

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. PWSC289/17-18
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/F/2/1(28)B

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

**Minutes of the 29th meeting
held in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex
on Monday, 11 June 2018, at 4:30 pm**

Members present:

Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, SBS, MH, JP (Chairman)

Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP (Deputy Chairman)

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 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
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 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

Members absent:

Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP
Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP
Hon LUK Chung-hung

Public officers attending:

Mr Raistlin LAU Chun, JP	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) ³
Mr HON Chi-keung, JP	Permanent Secretary for Development (Works)
Ms Doris HO Pui-ling, JP	Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands) ¹

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)
Mr Jack CHAN Jick-chi, JP	Under Secretary for Home Affairs
Ms Eugenia CHUNG Nga-chi, JP	Assistant Director of Home Affairs (2)
Mr Steve TSE Ling-chun, JP	District Officer (Kwun Tong) Home Affairs Department
Mr Rick CHAN Tin-chu, JP	District Officer (Wan Chai) Home Affairs Department
Mr Martin KWAN Wai-cheong	Chief Engineer (Works) Home Affairs Department
Mr Edward TSE Cheong-wo	Project Director (3) Architectural Services Department
Mrs Alice CHING WOO Wai-ling	Chief Project Manager 303 Architectural Services Department
Mr Chris LIU Chi-ho	Chief Project Manager 302 Architectural Services Department
Ms LAI Mei-ling	Chief Leisure Manager (Kowloon) Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Mr LUK Chi-kwong	Chief Leisure Manager (Hong Kong East) Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Attendance by invitation:

Dr Bunny CHAN Chung-bun, GBS, JP	Chairman Kwun Tong District Council
Mr Stephen NG Kam-chun, BBS, MH, JP	Chairman Wan Chai District Council

Clerk in attendance:

Ms Doris LO

Chief Council Secretary (1)2

Staff in attendance:

Mr Keith WONG

Council Secretary (1)4

Mr Raymond SZETO

Council Secretary (1)5

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 42 items had been endorsed by the Public Works Subcommittee ("PWSC") so far this year with a total funding allocation of \$94.226 billion. There was one funding proposal (PWSC(2018-19)15) on the agenda for the meeting. It was an item carried over from the previous meeting held on 30 May 2018. 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(2018-19)15 458RO Signature Project Scheme (Kwun Tong District) – Construction of Music Fountains at Kwun Tong Promenade

68RE Signature Project Scheme (Wan Chai District) – Construction of Moreton Terrace Activities Centre

2. Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Ms Starry LEE and Mr Paul TSE expressed support for early endorsement of the two projects under the Signature Project Scheme ("SPS"). They hoped members would respect the decision advocated and made by the District Councils ("DCs") concerned following detailed consultation and discussion, rather than disrupting the deliberation by using the tactics of filibustering or raising repeated questions endlessly. Mr Paul TSE pointed out that as a Member of Wan Chai District Council

("WCDC"), he grasped a full picture of the situation where WCDC discussed the SPS project. He emphasized that the DC of the previous term and the three area committees of Wan Chai ("WC") District gave unanimous support for the construction project of Moreton Terrace Activities Centre ("MTAC"), while the majority of WCDC Members of the current term also supported the project. He hoped members would respect the decision made by the local DC.

3. Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Mr Alvin YEUNG and Mr Jeremy TAM advised that the function of PWSC was to consider public works items submitted by the Administration. The Subcommittee should effectively perform its duty to consider each item and should not be subject to any decision made by DCs. Mr CHU said that unless the Administration set aside financial resources allowing DCs to use for implementation of SPS projects at their discretion, the Subcommittee had the power to examine the funding proposals for individual SPS projects under the prevailing mechanism.

4. The Chairman was of the view that the Administration could consider applying for a one-off provision from LegCo in future to set up a fund for taking forward similar district projects, such that the Administration needed not apply for funding for individual projects one by one.

5. Under Secretary for Home Affairs ("USHA") advised that most of the SPS projects had already commenced and the Administration would conduct an overall review on the project arrangements upon completion and commissioning of the remaining projects. He supplemented that the Administration currently had provided funding for DCs to carry out some district minor works.

Procedures for conducting consultations on projects under the Signature Project Scheme

6. Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr HUI Chi-fung, Mr AU Nok-hin and Mr Gary FAN criticized that the two SPS projects were controversial, but the Administration, Kwun Tong District Council ("KTDC") and WCDC had not properly consulted district stakeholders nor reached a cross-party consensus. Mr AU Nok-hin criticized WCDC for not following KTDC's practice of adopting a bottom-up consultation approach.

7. In response, USHA stressed that SPS projects were projects spearheaded by DCs and the Administration respected the approaches adopted by the DCs concerned in conducting consultation on the projects.

458RO Signature Project Scheme (Kwun Tong District) – Construction of Music Fountains at Kwun Tong Promenade

8. Mr WU Chi-wai queried whether the Music Fountains Project would be well received by the public.

9. Dr KWOK Ka-ki criticized that the construction of the music fountains at Kwun Tong ("KT") Promenade was a "white elephant" project. He was of the view that KTDC should consider making use of the funding for SPS projects to provide other community services for local residents and recreational facilities for use by young people.

10. Dr Fernando CHEUNG also considered that the Administration and KTDC should refer to the practice of Kwai Tsing DC and Southern DC in implementing SPS projects that could provide the necessary services to the district, rather than taking forward the Music Fountains Project at KT Promenade that would not be conducive to improving the living conditions of poor population and the elderly in KT District.

11. In response, USHA pointed out that the music fountains at KT Promenade would be open for use by all members of the public free of charge and suitable for enjoyment by the elderly as well as young people. Apart from the music fountains at KT Promenade, KTDC also obtained funding approval of the Finance Committee ("FC") earlier for the implementation of another SPS project to construct a lift tower at Shung Yan Street in KT connecting Hong Ning Road Recreation Ground and Shui Wo Street Market with a view to providing convenience for local residents (especially the elderly and people with limited mobility).

12. Dr Bunny CHAN, Chairman of KTDC, supplemented that the lift tower at Shung Yan Street in KT and the music fountains at KT Promenade were major projects decided by using a "bottom-up" approach. At that time, DC Members collected project proposals from residents and organizations and, following detailed deliberation by the DC working group, the two projects were selected from 16 proposals. KTDC considered that implementing the two projects simultaneously could take into consideration both people's livelihood and development, which was also supported by local residents. Currently, a "sensory garden" was provided at KT Promenade and a venue for recreational activities was provided at the adjacent "Fly the Flyover" for use by children and young people respectively. The DC was aware of the public's wish for addition of music fountains and water-friendly facilities at KT Promenade for families to play and enjoy together; members of the public could also enjoy a fantastic view of the music fountain performances at KT Promenade from a distance from the Kai Tak Cruise

Terminal. In addition, KTDC had all along been greatly concerned about people's livelihood needs in the district, such as striving for the redevelopment of the United Christian Hospital.

13. Mr WU Chi-wai advised that members of the public were not allowed to enter the boundary of the performance water fountain, which in effect would reduce the public space at KT Promenade. He urged the Administration to extend the wet play area to cover the whole area of the performance water fountain, which could also help promote a water-friendly culture. Mr Andrew WAN advised that he had also expressed the same view at the previous meeting, but the Administration did not respond positively. Mr WAN suggested that the Administration should draw reference from the Dadaepo Sunset Fountain of Dreams in Busan, South Korea and open the performance water fountain to the public for wet play outside show times during spring, summer and autumn seasons. Dr KWOK Ka-ki also expressed a similar view.

14. Mr CHU Hoi-dick enquired about the total lawn area within KT Promenade and the respective areas of the performance water fountain and the wet play area within the music fountains. He also urged the Administration to identify another location at KT Promenade to reprovide the lawn area reduced due to the construction of the music fountains.

15. USHA advised that the total area of KT Promenade was about 41 400 square metres ("sq m"), including 9 994 sq m of lawn area; the area of the performance water fountain under the Music Fountains Project was only around 400 sq m, while the area of the wet play area was about 250 sq m. In other words, the performance water fountain only occupied 1% of KT Promenade and 4% of the lawn in terms of area. Should there be a need in the future, consideration could still be given to increasing the lawn area at KT Promenade as far as practicable. The Government would continue, from a management perspective, proactively examining how to allow more members of the public to engage in water play activities at the same time and to diversify the performances and background music of the performance water fountain for attracting the public to watch such performances, so as to encourage a water-friendly culture. As for the issue of resolving relevant technical difficulties, the Government would conduct further detailed examination.

Pre-construction works

16. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen noted that the proposal for the music fountains at KT Promenade was submitted to FC of LegCo in 2016, but deliberation of the funding application in FC could not be completed before that legislative

session ended. Later, a provision of about \$300,000 was earmarked from block allocations under the Capital Works Reserve Fund for pre-construction works, consultancy fee and study in the 2017-2018 financial year. He raised concern over the purpose of the provision and whether it had been used to assist KTDC in examining the development direction of the project (such as accepting the proposal put forward by LegCo Members to expand the scope of the wet play area) in order to update the design and construction cost of the project.

17. Project Director (3), Architectural Services Department ("PD(3)/ArchSD") replied that, since submission to FC in 2016, the design of the project had been substantially the same and only the detailed design had been made; the construction cost had been estimated afresh according to the latest market price.

18. At the request of Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, the Administration was required to provide supplementary information on the purpose of the provision of about \$300,000 earmarked from block allocations under the Capital Works Reserve Fund for "pre-construction works, consultancy fee and study for construction of music fountains at KT Promenade (KT District)" in the 2017-2018 financial year.

(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC275/17-18\(01\)](#) on 29 June 2018.)

Fresh water consumption

19. Mr Jeremy TAM advised that fresh water was a precious resource and the Water Supplies Department ("WSD") introduced the Total Water Management Strategy in 2008 to educate members of the public how to conserve water. However, the proposed music fountains would waste around 550 cubic metres ("cu m") of fresh water each year, which was in opposition to the principle of water conservation. He asked whether the Administration had consulted WSD on the project.

20. In response, USHA pointed out that the capacity of the proposed music fountains was about 270 cu m (i.e. about one-ninth of the capacity of a standard swimming pool) and, together with its recycling design, about 550 cu m (i.e. the average annual water consumption of about 12 Hong Kong people) of fresh water would be evaporated per year when calculated based on evaporation capacity. The Administration would also follow the relevant guidelines of the Architectural Services Department ("ArchSD") in constructing the music fountains.

Other concerns

21. In response to an enquiry made by Mr Alvin YEUNG, USHA advised that the music fountains at KT Promenade would be under the management of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department ("LCSD").

68RE Signature Project Scheme (Wan Chai District) – Construction of Moreton Terrace Activities Centre

Facilities at Moreton Terrace Activities Centre

22. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen and Mr KWONG Chun-yu were concerned that the areas of the hall and the stage at the proposed MTAC were very small. Mr KWONG enquired whether the proposed community hall was the smallest venue on Hong Kong Island. Mr CHAN queried the truth of the Administration's statement that the hall could house 250 audiences. He pointed out that the total area of the hall and the stage was 206 sq m and, when calculated on the basis of 250 audiences, each audience could only occupy a space of about 0.58 sq m on average, which was even smaller than a seating space of low-cost carriers. Mr CHAN also questioned whether WCDC had clearly stated that the area of the hall would be relatively small when consulting the public on the proposed MTAC.

23. In response, USHA advised that the area of the hall stage at MTAC and its proportion to the hall were similar to those of other small-scale community halls, while the number of audiences that could be housed was calculated by ArchSD according to the relevant fire safety and architectural regulations. Among the around 100 community halls managed by the Home Affairs Department, the halls of 20 community halls or centres were smaller than the hall under the proposed project, such as the halls at Wong Tai Sin Community Centre, as well as Kwong Yuen Community Hall and Pok Hong Community Hall in Sha Tin where only about 200 audiences could be housed. Despite their relatively small areas, the average usage rates of the halls in these community halls or centres still exceeded 90%. District Officer (Wan Chai) ("WCDO") added that the Administration had indicated that the area of the hall was about 200 sq m when consulting the public on MTAC.

24. Ms Tanya CHAN said that at present Leighton Hill Community Hall ("LHCH") was the only community hall in WC District, but its usage rate was only about 70% during peak hours. She queried whether it was necessary to construct an additional community hall in WC District by using a large amount of public money.

25. In response, WCDO advised that the average usage rate of LHCH in the past three years was about 71% and its average usage rate during peak hours was about 75%, while its average usage rate at weekends when organizations mostly organized activities was about 82%, which was a pretty high level. The Government understood that a number of organizations were keen to have more community halls available for use.

26. At the request of Ms Tanya CHAN, the Administration was required to provide supplementary information to set out a comparison of usage rates between LHCH and other community halls.

(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC275/17-18\(01\)](#) on 29 June 2018.)

Tree preservation

27. Ms Tanya CHAN raised concern as to how the Administration would preserve the five trees located in the vicinity of the site boundary. She pointed out that the Administration should not consider using planters to surround these trees as this might obstruct their root growth.

28. USHA advised that the Administration would design and handle the basement works in a careful and cautious manner to preserve the five trees.

Cost effectiveness

29. Referring to Yuen Long District Community Services Building, Mr Gary FAN advised that its construction cost (\$118 million) was lower than that of the proposed MTAC (\$133 million), while its floor area was a few times larger than that of the later. He considered that the cost effectiveness of the proposed MTAC was very low and the area of the site had not been fully utilized. He queried that as the trees that were required to be preserved under the works were only common trees, it was unlikely that such preservation would affect the overall construction cost.

30. In response, USHA pointed out that as the environment of construction sites in various districts varied, the construction costs would also be different and could not be compared directly. Owing to the very limited space at MTAC's construction site and the need for tree preservation, the cost concerned was therefore higher. Although the five large trees located next to the site were not old trees, they were pretty flourishing and members of the

public hoped that the trees would be preserved. Therefore, the design and construction arrangements would cater for the need of preservation.

31. PD(3)/ArchSD supplemented that the area of the construction site was about 750 sq m only and its gross floor area was merely 2 200-odd sq m; in general, the construction unit cost for the works carried out on small sites would be higher. In addition, there was a seven-a-side football pitch adjacent to the construction site. Given that the project had already occupied the whole existing volleyball court, part of the seven-a-side football pitch would have to be used as a temporary construction site in the course of the works, and alternation and restoration of fences in the space after construction required additional expenditure. Furthermore, the design of MTAC had to be approved by the Planning Department. According to the opinion of the Planning Department, the height of the Centre should not exceed 25 metres. Due to the height limit, it was necessary for the Government to construct a basement to accommodate facilities of some plant rooms, resulting in a rise in the construction cost.

Alternative for the volleyball courts at Moreton Terrace Temporary Playground

32. Mr AU Nok-hin queried that, in its reply (LC Paper No. [PWSC245/17-18\(02\)](#)) to his written question (LC Paper No. [PWSC241/17-18\(01\)](#)) enquiring about the usage rates of the volleyball courts at Moreton Terrace Temporary Playground, the Administration only set out the figures of booking rates but did not provide the number of users. Given that the booking rates had not taken into account the number of users with no advance booking, the actual number of users using the venue could not be reflected. Mr AU also questioned that the alternative proposed by the Administration and WCDC to relocate the volleyball courts to Victoria Park was simply to share the venue with the handball court therein. The current population of Hong Kong Island was around 1.28 million, but only eight outdoor volleyball courts were provided, which was far below the standard of one volleyball court per 20 000 persons as set out in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines. Yet, under the current plan, the Administration would even further reduce the number of outdoor volleyball courts to six. Mr Gary FAN criticized that the Administration's work in providing sports facilities had no merit worth mentioning, resulting in a severe lack of volleyball courts. Mr FAN enquired whether the Administration had assessed the impact of demolishing and relocating the volleyball courts on users.

33. In response, Chief Leisure Manager (Hong Kong East), Leisure and Cultural Services Department ("CLM(HKE)/LCSD") advised that the

Administration had communicated with various stakeholders, including the national sports associations concerned, regarding the arrangements for demolishing and relocating the volleyball courts as well as the alternative.

34. Mr KWONG Chun-yu queried that facilities required for a volleyball court and a handball court were different and sharing the venue would cause inconvenience to users. Mr KWONG enquired about the time required for resetting a handball court to a volleyball court.

35. CLM(HKE)/LCSD replied that, in general, if a venue user used a venue without advance booking, the user had to contact venue staff upon arrival for resetting the venue into a volleyball court, which would take about 15 minutes. USHA advised that as volleyball and handball activities involved a certain number of participants, it was anticipated that cases where users used the venue without advance booking were rare.

36. USHA and Mr Stephen NG, Chairman of WCDC, further pointed out that relocating the volleyball courts to Victoria Park could maintain the number of outdoor volleyball courts. In addition, the Administration and WCDC were proactively planning for the construction of a new volleyball court and would conduct public consultation in due course.

37. Mr HUI Chi-fung, Mr AU Nok-hin, Mr KWONG Chun-yu and Mr Gary FAN considered that the Administration should retain the existing volleyball courts and construct the community hall at the nearby "Government, Institution or Community" site on Caroline Hill Road. Mr HUI and Mr AU criticized WCDC for not conducting sufficient consultation on the construction of MTAC, and for ignoring the joint submission by over 1 000 volleyball court users in the district against such a proposal.

38. In response, USHA advised that the use of the site concerned on Caroline Hill Road had yet to be discussed. On the other hand, the planning of MTAC had already been rather mature and community facilities that were urgently needed could be provided to the district as soon as possible. In addition, the area of the volleyball courts after their relocation to Victoria Park would be larger with better environment and more spectators could be accommodated. Mr Stephen NG, Chairman of WCDC, added that, since project initiation in 2013, WCDC had conducted detailed consultation on the project with area committees and other stakeholders, including various residents, 16 buildings in the vicinity of Moreton Terrace and 122 district organizations. Furthermore, WCDC had held a forum during the first consultation exercise and over 90% of the participants supported the project. Mr NG also pointed out that WCDC was gravely concerned about the

development direction of the site concerned on Caroline Hill Road and had expressed the wish to develop a civic centre there. However, the use of the site could only be confirmed after lengthy discussion and other procedures, and it was also uncertain as to whether the additional community facilities that the DC wished to provide could be accommodated.

Impact on the nearby organizations

39. Mr Alvin YEUNG enquired whether the proposed MTAC was close to Wan Chai Sports Federation, Wanchai District Women's Association and World War II Veterans Association; if so, whether the daily operation of these organizations would be affected during construction. Ms Tanya CHAN also enquired about the distance between the entrance/exit of the construction site and those of the sites of these organizations and whether the works would hinder their operation.

40. Mr Stephen NG, Chairman of WCDC, and WCDO confirmed that the sites of the aforementioned organizations were close to the proposed MTAC. The Administration had consulted the organizations concerned on the works project and no objecting views were received. Also, the works would not have any impact on the daily operation of these organizations. PD(3)/ArchSD supplemented that an arrangement had been made with the Hong Kong Central Library to use some of its space for providing a temporary passageway to facilitate access of persons to and from the sites of these organizations.

Issues relating to the consideration of the item

41. The Chairman pointed out that, at this meeting, members had been repeating again and again the questions and views discussed at the previous meetings.

42. At 5:39 pm, the Chairman advised that he would allow members who were waiting for their turns to raise questions and those who had not raised any questions on the item but wished to do so to each raise one question. After that, the "question and answer time" would end.

Voting on PWSC(2018-19)15

43. There being no further questions from members on the item, the Chairman put PWSC(2018-19)15 to vote. At the request of members, the Chairman ordered a division. Sixteen members voted for and seventeen members voted against the proposal. No member abstained from voting. The votes of individual members were as follows:

For:

Ms Starry LEE
Mr Paul TSE
Mr YIU Si-wing
Mr CHAN Han-pan
Ms Alice MAK
Mr HO Kai-ming
Mr Wilson OR
Mr LAU Kwok-fan
(16 members)

Dr Priscilla LEUNG
Mr Frankie YICK
Mr MA Fung-kwok
Mr LEUNG Che-cheung
Mr Christopher CHEUNG
Mr Holden CHOW
Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan
Mr Tony TSE

Against:

Mr Charles Peter MOK (Deputy Chairman)
Mr WU Chi-wai
Dr Fernando CHEUNG
Mr Alvin YEUNG
Mr CHU Hoi-dick
Ms Tanya CHAN
Dr CHENG Chung-tai
Mr Jeremy TAM
Mr AU Nok-hin
(17 members)

Ms Claudia MO
Mr CHAN Chi-chuen
Dr Helena WONG
Mr Andrew WAN
Mr LAM Cheuk-ting
Mr HUI Chi-fung
Mr KWONG Chun-yu
Mr Gary FAN

Abstained:

(0 member)

44. The Chairman declared that the item was negatived by the Subcommittee.

45. The meeting ended at 6:03 pm.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
10 July 2018