG said that he supported the project of the Avenue Park at Kai Tak (i.e. 436RO) as the park had been long anticipated by the

residents of two public housing estates, namely Kai Ching Estate and Tak Long Estate. Dr Helena WONG also said that members belonging to the Democratic Party supported the three proposed P/WP projects. Furthermore, she was concerned why the construction of the Avenue Park at Kai Tak had not been commenced although the residents had already moved into the two housing estates a few years ago. Both Mr CHENG and Dr WONG pointed out that a plot of land between Kai Ching Estate and Tak Long Estate which fell within the scope of the Avenue Park at Kai Tak had been enclosed by wire fences for a lone time, causing environmental hygiene problems and inconvenience to residents when accessing the estates. They therefore requested the Government to commence works at the site concerned first.

17. USHA replied that the Government was aware of the situation. He said that previously, residents could only access the two estates via the footbridges of Ching Long Shopping Centre. In response to the request of the local community, the Government demolished a section of the wire fences on the above site in 2014 to provide a pedestrian link for residents to access the two estates at grade. Under the proposed project of the Avenue Park at Kai Tak, the site would be turned into an open space to enhance pedestrian accessibility. The Government would also explore the provision of a temporary link at the site during construction to facilitate resident access.

18. Mr MA Fung-kwok said that while he supported the three proposed P/WP projects, he was concerned why it took almost a year for the Government to submit the funding proposals to the Subcommittee after consulting the relevant Panels. Dr Priscilla LEUNG was dissatisfied that some members filibustered when considering other projects, causing delay to the proposed project of the Avenue Park at Kai Tak.

19. Mr CHU Hoi-dick disagreed with Dr Priscilla LEUNG and opined that commencement of the proposed works of the Avenue Park at Kai Tak was long delayed because the two-phased project under the original plan would be implemented in one go instead, and hence the delay in project commencement. Meanwhile, the Government did not rearrange the order of the agenda items to accord priority to the submission of the proposed project of the Avenue Park at Kai Tak for the Subcommittee's consideration.

20. While expressing support for the three proposed P/WP projects, Dr Kwok Ka-ki requested the Government to provide information on the planning process of the proposed Avenue Park at Kai Tak, explain why it had not submitted the relevant funding proposal to the Subcommittee until now even though the planning had begun in 2009, and advise when and why it

decided to implement the two-phased project of the Avenue Park at Kai Tak under the original plan in one go.

21. USHA and Assistant Director of Leisure and Cultural Services (Leisure Services)1 ("AD(LS)1/LCSD") responded that it was the Government's original plan to develop the Avenue Park at Kai Tak in two phases. However, it decided to merge the two phases after examining the site conditions and project urgency. The Government undertook to provide a written response to Dr KWOK's enquiries after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: The written response provided by the Government was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC180/17-18\(01\)](#) on 2 May 2018.)

Facilities of the proposed parks/waterfront promenade

Sports facilities and play equipment

22. Mr AU Nok-hin noticed that the proposed Avenue Park at Kai Tak had an area up to 3.2 hectares, most of which was open spaces. However, sports facilities in the park were not sufficient, as exemplified by the provision of only one basketball court. Mr AU enquired whether the Government would turn part of the open spaces in the proposed park into various kinds of ball game pitches/courts.

23. USHA and AD(LS)1/LCSD said that sports facilities in the Kai Tak Development Area ("KTDA") included Kai Tak Sports Park, which was the largest of its kind in Hong Kong and comprised a Main Stadium, a Public Sports Ground, an Indoor Sports Centre and other facilities; a sports complex at the intersection (No. 1J3) between Shing Kai Road and Kai Tak River; and various kinds of ball game pitches/courts in Kai Ching Estate and Tak Long Estate. The open spaces in KTDA, which covered nearly 100 hectares, would be used for various purposes. As the proposed Avenue Park at Kai Tak would serve as one of the major connections for the surrounding developments, it could not accommodate too many active sports facilities or venues.

24. Ms Tanya CHAN referred to the feedback of some members of the public that children's play areas in Hong Kong lacked play equipment such as swings. She enquired whether the Government had set any standards for play equipment provided in children's play areas, and about the play equipment to be provided in the children's play areas at the Avenue Park at Kai Tak and the waterfront promenade adjacent to the Hong Kong Children's Hospital ("HKCH").

25. Mr CHU Hoi-dick opined that children's play areas should have play equipment which could attract children of different age groups. The Government and the contractors should consult the local community (e.g. organizing workshops) before procuring the relevant equipment. Dr Fernando CHEUNG said that the design of the proposed waterfront promenade adjacent to HKCH should adopt children-related theme. Besides, Ms Tanya CHAN, Mr CHU and Dr CHEUNG all suggested that inclusive play equipment for disabled children should be provided in the children's play areas at the waterfront promenade.

26. USHA and AD(LS)1/LCSD responded that play equipment would be procured through the contractor under a design-and-procurement model upon project commencement, so as to procure safe and attractive play equipment catering to children's needs in the most cost-effective manner. Moreover, inclusive play equipment would be provided at locations such as the proposed waterfront promenade adjacent to HKCH. However, details of the play equipment to be provided under the three proposed P/WP projects were not available at this stage as the projects were not yet commenced.

27. Mr MA Fung-kwok opined that as the waters off the coast of KTDA were suitable for water sports, the Government should consider identifying sites at the proposed waterfront promenade adjacent to HKCH, Hoi Bun Road Park or other coastal locations for development of water sports facilities. Expressing similar views, Dr KWOK Ka-ki enquired whether the Government would earmark part of the coastal area at the Kai Tak Approach Channel and the Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter (including land within the scopes of the three proposed P/WP projects) for development of water sports facilities; the types of water sports that could be carried out; and whether such facilities would be managed directly by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department ("LCSD") and not operated by relevant sports associations.

28. USHA and Head of Energizing Kowloon East Office, Development Bureau ("Head/EKEO/DEVB"), explained that given the space constraints, the sites at the waterfront promenade adjacent to HKCH and Hoi Bun Road Park could hardly accommodate any additional facilities. That said, the Government had discussed with relevant sports associations on ways to develop water sports facilities at other locations along the KTDA coastal area. In this connection, the Hong Kong Water Sports Council was applying for development of a temporary water sports centre for canoeing, rowing and dragon boat racing, etc. at a section of the former Kai Tak runway by way of short term tenancy. In the long run, the Government would consider developing permanent water sports facilities at suitable locations

along the KTDA coastal area, such as the open spaces along the coastal area of the former Kai Tak runway. The Government undertook to provide a written response to Dr KWOK's enquiries after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: The written response provided by the Government was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC180/17-18\(01\)](#) on 2 May 2018.)

Cycle tracks and associated facilities

29. Mr HO Kai-ming suggested that the Government should provide cycle tracks at the proposed district open space adjoining the San Po Kong public housing development and extend the cycle tracks to the proposed Avenue Park at Kai Tak, so as to enhance accessibility for bicycles at KTDA and San Po Kong.

30. USHA and AD(LS)1/LCSD replied that the Government planned to develop a cycle track network in KTDA by adopting a design concept of shared-use by pedestrians and cyclists. San Po Kong was not covered by the proposed alignment. The Government would forward Mr HO's suggestion of extending the cycle tracks to San Po Kong to the Civil Engineering and Development Department for consideration.

31. Mr Jeremy TAM and Dr KWOK Ka-ki sought details of the concept of shared-use by pedestrians and cyclists in KTDA, including the location of the cycle tracks; whether there would be sufficient bicycle parking spaces; the availability of bicycle rental facilities; and the alignment of the cycle tracks for cyclists to access the proposed Avenue Park at Kai Tak and the Station Square next to MTR Kai Tak Station via the park.

32. Director of Architectural Services ("DArchS") and AD(LS)1/LCSD said that according to initial planning, the proposed GreenWay would be extended to the roundabout of Muk Chui Street next to the proposed Avenue Park at Kai Tak, via which cyclists might access the Station Square. Moreover, while there would be no bicycle parking spaces in the proposed Avenue Park at Kai Tak, space had been reserved within the Station Square for provision of bicycle parking spaces. After finalizing the specific alignment of the GreenWay, the Government would decide whether it was necessary for the facilities in the proposed Avenue Park at Kai Tak to take this into account. The Government undertook to provide a written response to the enquiries of Mr TAM and Dr KWOK after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: The written response provided by the Government was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC180/17-18\(01\)](#) on 2 May 2018.)

33. Mr AU Nok-hin enquired whether the Government would reserve space at the proposed waterfront promenade adjacent to HKCH for building cycle tracks connecting with the proposed GreenWay. AD(LS)1/LCSD replied in the affirmative.

Barrier-free facilities

34. Dr CHENG Chung-tai urged that barrier-free entrances/exits should also be provided in the mid-section of the proposed waterfront promenade adjacent to HKCH (i.e. between Tower A and Tower B of HKCH), in addition to those provided at both ends. Dr Fernando CHEUNG noticed that stepped seating would be provided at the waterfront promenade. He enquired whether barrier-free ramps would be provided next to the stepped seating for the convenience of wheelchair users.

35. DArchS said that according to the design, the proposed waterfront promenade would be connected with the atrium garden of HKCH in its mid-section. There would also be an entrance/exit at Tower B of HKCH which directly led to the waterfront promenade. In addition, there would be barrier-free ramps not far from the stepped seating at the waterfront promenade. At Dr CHEUNG's suggestion, the Architectural Services Department would examine the possibility of moving the barrier-free ramps closer to the stepped seating.

Pet/animal gardens

36. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen was concerned whether the proposed parks/waterfront promenade would be managed by LCSD upon completion, and whether animals would be allowed inside. Dr Junius HO said that he supported the three proposed P/WP projects, and echoed the concerns of Mr CHAN.

37. Mr KWONG Chun-yu enquired whether animals (especially dogs) would be allowed inside the waterfront promenade adjacent to HKCH given the possible implementation of "Doctor Dog Programme" at HKCH; if not, the reasons for that. Ms Claudia MO raised a similar question.

38. In view of members' concern, the Chairman suggested that the Government might enquire and discuss with HKCH on the implementation of "Doctor Dog Programme" in the hospital and the need for animals participating in the programme to enter the waterfront promenade adjacent to the hospital, and consider whether corresponding measures were required.

39. USHA and AD(LS)1/LCSD replied that the Government had decided not to provide a pet garden in the proposed Avenue Park at Kai Tak having considered the proximity of the park to residential dwellings, the limited space of the pedestrian pavements in the park, and the views of the local DC. However, there was a plan to build a pet garden within the Station Square next to the park. Similarly, the Government did not intend to provide a pet garden at the waterfront promenade adjacent to HKCH at this stage given the space constraint of the waterfront promenade and the possible impacts of noise from dogs on the in-patients of HKCH. Notwithstanding this, at the request of Ms MO, the Government would provide the outcome of its discussion with the hospital management on whether dogs should be allowed inside the waterfront promenade.

(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Government was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC180/17-18\(01\)](#) on 2 May 2018.)

40. Ms Claudia MO opined that from the perspective of protecting animal rights, the Government should consider renaming "pet gardens" as "animal gardens".

Plants to be cultivated in the proposed parks/waterfront promenade

41. Mr AU Nok-hin opined that for landscape beautification purpose, the Government should plant seasonal flowers in the proposed parks/waterfront promenade instead of simply cultivating evergreen plants. He also said that the Government should plant more trees to provide shades at the central lawn of the park, so as to attract more visitors.

42. Mr Gary FAN enquired whether the Government would take into account the need to fit in with the environment of the nearby Kai Ching Estate and Tak Long Estate when selecting the plants to be cultivated in the proposed Avenue Park at Kai Tak. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen enquired about the greening theme of the thematic gardens in the park.

43. DArchS responded that the thematic gardens of the proposed Avenue Park at Kai Tak had a tree avenue theme. The Government would select the greening theme and plant species (e.g. *Spathodea campanulata* and *Tabebuia rosea*) for the park according to the Greening Master Plan for Kowloon City.

44. Mr Holden CHOW said that he supported the three proposed P/WP projects. He enquired whether the landscaped area of the proposed Avenue Park at Kai Tak would be open for public use. USHA and DArchS said that

trees and grass would be planted in the landscaped area and the lawn would be open for public use.

Energy efficient features and renewable energy technologies

45. Dr KWOK Ka-ki requested the Government to provide details of the energy efficient features to be installed and the renewable energy technologies (e.g. solar photovoltaic system) to be adopted under the three proposed P/WP projects, including the number of those features; the technologies adopted; and whether the power generated by the photovoltaic system was sufficient to meet the electricity demand within the proposed parks/waterfront promenade.

(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Government was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC180/17-18\(01\)](#) on 2 May 2018.)

Other facilities

46. Mr AU Nok-hin noted that the Government planned to provide thematic features with sound and lighting effects at the multi-purpose lawn of Hoi Bun Road Park. He cast doubt on the appeal of such features and considered that nuisance might be caused. He therefore suggested that the Government should turn the multi-purpose lawn into sports facilities in order to attract more users.

47. Mr Wilson OR said that he supported the three proposed P/WP projects. He requested the Government to consider designating part of the multi-purpose lawn of Hoi Bun Road Park as a multi-purpose venue (e.g. model car play area), so as to better utilize the park site.

48. AD(LS)1/LCSD replied that the multi-purpose venue in Hoi Bun Road Park could be used for staging various types of activities. At the request of Mr OR, the Government would provide a written response to his suggestion after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: The written response provided by the Government was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC180/17-18\(01\)](#) on 2 May 2018.)

49. Mr CHU Hoi-dick was concerned whether covered walkways would be provided at the thematic gardens/tree avenue in the proposed Avenue Park at Kai Tak. Dr CHENG Chung-tai opined that the covered walkways should adopt a "no-frills" design. DArchS said that in addition to facilities such as

shelters and sheltered seating, two covered walkways would be provided in the proposed Avenue Park at Kai Tak linking up MTR Kai Tak Station with Kai Ching Estate and Tak Long Estate respectively.

50. Dr CHENG Chung-tai noticed that there were two private development sites near the proposed Avenue Park at Kai Tak. He urged the Government to delineate clearly the respective parts of the proposed park and the private development sites managed by government departments and management companies, so as to ensure that local residents had the priority to use the public open space. Mr Holden CHOW was also concerned about the uses of the two private development sites and the supply of parking spaces in the vicinity. Head/EKEO/DEVB responded that the two private development sites were earmarked for commercial development under which parking spaces would be provided.

51. Dr CHENG Chung-tai urged the Government to provide more toilets at the proposed waterfront promenade adjacent to HKCH. Dr Junius HO requested the Government to provide more toilets in the proposed Avenue Park at Kai Tak.

52. DArchS said that due to the presence of underground utilities at the site, toilets could only be built at the southern tip of the waterfront promenade. USHA supplemented that sufficient toilets would be provided in the proposed Avenue Park at Kai Tak, with eight urinals and eight toilet cubicles in the male toilet and 26 toilet cubicles in the female toilet. Moreover, there would be accessible and unisex toilets in the park.

53. Mr Gary FAN enquired whether features such as fences at the proposed waterfront promenade adjacent to HKCH and Hoi Bun Road Park would be made with the same highly-transparent and environment-friendly materials as those used in Kwun Tong Promenade. DArchS confirmed that the fences concerned would be made with highly-transparent materials. Other environment-friendly materials, such as environment-friendly wood, would also be used to maintain the overall coherence of facility design along the waterfront.

54. Dr Priscilla LEUNG suggested that water dispensers should be provided in the proposed parks/waterfront promenade. USHA replied that the Government would provide water dispensers within the project areas. For instance, 24 water dispensers would be provided in the proposed Avenue Park at Kai Tai.

External connectivity of the proposed parks/waterfront promenade

55. Mr Wilson OR and Dr KWOK Ka-ki enquired about the measures to improve the external connectivity of the proposed parks/waterfront promenade under the three proposed projects with their adjacent areas, and whether road improvement works would be carried along Hoi Bun Road and the roads in Kowloon Bay near HKCH.

56. Head/EKEO/DEVB said that with the completion and commissioning of Central Kowloon Route and MTR Shatin to Central Link, traffic in Kowloon Bay and KTDA was expected to improve. Besides, in view of the insufficient capacities of some major road junctions in Kowloon Bay near HKCH, the Government would carry out widening and improvement works at those junctions. The Government undertook to provide a written response to the enquiries of Mr OR and Dr KWOK after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: The written response provided by the Government was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC180/17-18\(01\)](#) on 2 May 2018.)

57. Dr Junius HO suggested that the Government should build travellators in the Avenue Park at Kai Tai and improve the connectivity of the existing footbridges around the park to enhance pedestrian accessibility.

Overall waterfront development

58. Mr Wilson OR requested the Government to provide information on the waterfront development between Cha Kwo Ling and Kai Tak, and elaborate on its plan to improve the connectivity of the waterfront area. Dr Priscilla LEUNG urged the Government to build early an uninterrupted and landscaped promenade at the waterfront. Dr LEUNG and Mr MA Fung-kwok also requested the Government to address the water quality problem of the Victoria Harbour and the stench from the seawater along the coast.

59. Head/EKEO/DEVB replied that the Government had been making efforts to improve the water quality along the coast of KTDA in recent years and hence, the Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter had become suitable for rowing and other activities. The Government also expected that water sports could take place at the Kai Tak Approach Channel when the water quality in the area was further improved. The Government undertook to provide the information requested by Mr OR after the meeting.

(*Post-meeting note:* The supplementary information provided by the Government was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC180/17-18\(01\)](#) on 2 May 2018.)

60. As the contents of some questions put forward by members involved broad policy issues, the Chairman reminded members that such policy issues should be raised at a relevant Panel.

Voting on PWSC(2017-18)32

61. There being no further questions on the item from members, the Chairman put PWSC(2017-18)32 to vote. At the request of members, the Chairman ordered a division. Thirty-three members voted for the proposal. No member voted against the proposal or abstained. The votes of individual members were as follows:

For:

Ms Starry LEE	Mr CHAN Hak-kan
Dr Priscilla LEUNG	Mr Michael TIEN
Mr Frankie YICK	Mr WU Chi-wai
Mr YIU Si-wing	Mr MA Fung-kwok
Mr CHAN Chi-chuen	Mr CHAN Han-pan
Mr LEUNG Che-cheung	Dr KWOK Ka-ki
Mr Christopher CHEUNG	Dr Fernando CHEUNG
Dr Helena WONG	Mr Alvin YEUNG
Mr Andrew WAN	Mr CHU Hoi-dick
Dr Junius HO	Mr HO Kai-ming
Mr LAM Cheuk-ting	Mr Holden CHOW
Mr Wilson OR	Ms Tanya CHAN
Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan	Mr LUK Chung-hung
Mr LAU Kwok-fan	Dr CHENG Chung-tai
Mr Jeremy TAM	Mr Gary FAN
Mr AU Nok-hin	Mr Vincent CHENG
Mr Tony TSE	

(33 members)

62. The Chairman declared that the item was endorsed by the Subcommittee. The Chairman consulted members on whether the item would require separate voting at the relevant FC meeting. No member made such a request.

[At 10:24 am, the Chairman asked members if they agreed to extend the meeting for 15 minutes. Members present agreed. The Chairman directed that the meeting be extended for 15 minutes to 10:45 am.]

63. The meeting ended at 10:44 am.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
4 May 2018