

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. PWSC251/16-17

(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/F/2/1(25)B

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

**Minutes of the 24th meeting
held in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex
on Saturday, 24 June 2017, at 9:00 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 WONG Kwok-kin, SBS, JP

Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP

Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung

Hon Claudia MO

Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP

Hon Steven HO Chun-yin, BBS

Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, JP

Hon YIU Si-wing, BBS

Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP

Hon CHAN Chi-chuen

Hon CHAN Han-pan, JP

Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, BBS, MH, JP

Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP

Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki

Hon KWOK Wai-keung
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan
Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, JP
Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, JP
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 Tanya CHAN
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, JP
Hon HUI Chi-fung
Hon LAU Kwok-fan, MH
Hon KWONG Chun-yu
Hon Jeremy TAM Man-ho
Hon Nathan LAW Kwun-chung
Dr Hon YIU Chung-yim
Dr Hon LAU Siu-lai

Member attending:

Hon SHIU Ka-fai

Members absent:

Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, GBS, JP
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung
Hon SHIU Ka-chun
Hon Wilson OR Chong-shing, MH
Hon CHAN Chun-ying
Hon Kenneth LAU Ip-keung, MH, JP

[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 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:

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)
Mr Maurice LOO Kam-wah	Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)2
Mr TSE Chin-wan, JP	Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1)
Ms Margaret HSIA Mai-chi	Principal Assistant Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) (Works)
Mr YAU Shing-mu, JP	Under Secretary for Transport and Housing
Ms Rebecca PUN Ting-ting, JP	Deputy Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport)1
Ms Judy CHUNG Sui-kei	Principal Assistant Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport)5
Mr Daniel CHUNG Kum-wah, JP	Director of Highways
Mr Kelvin LO Kwok-wah	Project Manager (Major Works) Highways Department
Mr Chris CHAN Yu-yuen	Assistant Commissioner (Planning) Transport Department
Mr Raymond CHUNG Wah-fan	Chief Engineer (Strategic Roads) Transport Department
Ms Angela LEE Chung-yan, JP	Deputy Secretary for Home Affairs (2)
Ms Sandy CHEUNG Pui-shan	Principal Assistant Secretary for Home Affairs (Culture)2

Mrs Sylvia LAM YU Ka-wai, JP	Deputy Director of Architectural Services
Mr Edward TSE Cheong-wo	Project Director (3) Architectural Services Department
Mr LAM Wing-hong	Assistant Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene (Operations)2
Ms Annisa MA Sau-ching	Assistant Director of Social Welfare (Family and Child Welfare)(Acting)
Miss Fanny FUNG Hing-sum	Chief Social Work Officer (Family and Child Welfare)1(Acting) Social Welfare Department
Mrs Clara LEUNG SO Yu-bik	Assistant Director of Leisure and Cultural Services (Administration)
Mr Michael CHIU Yat-on	Chief Executive Officer (Planning)1 Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Attendance by invitation:

Mr Franki CHIU	Director Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd.
Prof Alexis LAU Kai-hon	Professor (Division of Environment and Sustainability) The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology

Clerk in attendance:

Ms Sharon CHUNG	Chief Council Secretary (1)2
-----------------	------------------------------

Staff in attendance:

Mr Raymond CHOW	Senior Council Secretary (1)6
Ms Mandy LI	Council Secretary (1)2
Ms Alice CHEUNG	Senior Legislative Assistant (1)1
Ms Christina SHIU	Legislative Assistant (1)2

Action The Chairman advised that there were 12 funding proposals on the agenda for the meeting, involving a total funding allocation of \$56,327 million. He drew members' attention to Rules 83A and 84 of the Rules of Procedure of the Legislative Council ("LegCo").

Head 706 - Highways

PWSC(2017-18)11 461TH Central Kowloon Route – Main Works

2. The Chairman advised that the proposal, i.e. PWSC(2017-18)11, was to upgrade 461TH to Category A at an estimated cost of \$42,363.9 million in money-of-the-day ("MOD") prices for the construction of the Central Kowloon Route ("CKR"). The Subcommittee had commenced deliberation on the proposal at the meeting on 21 June 2017.

Air quality impact assessment

3. At the Chairman's invitation, Professor Alexis LAU Kai-hon, Division of Environment and Sustainability, The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology ("Prof LAU/HKUST") gave a powerpoint presentation on the assessment he volunteered to make on the possible impacts of the Administration's proposed Compromise Scheme on air quality. He advised that the Environmental Impact Assessment ("EIA") of the original scheme conducted by the Administration had met the prevailing statutory requirements. As the noise enclosures under the Compromise Scheme proposed by the Highways Department ("HyD") covered a larger road section, the air quality of air sensitive receivers ("ASRs") in Prosperous Garden ("PG") would not be worse than that under the original proposed scheme. He said that factors affecting air quality at a receiver included emissions from sources under consideration, distance from source, wind speed and direction, background concentration and atmospheric stability. Emissions from sources under consideration, background concentration and atmospheric stability were invariant parameters. Given that the noise enclosures under the Compromise Scheme would cover a larger road section than the original scheme and the vertical opening would be farther away from PG, the distance between vehicle emissions and ASRs would be increased. As a result, air pollutant concentration at ASRs would not become worse when the wind was weak. In times of strong wind, the extensive coverage of noise enclosures would render it more difficult for vehicle emissions to escape and hence, the air pollutant concentration at ASRs would not become worse either.

4. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung said that many people (including PG residents) might not understand English. He was extremely dissatisfied that Professor Alexis LAU Kai-hon did not provide Chinese translation for the English terms in his powerpoint presentation materials. Prof LAU/HKUST explained that he had just returned to Hong Kong from overseas on the day before the meeting. Mr LEUNG opined that if Professor Alexis LAU Kai-hon was so busy, he should not have attended the meeting today and acted as the consultant for this proposed project. He also enquired about Professor LAU's nationality. The Chairman said that Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung could raise questions on the proposed project but should not query whether the public officers and university professors attending the meeting were too busy. He considered Mr LEUNG's comments inappropriate. Prof LAU/HKUST explained that he provided free advice to the Administration and supplementary information for members. He could provide members with the Chinese translation of the powerpoint presentation materials after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: The Administration subsequently provided at the meeting the Chinese translation of Professor LAU's powerpoint presentation materials. The soft copy of the presentation materials ([LC Paper No. PWSC225/16-17\(03\)](#)) was issued to members on 26 June 2017.)

[When Mr LAU Kwok-fan was speaking, Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung spoke aloud at his seat. The Chairman ordered Mr LEUNG to stop shouting at his seat. Mr LEUNG continued to speak aloud at his seat. The Chairman ordered him to withdraw from the meeting immediately. The Clerk and security staff went to Mr LEUNG's seat and asked him to leave but Mr LEUNG refused. At 9:25 am, the Chairman announced that the meeting be suspended for 10 minutes. The meeting resumed at 9:35 am. The Chairman said that he had ordered Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung to withdraw from the meeting. If Mr LEUNG was unwilling to leave, he could stay in the conference room but could not take part in the meeting.]

5. Dr Helena WONG said that as many public facilities would be constructed one after the other in the Kai Tak Development Area and such facilities would also be used by a lot of people in future, she supported the early implementation of the CKR project. She asked whether Professor LAU knew the details of the design of the vertical opening of the central enclosure under the Compromise Scheme (e.g. information on the number, length, width, height, etc. of the vertical opening); if not, how he came to the conclusion that the air quality at ASRs in PG would not become worse under the Compromise Scheme. She also asked, among the three options, namely

the original scheme, the Compromise Scheme and the proposal to extend the 150-metre long full noise enclosure southward (i.e. in the direction of Kansu Street) by 80 metres, which one was the most effective in mitigating air pollution.

6. Prof LAU/HKUST replied that HyD had provided him with information such as the EIA report of the CKR project, the layout plans of the original scheme and the Compromise Scheme for reference. He said that when making calculations with the Pollutants in the Atmosphere and their Transport over Hong Kong (or PATH in short) Air Quality Modelling System, given the similar height of the noise enclosures under the Compromise Scheme and the original scheme and that the relevant factors affecting the air pollution concentration at ASRs under the two schemes were the same, it could be assessed that the Compromise Scheme would not result in poorer air quality at ASRs in PG even without knowing the number and location of the vertical opening. Regarding Dr Helena WONG's enquiry on which option would be more effective in mitigating air pollution, Prof LAU/HKUST said that a narrower opening would change the layout of the original scheme and the distribution of emissions from sources under consideration would also be different, he needed more information (e.g. the distance between emissions sources and receivers) to conduct an analysis before making any comments. He reiterated that the Compromise Scheme would not result in poorer air quality at ASRs in PG.

7. Dr YIU Chung-yim pointed out that by incorporating the Compromise Scheme into the CKR project, the Administration might have to conduct afresh an air quality impact assessment ("AQIA") in accordance with the new Air Quality Objectives ("AQOs") which came into effect on 1 January 2014. He enquired: (a) if the EIA process of the proposed project (together with the Compromise Scheme) had to start afresh, how the Administration could ensure that the proposed project met the requirements of the new AQOs; and (b) whether the Administration had assessed the air quality impact of the Compromise Scheme on the basis of the old AQOs. Dr Helena WONG was also concerned whether the Compromise Scheme met the requirements of EIA.

8. Director of Highways ("DHy") replied that any revision to the CKR project would require gazettal and obtaining authorization to the amended scheme again under the Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance (Cap. 370), in order to implement the amended scheme. This would delay the implementation of the CKR project by at least about two years. He further said that AQIA of the CKR project and the Compromise Scheme were conducted in accordance with AQOs applicable at the time when the EIA report was approved and complied with the various statutory requirements.

The conduct of a new EIA of the proposed project on the basis of the new AQOs would pose a great challenge. Moreover, should the proposed Compromise Scheme have to be revised (i.e. extending the proposed full noise enclosure), it might be necessary to conduct a new EIA. If the AQIA outcome indicated that AQOs could not be met, neither the proposed project nor the amended Compromise Scheme could be taken forward.

9. DHy stressed that by diverting the traffic along the major east-west corridors in Kowloon, CKR could significantly reduce the traffic flow at-grade and traffic congestion which would in turn reduce the air pollution and noise nuisance generated by vehicles, hence bringing overall environmental benefits. Prof LAU/HKUST supplemented that as there was still a gap between the level of nitrogen dioxide concentration in background air and the new AQOs, the proposed project might not be able to meet the requirements of the new AQOs. Nevertheless, the proposed project should be conducive to improving the overall air quality in the area. Under Secretary of Transport and Housing ("USTH") considered that the CKR project should be implemented expeditiously so that the residents concerned could benefit early.

10. Noting that EIA of CKR was outdated, Dr LAU Siu-lai enquired whether the Administration would consider installing an additional air purifier in each of the three ventilation buildings located in the east (Kai Tak Development Area), middle (Ho Man Tin) and west (Yau Ma Tei) to reduce the amount of pollutants from vehicle exhaust being discharged to the atmosphere after the commissioning of CKR so as to meet the latest air quality requirements; if not, how the Administration would mitigate air pollution caused by vehicle exhaust along CKR. She suggested that the Administration should provide a 20-metre high exhaust vent when constructing the ventilation building in Ho Man Tin.

11. DHy advised that the three proposed ventilation buildings would be all equipped with air purification system to filter at least 80% of the nitrogen dioxide and respirable suspended particulates in the exhaust of the traffic in tunnel before discharging to the atmosphere. Additional air purifiers would not help further reduce the pollution caused by vehicular emissions in view of the exhaust capacity.

12. Mr Franki CHIU, Director, Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd ("D/OAPHK"), supplemented that the maximum exhaust velocity of the ventilation building in Ho Man Tin was roughly equivalent to the wind speed under Tropical Cyclone Warning Signal No.3, which would make it easier to dilute vehicular emissions. Moreover, the design of an exhaust vent shaft measuring 8 metres from the ground also met the minimum height

requirement in EIA. DHy said that apart from air quality, the Government had to consider whether the height of the ventilation building would cause any visual intrusion in the surrounding landscape. He further said that the issue relating to the overall air quality in Hong Kong could not be solved by a single public works project.

13. Mr HO Kai-ming said that as the proposed project could divert eastbound and westbound road traffic, relieve the congested Gascoigne Road Flyover ("GRF") and help reduce air pollution generated by vehicles, he hoped that the CKR project could be implemented as soon as possible. He enquired whether the pollutants emitted by vehicles along GRF would be discharged mainly through both ends of the full noise enclosure and the vertical opening of the semi-enclosure. Mr Jeremy TAM asked whether it was feasible to install fans or blowers in the vertical opening of the enclosure in order to disperse emissions away from residential development.

14. DHy replied that as the vertical opening of the semi-enclosure was wider, it was technically infeasible to install fans or blowers for air extraction purpose. D/OAPHK supplemented that the project consultant had conducted an assessment on locations within some 500 metres of different sensitive receivers (e.g. PG, the Coronation and residential development in the vicinity) in respect of traffic flow, meteorological information and background concentration. According to the EIA report, CKR complied with various statutory requirements in relation to air quality.

Extending the full noise enclosure under the Compromise Scheme

15. Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Ms Starry LEE said that Members belonging to the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong basically supported the CKR project. However, they urged the Administration to undertake to refine the Compromise Scheme and accede as far as possible to the residents' request for extending the full noise enclosure (i.e. extending the full noise enclosure covering the section of the existing GRF fronting Blocks 2 and 3 of PG by 80 metres). Dr CHIANG Lai-wan suggested that the full noise enclosure should be extended to not longer than 230 metres (say, 229 metres), having regard to both the fire services requirements and residents' request.

16. Mr KWONG Chun-yu, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen and Dr Helena WONG also expressed concern about the feasibility of replacing the proposed central enclosure (the section fronting Blocks 1 and 5 of PG) with a full noise enclosure. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen enquired whether the Administration would consider extending the full noise enclosure by 40 metres to 80 metres, and the timing of the review of the Compromise Scheme.

Dr Helena WONG said that extending the full noise enclosure should be conducive to mitigating the impact of air pollution on PG residents. Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr KWONG Chun-yu enquired about the cost involved in extending the full noise enclosure southward by 80 metres and urged the Administration to consult PG residents and Yau Tsim Mong District Council when conducting a review of the Compromise Scheme in future. The Chairman asked whether the Administration would consider the suggestion to extend the full noise enclosure when implementing the Compromise Scheme in future.

17. DHy said that replacing the semi-enclosure for the whole section of the existing GRF fronting Blocks 1 and 5 of PG with a full enclosure would render the total length of the fully enclosed road section along GRF to exceed 230 metres. In such case, in order to comply with the requirements of the Fire Services Department, extra fire services installation and equipment would be required for the said road section. According to the assessment of the effectiveness of the noise mitigation measures, the noise mitigation effect to be achieved by implementing the mitigation measures in the EIA report, together with the central enclosure (covering all traffic lanes on GRF and with a vertical opening) proposed in the Compromise Scheme, would be comparable to the central full noise enclosure requested by PG residents.

18. DHy further said that extending the full noise enclosure fronting Blocks 2 and 3 of PG would make the covered road section more resemble to a vehicular tunnel. HyD required extra time to conduct a more in-depth study, including computer modelling, to establish its technical feasibility. At this stage, the Administration was not certain whether the proposal was technical feasible but it would commence the study on the Compromise Scheme as soon as possible. USTH supplemented that apart from technical considerations, the Administration had to examine whether the proposal was cost-effective when taking forward any public works projects (including the Compromise Scheme). For the implementation of the Compromise Scheme, the Administration would carry out an engineering feasibility study, investigation and detailed design work in respect of the scheme following the established procedures of public works projects. Members of the public and stakeholders would be consulted in the process.

19. Ms Claudia MO enquired about the time the Administration required to conduct a study on extending the full noise enclosure and the construction cost involved. In her view, as the Administration could not ascertain whether extending the full noise enclosure was technically infeasible, it should not rule out the proposal.

20. DHy responded that the Administration had engaged a British expert through a consultant to conduct a technical analysis on the installation of additional noise enclosures along GRF which lasted about three months. A study on members' proposal (i.e. extending the full noise enclosure) was expected to be more time-consuming. The additional cost of the construction of the central enclosure was roughly estimated to be about \$520 million and the cost of the full noise enclosure should be even higher. He stressed that the design of the full noise enclosure had not been included in the proposed project scope. The Administration might have to re-gazette the amendments concerned and conduct a new EIA for the entire project should the design be adopted.

21. Mr Jeremy TAM said that the Administration should put residents' interest first. It should not give up a more desirable scheme to avoid delaying the progress of the CKR project. DHy said that the Government's proposal to implement the Compromise Scheme as a separate public works project item could facilitate the early implementation of the construction works of CKR while providing room for the Government to explore a scheme which best suited the residents' needs. If the CKR project and the Compromise Scheme were rigidly bundled up, the related works might have to be put on hold for failing to meet the requirements of the EIA legislation.

Traffic noise assessment

22. Mr Jeremy TAM made the following enquiries: (a) the highest traffic noise impacts measured in decibels of GRF on PG residents (the flats which suffered the most); and (b) after implementing the mitigation measures under (i) the original scheme and (ii) the Compromise Scheme, the respective changes in noise levels in (a) under (i) and (ii). Mr CHU Hoi-dick requested the Administration to explain the changes in the traffic noise levels on GRF in different locations. He enquired whether the noise level was particularly high in locations which were close to the opening of the enclosure.

23. D/OAPHK said that after implementing the noise mitigation measures within the project area, the sensitive receivers would be exposed to traffic noise at a level not exceeding 70 dB(A), and the level of traffic noise to be generated by the project would increase by less than 1.0 dB(A). DHy said that the materials used in the enclosure could absorb noise and the noise would not concentrate around the opening. USTH supplemented that the specific information on the traffic noise assessment relating to the CKR project had been set out in the EIA report. At the request of the Chairman and Mr Jeremy TAM, the Administration undertook to provide a written response to Mr TAM's enquiries.

(Post meeting note: The written response provided by the Administration was circulated to members on 10 July 2017 vide [LC Paper No. PWSC242/16-17\(01\).](#))

Traffic impact assessment

24. Given the commissioning of the Kwun Tong Line Extension, the pending commissioning of the Shatin to Central Link ("SCL") and possible toll adjustment of the Western Harbour Crossing ("WHC") in future, Mr CHU Hoi-dick enquired whether the Administration would examine the impacts of different railway projects and tunnel toll adjustments on CKR's traffic flow; if it would, of the details.

25. Assistant Commissioner (Planning), Transport Department ("AC(P)/TD") said that CKR's EIA had already taken into consideration the impacts of different railway projects and tunnel toll adjustments on its traffic flow; on the other hand, the Administration had commissioned a consultant early this year to study the rationalization of traffic distribution among the three road harbour crossings (namely Cross Harbour Tunnel, Eastern Harbour Crossing and WHC) and the three land tunnels between Kowloon and Sha Tin (viz. Tate's Cairn Tunnel, Lion Rock Tunnel, and Eagle's Nest and Sha Tin Heights Tunnel). The study was scheduled for submission to the Panel on Transport in the 2017-2018 legislative session. At Mr CHU Hoi-dick's request, the Administration undertook to provide the full version of the traffic impact assessment ("TIA") report of CKR completed by the project consultant in 2014 after the meeting.

(Post meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members on 10 July 2017 vide [LC Paper No. PWSC242/16-17\(01\).](#))

Cost-effectiveness of the Compromise Scheme

26. Mr Michael TIEN noted that the Administration's Compromise Scheme comprised: (a) conversion of the 100-metre long noise enclosure which originally only covered the eastbound traffic lane to cover both bounds in whole to bring about an additional 1.0 dB(A) reduction for the three PG dwellings; and (b) extension of the full enclosure northward by 40 metres to achieve an additional noise mitigation effect which would benefit about 50 additional dwellings of PG facing GRF by reducing the noise level by 1.0 dB(A) or above. The Administration estimated that the respective costs of the works in (a) and (b) was \$670 million and \$450 million. He was concerned whether the implementation of the Compromise Scheme was cost-effective, especially when the cost of the works in (a) would amount to a

subsidy of \$220 million for each dwelling. Besides, road users would be affected as the number of traffic lanes of Kansu Street had to be reduced from three to two. He was worried that the proposal would set a precedent and have implications on the use of public money in future. Mr TIEN expressed reservation on the works in (a) and requested the Administration to submit separate funding proposals for (a) and (b) in future.

27. USTH explained that although the CKR project met the EIA requirements and obtained the Environmental Permit issued by the Environmental Protection Department, members from different political parties passed a motion at the meeting of the Panel on Transport held on 17 March 2017 urging the Administration to respond to PG residents' request for the provision of the central full enclosure and the northern extension. After balancing the various factors and considering the damage to the community in general if the CKR project was deferred, the Government had examined the issue and come up with the Compromise Scheme. He took note of Mr Michael TIEN's views and said that the Compromise Scheme would not set a precedent.

28. DHy advised that since the existing GRF structure could not support the extra loadings of the full enclosure, standalone supporting structures would be required. The junction layout between Ferry Street and Kansu Street would need to be modified in order to accommodate the standalone supporting structures. According to the TIA concerned, the above modification would not bring any significant impact on the traffic.

29. Dr KWOK Ka-ki opined that the Administration might consider purchasing the PG dwellings affected by traffic noise for use as temporary housing for low-income households. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen expressed similar views. USTH took note of members' views.

Project cost

30. Dr Kwok Ka-ki noted that among the project cost of about \$42.4 billion (in MOD prices), contingencies and provision for price adjustment accounted for about \$2.2 billion and \$12.7 billion respectively. He enquired about the total tender price as anticipated by the Administration, and how to prevent contractors from submitting low-priced bids and then seeking to make up for the additional expenditure with contingencies and provision for price adjustment.

31. DHy said that the Administration would implement appropriate cost control measures including splitting the proposed works items into nine contracts for tender purpose in order to increase the competitiveness in the

bidding process. As the Government would conduct tender exercises for the proposed works items successively, the total tender price could not be confirmed for the time being. However, under the tender assessment mechanism, the Government could reject tender bids which were exceptionally low in prices.

Geological issues and works schedules

32. Ms Claudia MO pointed out that recently, some works projects incurred higher cost due to unfavourable ground conditions encountered at the construction stage. She was concerned whether the contractor of the CKR project would ask the Government to increase the project fee for the same reason in future. DHy said that Government would perform horizontal directional coring along the alignment of the main tunnel. This would allow the Government to get a full picture of the geotechnical and geological variations along the alignment as compared with ground investigation by means of vertical boring at certain intervals. The information concerned would be provided for tenderers' reference during tendering, thus enabling the tenderers to fully grasp the geological variations along the alignment and the risks involved. The Administration anticipated that the arrangement would be effective in reducing the risk of having contractors ask for higher project fee.

33. Dr YIU Chung-yim asked the Administration to illustrate with examples how it would honour its undertaking, i.e. the Compromise Scheme would be implemented under a separate public works item after securing funding for the main works. He was concerned that the Compromise Scheme might be delayed as both the gazettal procedure and consultation exercise took time. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen enquired about the timetable for implementing the Compromise Scheme.

34. USTH advised that as the CKR project took about eight years to complete and the Compromise Scheme (erection of noise enclosure) was smaller in scale, the timing of the two public works projects could match with each other. He told members that the Administration would follow up on the undertaking it made at the meeting. DHy said that the Administration would consult the public on the Compromise Scheme as soon as possible and planned to submit the funding proposal of the project within three years. At Mr CHU Hoi-dick's request, the Administration undertook to set out in a table the implementation plan of the works items under the CKR (main works) project.

(Post meeting note: In his letter to the Chairman after the meeting on 24 June 2017 ([LC Paper No. PWSC225/16-17\(04\)](#)) (Chinese version

only), Mr CHU Hoi-dick further explained that he requested the Administration to provide the implementation plan of the works items under the CKR (main works) project. The letter had been forwarded to the Administration for follow-up. The Administration's written response was circulated to members on 10 July 2017 vide [LC Paper No. PWSC242/16-17\(01\).](#))

35. Mr HO Kai-ming urged the Administration to ensure that the Trunk Road T2 project would dovetail with the completion time of CKR, otherwise Route 6 could not serve its purpose of linking West Kowloon and Tseung Kwan O. USTH advised that the Government had explained in the supplementary information paper ([LC Paper No. PWSC225/16-17\(02\)](#)) that it would submit a funding proposal to the Finance Committee ("FC") in a timely manner for the construction of Trunk Road T2.

Public facilities affected by the proposed project

36. Dr Priscilla LEUNG said that members of the Business and Professionals Alliance for Hong Kong supported the proposed project. However, she considered that the Administration should provide a concrete response to local residents' suggestions on mitigating traffic noise. Moreover, she was concerned about the reduction in parking spaces as a result of the demolition of the Yau Ma Tei Multi-storey Car Park ("YMTMCP") and enquired how the Administration would ease the demand for parking spaces in the area. Ms Starry LEE urged the Administration to provide more parking spaces in the area. Dr Helena WONG noted that the utilization rate of YMTMCP was about 88%, which meant that about 660 parking spaces were in frequent use. She enquired about the nature of the future development project at the site vacated by YMTMCP, the number of public parking spaces to be provided and whether the Administration would provide at least 660 parking spaces under this development project.

37. AC(P)/TD responded that the Administration would consider providing a certain number of public parking spaces under the development project. As for the exact number of parking spaces, it would depend on the development parameters of the site, public demand for parking spaces, overall parking policy and engineering feasibility. In the short to medium term, the Government would endeavour to identify a suitable site in the vicinity as far as possible for use as a temporary vehicle park to make up for the reduction in parking spaces due to the demolition of YMTMCP. The Administration had initially identified a site at the junction of Jordan Road and Lin Cheung Road which could be used as a temporary vehicle park. The Chairman said that members might follow up on the issue at the meeting of the relevant Panel.

38. Mr CHU Hoi-dick considered the Yau Ma Tei Jade Hawker Bazaar ("YMTJHB") one of Hong Kong's tourist attractions which should be properly reprovisioned by Government. Given that YMTJHB would be accommodated in the same temporary building with the Yau Ma Tei ("YMT") Public Library, Mr CHU enquired about the respective areas and number of floor(s) to be occupied by YMTJHB and the YMT Public Library. Dr LAU Siu-lai also raised a similar question.

39. In reply, DHy said that the temporary building would have four storeys. The second to fourth floors would be reserved for the YMT Public Library whereas the ground floor would be used as a temporary YMTJHB. The Administration would continue to liaise with the stakeholders on permanent reprovisioning of YMTJHB. The Chairman said that members might follow up on the reprovisioning of the above facilities at the meeting of the relevant Panel.

40. Given that some open space in YMT had to be used as temporary works areas for the construction of CKR, Dr LAU Siu-lai enquired whether the Administration would explore if there was any space in the area that could be used as temporary open space (e.g. park) for the elderly; if it would, of the details.

41. DHy said that the Government would carry out the landscaping works on the aboveground space and landscaped decks, and create public open space after the CKR tunnel and deck structure were completed. USTH supplemented that the Government would examine the feasibility of providing temporary open space in YMT. Besides, the West Kowloon Station of the Hong Kong Section of the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link would provide considerable open space.

[At 11:08 am, the Chairman announced that the meeting would be suspended for 10 minutes for members to take a short break. The meeting resumed at 11:25 am.]

Disposal of yard waste

42. Referring to the supplementary information paper ([LC Paper No. PWSC225/16-17\(02\)](#)), Mr CHU Hoi-dick considered it an outdated disposal method for the Administration to transfer yard waste generated from the removal of 1 858 trees to landfills. Instead, the Administration should make inter-departmental co-ordinating efforts to deal with yard waste. He enquired about the details of "a more appropriate and feasible way of

disposal" stated in the paper and whether the Administration would require the contractor to reduce the quantity of yard waste to be sent to landfills.

43. DHy said that the Administration would co-ordinate with relevant departments in respect of the disposal of yard waste and the contract of CKR would clearly stipulate that the contractor must comply with the requirements of the Waste Disposal Ordinance (Cap. 354).

44. At the request of Ms Tanya CHAN, the Administration undertook to provide the hyperlink to the latest Tree Survey Report relating to the proposed works after the meeting.

(Post meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members on 10 July 2017 vide [LC Paper No. PWSC242/16-17\(01\)](#).)

45. At 10:39 am, the Chairman said that he received a motion proposed by a member under paragraph 32A of the Public Subcommittee Procedure ("the Rule 32A motion"). He invited members to forward to him any Rule 32A motions they intended to move as early as possible for his timely perusal. At 11:55 am, the Chairman read out the names of members who were waiting for their turns to speak: Mr HO Kai-ming, Dr Helena WONG and Dr LAU Siu-lai. The Chairman said that after members who were waiting for their turns to speak had spoken, he would "draw a line" to end the "question time" for the Subcommittee to consider whether the Rule 32A motions proposed by members should be dealt with. At 12:05 pm, the Chairman said that after Mr CHU Hoi-dick had spoken, the Subcommittee would consider whether it should deal with the Rule 32A motions.

Motions proposed under paragraph 32A of the Public Works Subcommittee Procedure

46. At 12:07 pm, the Chairman said that he received a total of six Rule 32A motions from members. Proposed motions numbered 001 was from Ms Claudia MO, numbered 002 to 003 were from Dr Helena WONG, numbered 004 was from Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, and numbered 005 to 006 were from Mr CHU Hoi-dick. The Chairman considered that among the six proposed motions, motion numbered 005 was not directly related to the agenda item while the remaining five were directly related to the agenda item.

47. The Chairman took turn to put to vote the questions that proposed motions numbered [001](#), [002 to 003](#), [004](#) and [006](#) to be proceeded forthwith.

At members' request, the Chairman ordered a division. The five questions were all negatived.

Voting on PWSC(2017-18)11

48. As members had not put forward any further Rule 32A motions or questions on this item, the Chairman put PWSC(2017-18)11 to vote. At members' request, the Chairman ordered a division. Eighteen members voted for, one member voted against the proposal, and 11 members abstained. The votes of individual members were as follows:

For:

Mr Tommy CHEUNG
Mr CHAN Hak-kan
Mr WONG Kwok-kin
Mr Frankie YICK
Mr CHAN Han-pan
Ms Alice MAK
Dr Elizabeth QUAT
Mr HO Kai-ming
Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan
(18 members)

Ms Starry LEE
Dr Priscilla LEUNG
Mr Steven HO
Mr YIU Si-wing
Mr LEUNG Che-cheung
Mr KWOK Wai-keung
Dr Junius HO
Mr Holden CHOW
Mr LAU Kwok-fan

Against:

Dr YIU Chung-yim
(1 member)

Abstain:

Mr Charles Peter MOK
(Deputy Chairman)
Mr CHAN Chi-chuen
Mr Alvin YEUNG
Mr CHU Hoi-dick
Mr Jeremy TAM
Dr LAU Siu-lai
(11 members)

Ms Claudia MO

Dr Helena WONG
Mr Andrew WAN
Mr KWONG Chun-yu
Mr Nathan LAW

49. The Chairman declared that the item was endorsed by the Subcommittee. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen requested that this item, i.e. PWSC(2017-18)11, be voted on separately at the relevant FC meeting.

Head 703 – Buildings**PWSC(2017-18)4 183GK Reprovisioning of Shanghai Street refuse collection point and street sleepers' services units to the site on Hau Cheung Street, Yau Ma Tei for the phase II development of the Yau Ma Tei Theatre project**

50. The Chairman advised that the proposal, i.e. PWSC(2017-18)4, sought to upgrade 183GK to Category A at an estimated cost of \$229.7 million in MOD prices for the reprovisioning of the Shanghai Street refuse collection point ("RCP") and the street sleepers' services units ("SSSUs") adjoining the Yau Ma Tei Theatre ("YMTT") in order to vacate the original site for the phase II development of the YMTT project. The Administration had consulted the Panel on Home Affairs on the proposed works on 27 March 2017. Panel members in general had no objection to submitting the funding proposal to the Subcommittee for consideration. A gist of the Panel's discussion had been tabled at the meeting.

Number of street sleepers and the supply of shelter places

51. Dr Helena WONG noted that 70 shelter places were currently provided by the street sleepers' shelter on Shanghai Street and the number of shelter places would remain unchanged after its reprovisioning to the proposed building on Hau Cheung Street ("the Hau Cheung Street building"). Dr WONG said that despite being in dire need for shelter places, street sleepers were unwilling to seek refuge in the existing street sleepers' shelter on Shanghai Street because of its poor hygiene conditions. After completion of the Hau Cheung Street building with improved hygiene conditions, the number of shelter places might fall short of demand given the expected increase in the number of street sleepers who were willing to take shelter there. The Administration should therefore review from time to time the supply and demand of shelter places for street sleepers. She enquired whether the Administration would allocate the second floor of the Hau Cheung Street building, which would be the office of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department ("LCSD"), for use by the street sleepers' shelter to provide more shelter places. Dr CHIANG Lai-wan also urged the Administration to take the opportunity of the development of the Hau Cheung Street building to provide more shelter places for street sleepers.

52. Deputy Secretary for Home Affairs (2) ("DSHA(2)") replied that pursuant to the suggestion by LegCo Members, the Administration had revised the design of the Hau Cheung Street building by adding two floors

between RCP and SSSUs to increase their vertical distance apart. The additional floors would be used by LCSD to address the problem of insufficient office and storage space. DSHA(2) added that while the second floor of the Hau Cheung Street building would be allocated for use by LCSD in the project proposal, the floor would adopt an open plan design to allow certain flexibility for repartitioning. Should there be a heavy demand for street sleepers' service in the district, the Administration might consider changing the use of the second floor of the Hau Cheung Street building, having regard to LCSD's demand for office space, and the statutory requirements and the resources available at that time.

53. Assistant Director of Social Welfare (Family and Child Welfare)(Acting) ("ADSW(F&CW)(Atg)") supplemented that the utilization rate of the street sleepers' shelter on Shanghai Street was 66% as at the end of December 2016. As proposed by the Administration, the number of shelter places provided would remain unchanged after the street sleepers' shelter had been reprovisioned to Hau Cheung Street. However, the Administration would review from time to time the supply and demand of shelter places for street sleepers. If necessary, the Social Welfare Department would bid for resources to ensure that shelter service could meet street sleepers' needs.

54. Dr Helena WONG requested the Administration to provide information on: (a) the number of street sleepers in Yau Tsim Mong District and Sham Shui Po District; (b) the number of accommodation places that could be provided by street sleepers' hostels in the two aforesaid districts; and (c) whether the Administration would consider allocating more resources to increase the number of subvented accommodation places in street sleepers' hostels.

55. ADSW(F&CW)(Atg) advised that as at May 2017, there were 936 registered street sleepers in Hong Kong, among which 366 and 375 were in Yau Tsim Mong District and Sham Shui Po District respectively. A total of 393 accommodation places for street sleepers were provided in the two aforesaid districts on a subvented or self-financing basis. The Administration undertook to provide the information requested by Dr WONG in writing after the meeting.

(Post meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC231/16-17\(01\)](#) on 28 June 2017.)

Design of the proposed building on Hau Cheung Street

56. Dr LAU Siu-lai said that the SSSUs on Shanghai Street had serious bed bug and rodent problems because it was located above RCP. She queried why RCP and SSSUs on Shanghai Street would still be co-located in the Hau Cheung Street building in the reprovisioning exercise.

57. DSHA(2) explained that in the past few years, the Home Affairs Bureau ("HAB") had been exploring the feasibility of separate reprovisioning of the RCP and the SSSUs on Shanghai Street to other locations within the district. However, it was extremely difficult to identify other locations in Yau Ma Tei to reprovision the two facilities. HAB and relevant government departments had examined various sites in the district for quite a number of times, and confirmed that there were no alternative locations for the separate reprovisioning of the two facilities. To minimize the effects of the operation of RCP on the users of SSSUs, the Administration had revised the design of the Hau Cheung Street building. For example, additional floors would be built to increase the vertical distance between the two facilities.

58. Dr LAU Siu-lai opined that one of the reasons for the low utilization rate of the street sleepers' shelter on Shanghai Street was its use of bunk beds, which made it difficult for street sleepers with mobility impairment to use the upper bunks. She enquired why the Administration did not build more floors in the Hau Cheung Street building for use by the street sleepers' shelter. This would increase the number of shelter places while obviating the need for using bunk beds by SSSUs to provide shelter places. Dr LAU requested the Administration to provide information explaining the reasons (including planning requirements, plot ratio restrictions, implications on ventilation, visual considerations, etc.) for imposing a height limit of 25 metres on the Hau Cheung Street building.

59. In response, DSHA(2) said that the site on Hau Cheung Street was zoned as "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC"). The Planning Department advised that the Administration, when developing the site on Hau Cheung Street, was required to maintain good ventilation in the area and use the G/IC zone as a spatial and visual relief in the densely developed urban area. The Administration therefore recommended that the building height of the Hau Cheung Street building should not exceed 25 metres. The design height of the building was close to 25 metres. Deputy Director of Architectural Services supplemented that the Planning Department recommended the height of the Hau Cheung Street building on the basis of ventilation conditions and other relevant factors. The Administration undertook to provide the information requested by Dr LAU in writing after the meeting.

(*Post meeting note:* The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC231/16-17\(01\)](#) on 28 June 2017.)

Cost of the proposed project and completion time

60. Dr CHIANG Lai-wan pointed out that the proposed project was first submitted by the Administration to the Subcommittee for consideration as early as in 2014, but was rejected by the Subcommittee. She enquired about the project estimate at the time. Dr CHIANG also requested the Administration to provide information on the completion time of the phase II development of the YMTT project and the Hau Cheung Street building.

61. DSHA(2) said that the project estimate was \$165.3 million when the Administration submitted the proposal to the Subcommittee for consideration in 2014. The cost estimate did not include the cost involved in building the two additional floors in the Hau Cheung Street building pursuant to subsequent recommendations. Subject to the funding approval of FC, construction of the Hau Cheung Street building would commence in the fourth quarter of 2017 for completion in the first quarter of 2020. The decanting and demolition works of the existing site on Shanghai Street were tentatively scheduled for completion in the fourth quarter of 2020.

62. The Chairman advised that the Subcommittee would continue to discuss this item at the next meeting. The meeting ended at 1:00 pm.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
21 July 2017