

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. PWSC40/00-01  
(These minutes have been  
seen by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/F/2/2

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

**Minutes of the 5th meeting  
held in the Chamber of Legislative Council Building  
on Wednesday, 6 December 2000, at 10:45 am**

**Members present :**

Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai, JP (Chairman)  
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon Kenneth TING Woo-shou, JP  
Hon Eric LI Ka-cheung, JP  
Hon CHAN Yuen-han  
Hon CHAN Kam-lam  
Hon Andrew WONG Wang-fat, JP  
Hon WONG Yung-kan  
Hon LAU Kong-wah  
Hon Mrs Miriam LAU Kin-yee, JP  
Hon Andrew CHENG Kar-foo  
Hon LAW Chi-kwong, JP  
Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP  
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, JP  
Hon Henry WU King-cheong, BBS  
Hon IP Kwok-him, JP  
Hon LAU Ping-cheung

**Members absent:**

Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan  
Hon Fred LI Wah-ming, JP  
Prof Hon NG Ching-fai  
Hon James TO Kun-sun

Hon SIN Chung-kai  
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP  
Dr Hon TANG Siu-tong, JP  
Hon Michael MAK Kwok-fung  
Hon WONG Sing-chi

**Public officers attending:**

Miss Elizabeth TSE	Deputy Secretary for the Treasury
Mr S S LEE, JP	Secretary for Works
Mr Gordon SIU, JP	Secretary for Planning and Lands
Mr Rob LAW, JP	Director of Environmental Protection
Mr James HERD	Principal Assistant Secretary of the Treasury (Works)
Mr Donald TONG	Principal Assistant Secretary for the Environment and Food
Dr LAU Ching-kwong, JP	Director of Civil Engineering
Mr F M LUK	Chief Engineer/Technical Services, Civil Engineering Department
Mr Sam WONG	Principal Environmental Protection Officer/Local Control Office (Territory North), Environmental Protection Department
Miss Eliza YAU	Principal Assistant Secretary for Security
Mr KWOK Ka-keung, JP	Director of Finance, Administration and Planning, Hong Kong Police Force
Mr Patrick LI	Principal Assistant Secretary for Education and Manpower
Mr S H PAU, JP	Director of Architectural Services
Mr Peter P Y LEUNG	Assistant Director of Education (Special Duties)
Mr M L WAN	Principal Assistant Secretary for Housing (Project Management)
Mr H K WONG, JP	Director of Territory Development
Mr P S TAM	Project Manager, Housing Department
Mrs Christina KWONG	Chief Engineer (Kowloon West), Kowloon Development Office Territory Development Department
Ms Shirley LAM	Principal Assistant Secretary for Transport
Mr Y C LO, JP	Director of Highways
Mr Y C TSE	Chief Engineer/Major Works 2-1, Highways Department
Mr Y M LEE	Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories West, Transport Department
Mrs Christina KWONG	Chief Engineer (Kowloon West), Kowloon Development Office Territory Development Department

**Clerk in attendance:**

Miss Polly YEUNG

Chief Assistant Secretary (1)3

**Staff in attendance:**

Ms Pauline NG

Assistant Secretary General 1

Ms Anita SIT

Senior Assistant Secretary (1)8

---

**HEAD 705 - CIVIL ENGINEERING**

**PWSC(2000-01)65**

**51DP**

**Environmental improvement of  
Shing Mun River**

Some members expressed concern about the effectiveness of the proposed bioremediation method, which was a new technology in Hong Kong, for tackling the pollution problems of the Shing Mun River (the River). Noting that the project comprised two stages and was scheduled for completion by December 2005, Mr LAU Kong-wah urged that the proposed works should be closely monitored at the early stage of implementation. If the proposed works were ineffective in attaining the intended results, the Administration should take prompt action to explore other alternatives.

2. The Director of Civil Engineering (DCE) assured members that a three-month pilot field trial of the bioremediation method had been carried out at a section of the River in 1997 and the results were very satisfactory. He added that although bioremediation was a new technology in Hong Kong, its use in many countries including Japan, the United States and Canada had proved to be very effective.

3. On monitoring, the Principal Environmental Protection Officer/Local Control Office (Territory North), Environmental Protection Department (PEPO/LCO(TN)) pointed out that during the Stage 1 works, the condition of the riverbed sediments and the water quality of the River would be closely monitored with reference to a comprehensive set of indicators. Based on the outcome of the Stage 1 works scheduled for completion in December 2002, the Administration would review the works programme of Stage 2. At the Chairman's request, the Administration agreed to report the monitoring results of the Stage 1 works to the Panel on Environmental Affairs in due course.

4. Mr Andrew CHENG considered the time frame for the whole project unduly long and urged the Administration to expedite the project. In response, DCE confirmed that the Administration had critically reviewed the programme for the Stage 1 works and considered that the present schedule was appropriate.

He further advised that the scale of the Stage 2 works would be reviewed in about one year's time in the light of the results of the Stage 1 works.

5. Noting that the proposed works included the dredging of riverbed sediments, Mr CHAN Kam-lam sought clarification on how the dredging works would complement the bioremediation method. He was also concerned whether the effectiveness of the bioremediation method would be affected by the tidal flows between the River and Tolo Harbour.

6. In response, PEPO/LCO(TN) explained that the bioremediation process involved the injection of chemicals into the riverbed sediments. Micro-organisms in the river would then utilize the chemicals to convert organic matter within the sediments into harmless natural materials. Thus, the organic contaminant content in the treated sediments would be significantly reduced. If dredging works were carried out without bioremediation, the contaminated sediments at the lower riverbed levels would be exposed to the water body during the dredging works and give rise to obnoxious odour. He also advised that generally speaking, bioremediation would be applied before undertaking dredging works but the actual arrangement would depend on the condition of the sediments and the geographical characteristics of different sections of the River. DCE supplemented that as bioremediation chemicals would be injected into the riverbed sediments as deep as one metre below the riverbed surface, the tidal flows of the River would not cause significant depletion of the chemicals applied. This was confirmed during the aforesaid three-month pilot field trial.

7. On the various sources of pollution load discharged into the River, PEPO/LCO(TN) advised that at present, the main source of pollution load was the unsewered villages in the Shing Mun River Catchment and the situation would be significantly reduced upon completion of a phased sewerage programme for these villages. The project under the present proposal sought to deal with the other major problem, i.e. the contaminated sediments that had been accumulated in the River over the years. In reply to the Chairman's enquiry, PEPO/LCO(TN) confirmed that the problem relating to the pollution load of the industrial discharges carried through the Fo Tan Nullah had been satisfactorily tackled with in the early 1990s.

8. Mr WONG Yung-kan and Mr Andrew WONG expressed concern that while the pollution load carried by various discharge sources had been effectively dealt with through other projects, pollution load might still be brought into the River by the tidal flows from Tolo Harbour, bearing in mind that reclamation works were underway at the Pak Shek Kok area. In this connection, Mr Andrew WONG suggested that the Administration should seriously consider the construction of water dams at the River with a view to controlling the tidal flows between the River and Tolo Harbour and containing the bioremediation chemicals applied into the River as desired.

9. In response, PEPO/LCO(TN) confirmed that the Administration had already considered various improvement techniques and engineering methods to tackle the pollution problems of the River and had come to the view that a combination of the measures under the present proposal was the most cost-effective option. He also advised that all along, the River had served a flood relief function. The construction of water dams at the River might give rise to flooding risks. The Principal Assistant Secretary for the Environment and Food (PAS(EF)) also highlighted the importance of timely improvement to the water quality of the River. The present project with emphasis on bioremediation was expected to commence in March 2001. While the Administration could look into other proposals such as the construction of water dams, it would take quite some time to study, plan and implement such proposals. Hence, unlike the present proposal, these alternative proposals would not be able to bring early improvement to Shing Mun River.

10. Mr Andrew WONG was not convinced and stated his view that unlike other rivers, Shing Mun River was subject to the pollution impact of Tolo Harbour apart from the discharges from its upstream catchment. Hence, the pollution problems of the River could only be effectively tackled by controlling the tidal flows between the River and Tolo Harbour.

11. Noting that about 140 000 cubic metres of contaminated riverbed sediments generated by the project would be disposed of at East Sha Chau, Mr WONG Yung-kan expressed grave concern about possible overloading of the dumping site, bearing in mind that it would also accommodate the contaminated mud generated from other ongoing large scale projects such as the Disneyland development project and the Container Terminal No. 9 project. In response, PAS(EF) advised that according to the Administration's estimate, the dumping site for contaminated mud at East Sha Chau could cope with the requirements of existing and committed projects up to year 2004. The Administration was undertaking a study to identify other suitable sites for disposal of contaminated mud and would conduct an environmental impact assessment for any site so identified. LegCo Members and the Advisory Council on the Environment would also be consulted before a decision was taken on designating new marine disposal site(s).

12. Noting that the Stage 1 works were estimated to cost \$70 million, Mr Kenneth TING enquired about the estimated total cost for the project. In reply, DCE advised that the current estimate for the Stage 2 works was \$30 million. However, depending on the results of the Stage 1 works, the Stage 2 works might be scaled down or might even not be required.

13. Mr Henry WU enquired whether the Administration had made reference to the experience in the Mainland as he understood that the relevant authority in Shanghai had tackled similar river pollution problems with success and at relatively low costs. In response, DCE said that he had learned through

media reports and informal contacts about the environmental improvement works undertaken in Shanghai to tackle the pollution problems of the Suzhou River. He confirmed that there had been no formal exchange of views between the Hong Kong Government and the Mainland authorities about the present project. In this connection, Mr Henry WU commented that apart from overseas cases, the Administration should also make reference to the experience of the Mainland in tackling water pollution problems. The Administration took note of Mr WU's comment for consideration.

Admin

14. Mr Kenneth TING enquired whether the Administration had tapped the expertise at local universities in planning for the present project. In reply, DCE advised that as far as the Administration was aware of, local universities had not undertaken any research on the bioremediation technology. As the technology had not been applied in Hong Kong, the consultants in planning for the project had drawn reference mainly from overseas experience. He however remarked that arrangements had been made for in-house staff to be actively involved in the project with a view to developing in-house expertise in the new technology.

15. In reply to Mr Andrew WONG's enquiry about the management of the River, PEPO/LCO(TN) advised that the Lands Department was responsible for the routine collection of floating refuse in the River while the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department carried out routine street cleaning to reduce rubbish and pollutants being carried into the River.

16. The item was voted on and endorsed.

## **HEAD 705 - CIVIL ENGINEERING**

### **PWSC(2000-01)63                      238LP                      Reconstruction of Tai Lam Chung Pier, Tuen Mun**

17. Mrs Miriam LAU expressed support for the present proposal. However, she questioned the need for the proposed 6.5-ton crane at the new pier to replace the existing fixed crane with a 3 ton capacity. Mr CHAN Kam-lam shared her view and pointed out that most cargoes carried by vessels were usually below 1.5 ton in weight.

18. In response, the Principal Assistant Secretary for Security (PAS(S)) advised that as larger vessels were currently being used for transporting cargoes, the 6.5-ton crane was required to improve the efficiency of the loading/unloading activities at the new pier. The said crane would mainly be used for the loading and unloading of equipment and other supplies for the Tai Lam Marine Police Base (TLCMPB) as well as for an office of the Customs and Excise Department located in the vicinity.

19. On the provision of loading/unloading crane facilities in other Marine Police bases, PAS(S) provided the following information -

<u>Marine Police base</u>	<u>Provision of crane facility</u>
Marine Police Regional Headquarters	one 5-ton pillar crane
Marine Eastern Division	one 70-ton mobile crane
Marine South Division	two 2-ton pillar cranes
Marine Northern Division	one 10-ton mobile crane
Shum Shui Po Operational Base	one 6.5-ton pillar crane

20. Members noted that under this project, in order to provide adequate space for the maintenance of small boats, the existing slipway would be demolished and an area of about 600 square metres would be reclaimed at the same location. Also, a solid finger pier equipped with a 30-ton marine travel hoist for lifting small boats would be constructed. Mrs Miriam LAU sought justification for these facilities.

21. The Administration explained that a slipway was not a satisfactory arrangement for maintenance and repair, as the limited space at the slipway allowed only one boat to be maintained at any one time and the maintenance work had to be undertaken in an unsheltered area. With the construction of the proposed facilities, small boats requiring maintenance and repair would moor at the area between the solid finger pier and the reclaimed area where they would be lifted by the 30-ton marine travel hoist onto the reclaimed land for repair works. The marine travel hoist would be movable and straddle across the solid finger pier and the reclaimed area. The Administration also confirmed that the proposed combination of facilities for small boat maintenance and repair works was the most economical option given the site constraints.

22. In response to Mr CHAN Kam-lam's concern about the need for a breakwater to reduce wave force, DCE advised that the proposed solid pier of 95 metres long and 14 metres wide would also serve the function of a breakwater.

23. On the use of the proposed two pillars, the Chief Engineer/Technical Services, Civil Engineering Department (CE/TS) advised that the two pillars would be used for the mooring of small boats. As to whether buoys would be a better alternative as suggested by Mr CHAN Kam-lam, CE/TS said that pillars and buoys served similar functions but the latter were usually used in fairways. Mrs Miriam LAU considered that pillars were more suitable in this case as the marine base was akin to a typhoon shelter and pillars could better secure the moored small boats in position.

24. Noting that four berths would be provided at the new pier, Mr CHAN Kam-lam enquired whether consideration had been given to providing a movable crane at the pier so that loading/unloading activities could take place at any of the four berths. CE/TS advised that the four berths were provided to facilitate the boarding and landing of passengers. According to the user department, i.e. TLCMPB, there was no need to provide a movable crane for the loading and unloading of cargoes.

25. The item was voted on and endorsed.

### **HEAD 703 - BUILDINGS**

<b>PWSC(2000-01)68</b>	<b>238ES</b>	<b>Secondary school in Area 12, Tai Po</b>
	<b>256EP</b>	<b>Primary school in Area 12, Tai Po</b>

26. Mr Henry WU noted that the piling costs for the proposed secondary school and primary school were \$14 million and \$2.5 million respectively and enquired whether it was feasible to swap the position of the two schools to reduce the total piling cost for the two schools.

27. In reply, the Director of Architectural Services (DArchS) confirmed that consideration had been given to swapping the position of the two schools, but it was found that the resultant layout would not be desirable given the need to provide an emergency vehicular access for both schools. He also advised that as the piling cost difference was mainly attributed to the different ground conditions of the two school sites, swapping the position of the two schools would not result in a significant reduction in the total piling cost.

28. Mr Henry WU considered that more diverse school designs instead of a standard design should be adopted for new schools. Mr LAU Kong-wah echoed Mr Henry WU's concern. While they appreciated the practical constraints of making substantial variations to the design of the proposed two schools and other new schools scheduled for completion shortly, they enquired about the feasibility of providing non-standard designs for those schools that were under longer-term planning.

29. In response, the Principal Assistant Secretary for Education and Manpower advised that there was a practical need to adopt standard school designs as the Government was undergoing a massive school programme with the construction of about 120 secondary and primary schools between 1998 and 2002 to meet the demand for school places and to achieve the 60% interim target on the provision of whole-day primary schooling. The adoption of a standard design would enable schools to be completed in a shorter period of time. Notwithstanding, the Government recognized the importance of enhancing the diversity of school design and to cater for the needs of individual



schools. To this end, for standard design schools, the Education Department would aim to allocate these schools to school sponsoring bodies as early as possible so that the latter's views could be tapped at an early stage and accommodated as far as possible and practicable. Moreover, starting from the school allocation exercise in 1999, some school sites were allocated to school sponsoring bodies direct for them to construct their own school buildings.

30. DArchS supplemented that it would take an additional nine to 12 months to complete a school project if a non-standard design was to be adopted for each school project. He however advised that the Architectural Services Department was undertaking a study to devise a series of feasible layouts for schools. The objective was to retain the existing grouping of school blocks for fire safety and practical design but to vary their relative positions with a view to optimizing the potential of individual sites for provision of facilities. The study would be completed in one month.

31. The item was voted on and endorsed.

## **HEAD 711 - HOUSING**

### **PWSC(2000-01)71          652TH          Noise mitigation measures for Housing Site No. 6 and 10 at West Kowloon Reclamation**

32. Mr Albert CHAN sought clarification on the policy regarding the responsibility for the provision of noise mitigation measures, notably noise barriers, alongside railways. He questioned whether the present proposal signified a policy change in that in future, it would be the responsibility of the Government, instead of the relevant railway corporation to provide the required noise mitigation measures alongside railway tracks if the requirement arose from a change in land use after construction of the railway tracks in question. Mr Abraham SHEK opined that as excessive noise in this case was generated by the Airport Railway, the Mass Transit Railway Corporation Limited (MTRCL) should be responsible for funding the construction of the proposed noise barriers.

33. In response, the Principal Assistant Secretary for Housing (Project Management) (PAS(H)PM) advised that the Administration had carefully examined the circumstances of the present case taking into account the relevant provisions in the Noise Control Ordinance (NCO) (Cap. 400), the Mass Transit Railway Ordinance (Cap. 556) and the Agreement for the Design, Construction, Financing and Operation of the Airport Railway (ARA). Legal advice from the Department of Justice confirmed that MTRCL should not be held responsible for the provision of the required noise barriers in the present case.

34. The Deputy Secretary for the Treasury (DS/Tsy) said that the Administration had critically reviewed whether the MTRCL should be requested to pay for the construction and/or recurrent costs for the noise barriers proposed under this project item. As advised by the Government's counsel, however, the plans for the noise barriers were drawn up after finalization of the ARA and the Corporations' plan to develop the two new Tung Chung extensions. Accordingly, the Government could not bind the Corporation to accept any funding responsibility. Cases involving a change in land use zoning to facilitate new housing developments were a relatively new phenomenon. In anticipation of more such cases coming up, the Administration had already initiated a review involving the Housing Authority on how noise barriers so necessitated should be funded. As a general policy, the Administration would expect developers to share the costs. However, there could be complications as some noise barriers could straddle several roads or several development lots. The Administration would try to find an equitable way forward.

35. On the legal aspects, the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) referred to the application of the NCO in this case. DEP advised that he was empowered to issue a noise abatement notice to MTRCL under the said Ordinance when the housing developments in question had been occupied and the residents were subject to excessive noise generated by the railway. The NCO did not provide any defence for MTRCL on the grounds that the railway tracks were already in place before completion of the housing developments in question. However, in requiring rectification, DEP could not demand the other party to carry out works which were considered impracticable. In the present case, MTRCL would have a strong case to appeal against a noise abatement notice issued by DEP on the grounds that there would be enormous physical difficulty in putting up the required noise barriers for the housing developments after the two additional tracks for the Tung Chung Line were in place. This technical difficulty might be reinforced by a planning condition imposed by the Town Planning Board that the required noise barriers should be provided before the population intake of the housing sites in question. DEP recapitulated that it was also on grounds of impracticality that the Kowloon Canton Railway Corporation (KCRC) had not in the past been required to provide noise barriers to mitigate the excessive noise impact of its railway tracks at some locations because such provision was not practicable.

36. Mr Andrew WONG enquired whether DEP could issue a noise abatement notice under NCO pursuant to a complaint made by a passer-by. In reply, DEP advised that where residential buildings were concerned, DEP could not issue a noise abatement notice under the NCO simply in response to such a complaint. In this connection, the Chairman advised that issues related to DEP's powers under the NCO should preferably be pursued at another forum.

37. Mr Albert CHAN was not convinced and considered that the Administration's position in the present case had set an undesirable precedent of exonerating the railway corporations from their responsibility of providing noise barriers. He was of the view that the Administration should have provided sufficient justification for its policy change before seeking funding approval for the present project. As the developer of the housing developments in question was the Housing Authority (HA), Mr Albert CHAN queried whether HA should be responsible for the provision of the required noise barriers.

38. In response, PAS(H)PM advised that at present, there was no provision in the agreements between the Government and HA to enable the Government to recover the cost for providing the required noise barriers in this case. DS/Tsy confirmed that the Administration had been discussing with HA the arrangements for this project and similar cases which might arise in future. In view of the urgent need to provide the required noise barriers in this case, the Administration considered it appropriate to seek funding approval for the construction of the noise barriers without awaiting the outcome of the discussions with HA. In reply to the Chairman, DS/Tsy said that subject to any agreement to be reached with HA, she would not rule out the possibility that the cost for providing noise barriers for similar cases might be borne by HA.

39. Mr LAW Chi-kwong stated the view of Members of the Democratic Party (DP) that the present proposal, if approved, would have serious financial implications for the Government. So far, the Administration had not satisfactorily addressed the relevant policy issues, and it was still unclear as to which party, namely the Government, the relevant railway corporation or the developer(s) of the housing developments concerned, should be responsible for providing the required noise mitigation measures in future cases involving a change in land use after the railway tracks concerned had been built or the relevant agreement had been finalized. Pending a satisfactory response from the Administration, Mr LAW said that Members of DP could not support the present proposal.

40. Mr Abraham SHEK and Mr LAU Ping-cheung expressed concern about the safety aspects of noise barriers and enquired about the Government's legal liability in this regard. In response, DTD confirmed that the Government would pay for their maintenance cost. He advised that the noise barriers provided by the Government under this and other projects were in full compliance with relevant safety standards. For instance, emergency exit would be provided for fully enclosed noise barriers longer than 220 metres and the materials used for noise barriers were fire resistant. The Administration thus considered that the barriers would not pose any safety hazards which would incur liability on the Government.

41. Noting that the proposed noise barriers would reduce the rail noise impact at the housing sites in question from 71dB(A) to within the night time limit of 60dB(A), Mr Kenneth TING enquired which party would be held responsible if the noise barriers were found not effective for noise abatement after construction. In response, DTD advised that the rail noise impact levels on nearby housing developments before and after the provision of the proposed noise barriers had been derived from scientific calculations. It was unlikely that the proposed noise barriers would fail to achieve the intended noise mitigation effect. He added that the present methodology for calculation of noise impact levels had proved reliable based on the post-construction monitoring results of previous projects involving noise barriers.

41. In view of the possible adverse visual impact and high replacement and maintenance costs of noise barriers, Mr LAU Ping-cheung enquired whether the Administration had explored alternative measures for noise mitigation such as the planting of trees alongside roads and railways. The Chairman also highlighted his personal view that noise barriers were not necessarily the best option for noise mitigation. In response, DTD said that the planting of trees was not regarded as an effective noise mitigation measure as its mitigation effect was limited.

42. On the 16.5% on-costs payable to MTRCL for the design, construction supervision and insurance costs, DS/Tsy and DTD explained that the 16.5% on-cost formula had been in use for years for entrustment projects between the Government and MTRCL, including a number of Airport Core Programme projects. The Administration had initiated a review of this on-cost package in late 1999 taking into account the costs for similar items of work undertaken in-house, and the actual on-costs incurred under past projects entrusted to MTRCL and KCRC. The results of the review confirmed that the on-cost formula approach and the maximum rate of 16.5% remained appropriate. She agreed to provide a breakdown of individual components within the 16.5% on-cost package after the meeting for members' reference. DS/Tsy also clarified that the 16.5% was only the ceiling for the formula; if the Government was to entrust only certain but not all of the components within the package (which included design, project management, insurance, etc.), the on-costs applicable would be less than 16.5%.

Admin

43. On Mr Henry WU's concern about possible noise impact on the future school located between the housing sites in question, the Project Manager, Housing Department confirmed that the school would not be subject to excessive noise impact as it would be designed in such a way that the noise-sensitive elements would not be facing directly onto the railway tracks.

44. Mr Albert CHAN requested the Administration to withdraw the proposal and resubmit it after the relevant policy issues had been satisfactorily addressed. In response, DS/Tsy affirmed that prior to submitting the present

proposal, the Administration had discussed the subject at length with MTRCL, and had sought the necessary legal advice. Having considered all relevant factors, the Administration had decided to accept the responsibility of providing the required noise barriers in this case.

45. The item was voted on and endorsed.

#### **HEAD 706 - HIGHWAYS**

<b>PWSC(2000-01)73</b>	<b>365TH</b>	<b>Castle Peak Road improvement between Area 2 and Sham Tseng, Tsuen Wan</b>
	<b>553TH</b>	<b>Castle Peak Road improvement between Sham Tseng and Ka Loon Tsuen, Tsuen Wan</b>

46. Mrs Miriam LAU pointed out that this item might require considerable discussion. As it was approaching 12:30 pm, she envisaged that the Subcommittee might not have sufficient time to deal with this item and suggested that a special meeting be convened to consider this item. The Chairman also informed members that the Administration had initially proposed to include two other items for consideration at this meeting. However, on his advice that the agenda might then be too heavy, these two items had not been included. He therefore suggested that the present item PWSC(2000-01)73 and the aforesaid two items be considered at a special meeting while the Subcommittee would deal with the remaining item PWSC(2000-01)70 at this meeting as scheduled. Members then agreed to hold the special meeting on 13 December 2000 at 8:30 am. The Administration agreed to the meeting arrangement.

#### **HEAD 707 - NEW TOWNS AND URBAN AREA DEVELOPMENT**

<b>PWSC(2000-01)70</b>	<b>332CL</b>	<b>West Kowloon Reclamation - main works (remainder)</b>
------------------------	--------------	--

47. The item was voted on and endorsed.

48. The meeting ended at 12:35 pm.