

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. PWSC41/17-18
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/F/2/1(4)B

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

**Minutes of the 4th meeting
held in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex
on Wednesday, 15 November 2017, 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 Martin LIAO Cheung-kong, SBS, JP
Hon Alvin YEUNG
Hon Andrew WAN Siu-kin
Hon CHU Hoi-dick
Hon HO Kai-ming
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

Members absent:

Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP
Hon LAM Cheuk-ting

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 Donald TONG Chi-keung, JP	Permanent Secretary for the Environment

Ms Margaret HSIA Mai-chi	Principal Assistant Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) (Works)
Dr Christine CHOI Yuk-lin, JP	Under Secretary for Education
Miss Sharon KO Yee-wai	Principal Assistant Secretary for Education (Higher Education)
Miss Winnie WONG Ming-wai	Deputy Secretary-General (1) University Grants Committee Secretariat
Mr Alan SIN Kwok-leung	Chief Technical Adviser (Subvented Projects) Architectural Services Department
Mr LAM Sai-hung, JP	Director of Civil Engineering and Development
Mr Michael LEUNG Chung-lap	Deputy Project Manager (New Territories East)1 Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr Stephen LI Tin-sang	Chief Engineer (New Territories East)2, New Territories East Development Office Civil Engineering and Development Department
Ms Jessie KWAN Ka-pui	Senior Town Planner (Kowloon)5 Planning Department

Attendance by invitation:

Dr Steven J CANNON	Executive Vice-President (Administration and Finance) University of Hong Kong
Professor CHAN Ying-shing	Associate Dean (Development and Infrastructure) Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine University of Hong Kong

Mr TAM King-leung

Director of Estates
University of Hong Kong

Mr Bernard V LIM

Principal
Architecture Design and Research Group
Limited

Clerk in attendance:

Ms Doris LO

Chief Council Secretary (1)2

Staff in attendance:

Mr Raymond CHOW

Senior Council Secretary (1)6

Ms Mandy LI

Council Secretary (1)2

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 four funding proposals on the agenda for the meeting. All of them were items carried over from the previous meeting of the Subcommittee. He reminded members that in accordance with Rule 83A of the Rules of Procedure ("RoP") of the Legislative Council, 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 708 – Capital Subventions and Major Systems and Equipment
PWSC(2017-18)20 63EG Academic building at No. 3 Sassoon
Road**

2. The Chairman advised that the proposal, i.e. PWSC(2017-18)20, sought to upgrade 63EG to Category A at an estimated cost of \$810.9 million in money-of-the-day ("MOD") prices for the construction of a new academic building for the Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine ("Medical Faculty") of the University of Hong Kong ("HKU") at No. 3 Sassoon Road, Pokfulam. The Administration consulted the Panel on Education on the proposed works on 15 May 2017. Panel members supported the submission of the funding

proposal to the Subcommittee for consideration. A gist of the Panel's discussion was tabled at the meeting.

Cost of works and plot ratio of the site of the proposed building

3. Dr KWOK Ka-ki said that he was a graduate of the Medical Faculty of HKU. He supported the proposed works. Dr KWOK recalled that in 2016, the university estimated that the capital cost of the proposed works would be about \$500 million. He asked HKU to explain why the then estimated construction cost was lower than the current funding request of \$810.9 million. Dr CHENG Chung-tai raised similar questions.

4. Mr TAM King-leung, Director of Estates, HKU ("DoE/HKU"), explained that the preliminary cost estimate of the proposed works HKU had worked out earlier was based on a plot ratio of 3.5 for the proposed building. As the proposed building had a plot ratio of 5 under the current design, the amount of funding being sought was higher than the preliminary estimate. He further said that the construction unit cost of the construction floor area under the proposed project was lower than that of similar projects.

5. Dr KWOK Ka-ki enquired whether the cost estimate of the proposed works had been examined by the Project Cost Management Office ("PCMO") of the Development Bureau, and requested HKU to take measures to reduce the cost of works. Permanent Secretary for Development (Works) ("PS/DEV(W)") said that PCMO had examined the design of the proposed works to ensure that the construction cost was reasonable.

6. Mr HUI Chi-fung enquired whether the proposed works would involve expenses other than the funding being sought; if so, the details of such expenses.

7. DoE/HKU replied that under the existing mechanism, the construction cost of the teaching facilities of University Grants Committee-funded tertiary institutions that were consistent with the Administration's funding policy was fully funded by the Government. The cost related to other additional items or special improvement works, such as those carried out to meet the specific needs of the university, would be borne by HKU. According to HKU's estimate, the relevant cost was in the region of \$50 million to \$100 million.

8. Mr YIU Si-wing enquired whether the proposed building had fully utilized the plot ratio of the site concerned. DoE/HKU said that the permitted plot ratio of the site was 10. Taking into account restrictions such

as building height, the proposed building had already fully utilized the site's usable plot ratio of 5 under its current design.

Land exchange arrangement required for the implementation of the proposed works

9. Mr WU Chi-wai requested the Administration/HKU to provide information on the details of the land exchange arrangement in connection with the proposed works (i.e. surrender of HKU's University Pathology Building to the north of the existing Block K of Queen Mary Hospital ("QMH") and re-grant of the Hospital Authority's site at No. 3 Sassoon Road), including the timetable of the land exchange, and the implications on the commencement time and cost of the proposed works if the exchange could not be completed on schedule.

Admin/
HKU

10. DoE/HKU undertook to provide the relevant information after the meeting. He pointed out that subject to the relevant funding approval of the Finance Committee ("FC"), the proposed works and the land exchange could commence. He further said that in order to speed up implementation, HKU had invited tenders for the proposed works. However, the validity periods of the tenders would expire if the project funding could not be obtained on schedule.

11. Mr WU Chi-wai enquired if the proposal was endorsed by the Subcommittee, whether the Administration would submit the funding proposal for the proposed works for FC's consideration as soon as possible for their timely implementation. Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury)³ replied in the affirmative.

12. Mr YIU Si-wing enquired about the respective areas of the site of the University Pathology Building and the site at No. 3 Sassoon Road; and whether additional expenses would be incurred for the handover of the two sites; if so, which party should bear the expenses. In response, DoE/HKU said that the site at No. 3 Sassoon Road was larger than the site of the University Pathology Building. The cost of the proposed works had already included the expenses involved in the handover relating to the land exchange.

Facilities of the proposed building

13. Mr Jeremy TAM enquired: (a) whether the number of places to be provided by the Medical Faculty of HKU was expected to increase after completion of the proposed building; if so, the number of places involved; and (b) whether the size and patient handling capacity of the teaching clinic

of the School of Chinese Medicine would be expanded following its relocation to the proposed building; if so, the relevant figures.

HKU

14. Prof CHAN Ying-shing, Associate Dean (Development and Infrastructure), Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine, HKU ("Asso Dean (D&I)/LKS Fac Med, HKU"), responded that the new building was mainly for addressing the issue of inadequate teaching and research facilities at the Medical Faculty of HKU due to the substantial growth in staff and student populations in recent years. He undertook to provide the information requested by Mr TAM after the meeting.

15. Dr CHENG Chung-tai enquired: (a) what improvements would be made to the teaching facilities of the Medical Faculty of HKU and whether the teaching and learning space per student would increase upon completion of the proposed building; and (b) whether the teaching facilities of the proposed building would cater for the changes in teaching approach at the Medical Faculty in recent years, such as requiring students to take elective subjects apart from their major subjects.

16. DoE/HKU said that the crowded teaching environment at the Medical Faculty of HKU at present would be improved upon completion of the proposed building. Asso Dean (D&I)/LKS Fac Med, HKU further pointed out that the proposed building was mainly for use by the nursing and Chinese medicine students of the Medical Faculty of HKU. Facilities such as the nursing teaching laboratory and the teaching clinic of the School of Chinese Medicine inside the building could provide students with sufficient study space. He also advised that under the current arrangement, Medical Faculty students could choose elective subjects which were taught at the Main Campus of HKU alongside their major subjects.

17. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen enquired about the details of the gender-friendly facilities in the proposed building. Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan noted that the proposed building would be the first of its kind in HKU with gender-friendly toilets on each floor. He asked how HKU came up with this idea and whether the university would provide such facilities in other new buildings to be built in future. Dr Fernando CHEUNG enquired whether, instead of toilets that served both purposes, gender-friendly toilets and accessible toilets would be provided separately in the proposed building.

18. Mr Bernard V LIM, Principal, Architecture Design and Research Group Limited, ("Principal/AD+RG") said that apart from accessible toilets, gender-friendly toilets would also be provided on each floor of the proposed

building. There would be altogether 41 gender-friendly toilets in the whole building.

19. Dr Steven J CANNON, Executive Vice-President (Administration and Finance), HKU ("EVP (A&F)/HKU"), further explained that HKU was committed to providing its staff and students with an equal opportunities (including gender-friendly) environment. The proposed project presented the right opportunity for the university to implement the initiative. DoE/HKU supplemented that at the request of HKU Student Union, the university planned to redevelop some facilities on the campus to make way for gender-friendly toilets. The university would determine the number of gender-friendly toilets in new buildings to be built in future having regard to the feedback of staff and students.

20. Dr Fernando CHEUNG supported the proposed works. He suggested that HKU should entrust the operation of the cafeteria in the proposed building to social enterprises so as to assist the disadvantaged groups. DoE/HKU took note of Dr CHEUNG's suggestion and undertook to relay the same to the relevant departments.

21. Mr WU Chi-wai was concerned whether the provision of merely 26 carparking spaces in the proposed building would be sufficient. He enquired about the standards adopted by HKU in determining the number of carparking spaces to be provided and whether the number could be increased.

22. Principal/AD+RG replied that the number of carparking spaces provided in the proposed building conformed with lease conditions. As the car park was located on the basement floor of the proposed building and was costly to build, the university had no plans to provide more carparking spaces in the proposed building.

Connectivity between the proposed building and the surrounding areas

23. Mr HUI Chi-fung supported the proposed works. He was concerned how the proposed building would be connected to the adjacent QMH, and whether convenient access to the bus stop on Pokfulam Road was available for users of the building. He also enquired whether the building would be opened to the public after its completion. Mr CHU Hoi-dick suggested that an additional pedestrian entrance/exit be provided on the southeastern side of the proposed building to facilitate users' access to the nearby bus stop on Pokfulam Road.

24. DoE/HKU explained that a pedestrian bridge would be built to provide connection between the second floor of the proposed building and the

existing footbridge linking to QMH. The Administration also planned to widen the walkway at the bus layby along Pokfulam Road located next to the proposed building. He also pointed out that to ensure traffic and pedestrian safety, the vehicular ingress/egress of the building would be provided on Sassoon Road where there was less pedestrian and vehicular traffic.

25. Principal/AD+RG supplemented that building users might access the bus stop on Pokfulam Road via the Pokfulam Road entrance/exit on the first floor of the building. The proposed works also covered improvement works to the walkway from Sassoon Road to Pokfulam Road to divert the pedestrian traffic accessing Pokfulam Road. As for the suggestion of providing an additional entrance/exit on the southeastern side of the proposed building, he explained that there was a plot of land under the management of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department situated between that side of the building and Pokfulam Road, and the gradient between that plot of land and Pokfulam Road was rather steep. Therefore, it might not be a suitable location for building an additional entrance/exit.

26. Dr Fernando CHEUNG was concerned whether the existing footbridge to QMH and the lift beside it would have to be closed for use when the proposed works were in progress. Principal/AD+RG responded that during the implementation of the proposed works, the footbridge and the lift beside it would remain open for public use. Protection measures would also be taken as appropriate at locations near the project site for the safety of passers-by.

Impact of the proposed works on important trees

27. Mr HUI Chi-fung noted that according to the discussion paper provided by the Administration, two important trees (T41 and T43) would be affected during the implementation of the project. Felling of the two important trees might be necessary to allow for the necessary slope upgrading works. On the other hand, the discussion paper also mentioned that the proposed felling of the two important trees was subject to the consideration and approval by the Lands Department under the Conditions of Exchange upon completion of the land transaction with HKU. In this connection, he asked the Administration/HKU to clarify whether the two trees would be felled.

28. Mr CHU Hoi-dick pointed out that the two aforesaid important trees were located on the slope between the proposed building and the recently-built Hong Kong Jockey Club Building for Interdisciplinary Research. He enquired whether upgrading works had been carried out for the slope concerned during the construction of the Building for

Interdisciplinary Research; and whether the Administration/HKU had taken this into consideration with a view to preserving the two trees as far as practicable. Dr Fernando CHEUNG also requested for preserving the two trees.

29. Principal/AD+RG responded that according to the preliminary investigation conducted by the engineering team, the necessary slope upgrading works would possibly damage the two important trees. The trees were therefore proposed to be felled. However, both HKU and the engineering team were eager to preserve the two trees. Upon completion of the land transaction, the engineering team would enter the project site to examine the conditions of the trees in detail and explore feasible preservation options. Before this, the engineering team could not confirm whether the trees could be preserved. DoE/HKU supplemented that the university had all along adopted a stringent monitoring mechanism for tree protection.

30. PS/DEV(W) also advised that staff of the Civil Engineering and Development Department and the engineering team of HKU should conduct site inspection of the slope and the conditions of the two important trees before deciding whether the trees could be preserved.

Admin/
HKU

31. The Chairman and Mr Dr KWOK Ka-ki requested the Administration/HKU to provide a further response after the meeting on whether the relevant government departments and the university would arrange expeditiously site inspections and further assessment on the conditions of the two important trees and invite tree experts to advise on possible preservation proposals, without having to wait until the land transaction had been completed. Dr Fernando CHEUNG made similar requests.

Energy conservation, green and recycled features

32. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen enquired whether the Administration had set any standards for the greening ratio of public works projects; and how the Administration would supervise the proposed works to ensure that incidents like the collapse of the greenery platform of a sports centre at the City University of Hong Kong in 2016 would not happen to the proposed building.

33. Principal/AD+RG said that the Administration had formulated guidelines on the greening ratio of public works projects. With a greening ratio of 20%, the proposed building had met the standards stipulated in the aforesaid guidelines. Provision of green features would not cause structural problems to the proposed building as the structural engineer had taken into

account the weight of such features when calculating the loading of the building.

Admin/
HKU

34. Mr CHU Hoi-dick requested the Administration/HKU to provide information on the design details of the energy conservation features and the renewable energy system under the proposed works, including the generating capacity of the photovoltaic system, the calculation of the payback period of about 9.6 years for the relevant devices, and a comparison with the payback period of other devices of the same type.

Naming of the proposed building and seeking donations for its construction

35. Dr KWOK Ka-ki requested HKU to provide information setting out the payment schedule and the amount of each installment in respect of the installment donation of \$1,000 million pledged by the Li Ka Shing Foundation to the Medical Faculty of HKU some years ago. Considering that the construction of the proposed building was mainly funded by the Administration, Dr KWOK and Dr Fernando CHEUNG requested the university to clarify whether the name of the proposed building would contain the words "Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine".

HKU

36. Asso Dean (D&I)/LKS Fac Med, HKU responded that the donation of \$1,000 million committed some years ago by the Li Ka Shing Foundation to the Medical Faculty of HKU had been received in full. He undertook to provide information on the donation at the request of Dr KWOK after the meeting. Asso Dean (D&I)/LKS Fac Med, HKU further said that the name of the proposed building would not contain the words "Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine".

37. Dr KWOK Ka-ki was concerned whether the naming of the Medical Faculty of HKU as Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine had discouraged people from making donations to the Medical Faculty, and whether the university had sought donations for the proposed building.

38. EVP (A&F)/HKU advised that at this stage, HKU had not yet sought donations for the proposed building. Asso Dean (D&I)/LKS Fac Med, HKU supplemented that the university would seek donations only after FC had approved the funding for the proposed works. Moreover, there had not been any cases where the Medical Faculty sought donations for new buildings in the past few years.

Other concerns

39. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen and Dr KWOK Ka-ki noted that HKU had an academic space shortfall of around 42 800 square metres in net operational floor area ("NOFA") as at the 2016/2017 academic year, while the proposed building could only provide space of around 10 400 square metres in NOFA. They enquired about HKU's plan to make up for the remaining space shortfall.

40. In response, EVP (A&F)/HKU said that HKU had drawn up a 10-year capital plan for expansion, which would be funded by the Government and donors, etc. DoE/HKU supplemented that HKU would build three more academic buildings on the Main Campus. The relevant projects were in the planning/design/vetting stage.

41. Dr KWOK Ka-ki noted that Patrick Manson Building, which was used by the Medical Faculty of HKU for teaching purpose, was built in the early 1960s and was approaching the last phase of its designed lifespan. He enquired whether Patrick Manson Building would be demolished after the completion of the proposed building.

42. Asso Dean (D&I)/LKS Fac Med, HKU replied that the Medical Faculty of HKU would relocate the teaching facilities at Patrick Manson Building to the proposed building after its completion. However, HKU would retain Patrick Manson Building and had no plans to demolish it at this stage.

43. Mr CHU Hoi-dick said that the proposed MTR South Island Line (West) would provide a station at QMH. He was concerned whether the Administration had reserved any space near the proposed building to tie in with the proposed railway development.

44. Dr CHENG Chung-tai enquired about the measures to be taken by Administration/HKU during the implementation of the proposed works to avoid affecting the operation of the adjacent QMH.

45. Principal/AD+RG advised that in order to minimize the impact of the proposed works on QMH, HKU would require works vehicles to access the project site only by the ingress/egress on Sassoon Road, which was located farther away from QMH, during construction. Moreover, other traffic arrangements in connection with the project site during construction were also subject to the Administration's approval.

46. There being no further questions from members on the item, the Chairman put the item to vote.

47. The item was voted on and endorsed. Dr KWOK Ka-ki requested the item, i.e. PWSC(2017-18)20, be voted on separately at the relevant FC meeting.

Head 707 – New Towns and Urban Area Development

PWSC(2017-18)21 765CL Development of Anderson Road Quarry Site

48. The Chairman advised that the proposal, i.e. PWSC(2017-18)21, sought to upgrade part of 765CL to Category A at an estimated cost of \$2,654.4 million in MOD prices for the road improvement and infrastructure works to support the proposed development of the Anderson Road Quarry ("ARQ") site. The Administration had consulted the Panel on Development on the proposed works on 28 March and 25 April 2017. A gist of the Panel's discussion was tabled at the meeting.

Private/subsidized split of the development of Anderson Road Quarry site

49. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen noted that the ARQ site would provide about 9 400 private and subsidized housing flats, while the Chief Executive had proposed in the 2017 Policy Address that the Administration would implement the "Starter Homes" Pilot Scheme for Hong Kong Residents ("Starter Homes" Pilot Scheme') using a residential site at Anderson Road on the Government's Land Sale Programme, which had an estimated capacity to provide about 1 000 residential units. In this connection, Mr CHAN requested the Administration to provide information on: (a) the private/subsidized (including public rental housing ("PRH"), Home Ownership Scheme ("HOS") and "Starter Homes" Pilot Scheme) split at the ARQ site; and (b) a breakdown of the flats by the aforesaid categories.

50. Dr KWOK Ka-ki supported the proposed works. He opined that the Administration should consider increasing the proportion of subsidized housing at the ARQ site, so as to address the shortage of PRH units in Hong Kong.

51. Mr CHU Hoi-dick said that he did not support the funding proposal. He and Ms Claudia MO requested the Administration to increase the supply of PRH units at the ARQ site.

52. In response, Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)¹ said that according to initial planning, the private/subsidized split was 80:20 for the some 9 400 flats proposed to be provided at the ARQ site. Under the proposed "Starter Homes" Pilot Scheme, the Administration planned to provide, among others, about 1 000 flats at a plot of land within the ARQ site which was originally earmarked for private housing development. As a result, the proportion of subsidized housing at the site would increase to more than 20%. She further said that the Development at Anderson Road next to it provided mainly public housing units, including about 17 000 PRH units in On Tat Estate and On Tai Estate. The overall private/subsidized split in the area would be around 30:70 if these new PRH flats and the existing public housing units in Sau Mau Ping were taken into account. The subsidized flats provided at the ARQ site were mainly HOS flats. When addressing the shortage of PRH units, the Government must also increase the supply of HOS flats to meet the aspiration of home ownership of the grassroots.

53. The Chairman requested the Administration to set out in writing the overall private/subsidized split under the Development at Anderson Road and the development of the ARQ site, so as to facilitate members' understanding of the overall housing planning of the area. The Administration undertook to provide the information requested by the Chairman and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen in writing after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: The written response provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC34/17-18\(01\)](#) (Chinese version) on 28 November 2017.)

Cost of works

54. Ms Claudia MO enquired how the Administration ensured that the proposed works would not experience cost overruns. In response, Director of Civil Engineering and Development ("DCED") said that in estimating the cost of the proposed works, the Administration had taken into account various design requirements and risk factors. As such, it was anticipated that cost overruns were unlikely to occur in the proposed works.

55. As the ARQ site would be mainly used for private housing development, Dr KWOK Ka-ki opined that the Administration should consider requiring private developers to share the construction cost of the infrastructure works, instead of having the works fully funded with public money. DCED replied that apart from the infrastructure works of the project, the proposed capital cost was mostly spent on improving/developing

the road system and pedestrian connectivity facilities surrounding the ARQ site to support the development needs of the whole area.

Traffic impact and the effectiveness of the proposed road improvement works

56. Mr Wilson OR noted that the Administration had conducted a traffic impact assessment ("TIA") in 2014 for the proposed development of the ARQ site. He enquired: (a) whether the Administration had updated the TIA in view of the latest development of the aforesaid site and surrounding areas; if so, the details of the latest assessment; if not, the reasons for that; and (b) how the road improvement works under the proposed works could mitigate the traffic impact of the development of the aforesaid site on Kwun Tong District. Mr WU Chi-wai made similar enquiries. Mr CHU Hoi-dick requested the Administration to provide the full text of the TIA report.

57. DCED explained that when conducting the TIA in 2014, the Administration had taken into account the traffic impact of the future development of the ARQ site and surrounding areas on Kwun Tong District. Moreover, the Transport Department had introduced short-term traffic mitigation measures in Kwun Tong District to alleviate local traffic congestion. Deputy Project Manager (New Territories East)1, Civil Engineering and Development Department ("DPM(NTE)1/CEDD"), added that the traffic mitigation measures included adjusting traffic signal timings and the locations of pick-up/drop-off areas. The Chairman urged the Administration to provide supplementary information on the TIA and the proposed road improvement works at the requests of members.

(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC34/17-18\(01\)](#) (Chinese version) on 28 November 2017.)

58. Ms Claudia MO noted that according to the supplementary information paper provided by the Administration for the Panel on Development ([LC Paper No. CB\(1\)847/16-17\(01\)](#)), the Administration envisaged that following the completion of a number of traffic infrastructural facilities (e.g. the Tseung Kwan O – Lam Tin Tunnel) and having regard to the traffic generated by the development of the ARQ site, the volume/capacity ratio of Tseung Kwan O Road in the morning peak hours in 2026 would be lower than the current ratio. Ms MO enquired how the Administration ensured that the projection tallied with the actual traffic conditions in future, so that traffic congestion would not occur in the vicinity of the ARQ site and surrounding areas.

59. DCED said that in its projection of the traffic conditions in the area up to 2026 in the TIA for the development of the ARQ site conducted in 2014, the Administration had taken into account the traffic impact on the district arising from the future development of the site and surrounding areas, as well as the completion of various traffic infrastructural facilities.

60. Mr HO Kai-ming said that he was a member of Kwun Tong District Council ("DC"). Mr HO urged the Administration to widen the roundabout at the junction of Lin Tak Road and Pik Wan Road, so as to improve the traffic conditions. He also queried why the Administration planned to provide pedestrian crossing facilities at the roundabout which was used by few pedestrians, without consulting members of the local DC. He was concerned that provision of pedestrian crossing facilities might slow down the vehicular traffic in the area.

61. Mr Wilson OR said that he was also a member of Kwun Tong DC. He enquired about the details of the public consultation conducted for the proposed works, including how the requests of members of local DCs were addressed. He pointed out that during the Administration's consultation with the Panel on Development on the proposed project, he had expressed concern over the traffic impact and moved a motion on road improvement works which was also passed by the Panel. Mr OR was dissatisfied that the Administration had not followed up with him on his suggestions. He requested the Administration to provide details of the improvement works to the roundabout at the junction of Lin Tak Road and Pik Wan Road.

62. DPM(NTE)1/CEDD replied that in 2015, the Administration consulted the relevant committees of Sai Kung DC and Kwun Tong DC on the proposed road improvement works. The relevant works were gazetted according to established procedures, and no objection was received. Some of the views collected during the consultation were adopted, including Mr OR's suggestion of adding a carriageway to Sau Mau Ping Road. The Administration was also willing to communicate further with Legislative Council Members and members of local DCs regarding the works concerned. On the road improvement works to the roundabout at the junction of Lin Tak Road and Pik Wan Road, DCED said that the proposed works involved a slight change in the location of the roundabout in order to improve the traffic conditions in the area.

Pedestrian connectivity facilities

63. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen was concerned that the pedestrian connection facilities near Po Tat Estate, Sau Mau Ping (South) Estate and Sau Mau Ping Estate were not included in the proposed project due to potential land issues

such as land resumption, where the Administration needed more time to sort out. He enquired when those issues were expected to be resolved.

64. DCED replied that various government departments were discussing the ways to resolve those issues. Once the issues were resolved, the Administration would seek funding approval from FC as soon as practicable, so that the pedestrian connection facilities could be completed expeditiously to tie in with the anticipated population intake of the ARQ development in 2023-2024.

65. Mr HO Kai-ming noted that under the proposed project, there was only one escalator link between Hiu Yuk Path and Hiu Ming Street. He urged the Administration to further extend the escalator link from Hiu Ming Street to Tsui Ping Road through Tsui Ping (North) Estate.

66. In response, DPM(NTE)1/CEDD said that the Incorporated Owners of Tsui Ping (North) Estate disagreed to the building of an escalator link through Tsui Ping (North) Estate due to the concern that the increased pedestrian traffic might cause disturbances to residents. Notwithstanding this, the Administration was willing to maintain communication with the Incorporated Owners on this matter.

67. Dr KWOK Ka-ki was concerned that the construction of the escalator link between Hiu Yuk Path and Hiu Ming Street cost \$67.2 million. He asked whether the said escalator was more costly than that of similar government projects. DCED said that the cost of the proposed escalator was comparable to that of similar government projects.

Proposed environmental mitigation measures

68. Mr WU Chi-wai noted that among the capital cost estimate of the proposed works, a total sum of \$397.7 million was earmarked for environmental mitigation measures and an environmental monitoring and audit programme. He requested the Administration to provide a breakdown of the expenditures under this item and the amounts involved. The Administration undertook to provide the information requested by Mr WU after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC34/17-18\(01\)](#) (Chinese version) on 28 November 2017.)

69. Mr HO Kai-ming was worried about the noise nuisance caused to the residents of Hong Wah Court in Lam Tin by the proposed vehicular flyover

connecting Lin Tak Road and Sau Mau Ping Road. He was concerned that the traffic noise generated from the vehicular flyover would not be sufficiently mitigated if the section of the flyover near Hong Wah Court was provided only with a noise semi-enclosure/noise barrier. As such, he opined that the Administration should instead provide a full noise enclosure for the section concerned.

70. DPM(NTE)1/CEDD explained that the noise barrier to be retrofitted to the section concerned was designed according to the criteria set out in the environmental impact assessment report, so as to lower the level of traffic noise generated from the proposed road to below 70 decibels.

71. Mr HO Kai-ming requested the Administration to provide supplementary information on the difference in the noise levels caused by flyover traffic to the residents of Hong Wah Court under the scenarios where a full noise enclosure, a noise barrier, or no noise mitigation measure was provided for the section near Hong Wah Court. The Administration undertook to provide the information after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC34/17-18\(01\)](#) (Chinese version) on 28 November 2017.)

72. Mr Wilson OR enquired about the technical issues which had to be overcome if a full noise enclosure was to be provided for the flyover section near Hong Wah Court. DCED said that the Administration had used a computer model to evaluate the design of the noise mitigation measures. The outcome indicated that the retrofitting of a noise semi-enclosure/noise barrier to the section was the most cost-effective option.

[At 10:00 am, the Chairman declared that the meeting be suspended for two minutes. The meeting resumed at 10:02 am.]

[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.]

73. The Chairman said that the Subcommittee would continue to discuss the item at the next meeting. The meeting ended at 10:45 am.