

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. PWSC172/00-01
(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 21st meeting
held in the Chamber of Legislative Council Building
on Wednesday, 20 June 2001, at 8:30 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 Fred LI Wah-ming, JP
Prof Hon NG Ching-fai
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon CHAN Yuen-han
Hon CHAN Kam-lam
Hon SIN Chung-kai
Hon LAU Kong-wah
Hon Mrs Miriam LAU Kin-yee, JP
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP
Hon Andrew CHENG Kar-foo
Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP
Hon Henry WU King-cheong, BBS
Hon Michael MAK Kwok-fung
Hon IP Kwok-him, JP
Hon LAU Ping-cheung

Members absent:

Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan
Hon Andrew WONG Wang-fat, JP
Hon WONG Yung-kan
Hon LAW Chi-kwong, JP
Dr Hon TANG Siu-tong, JP

Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, JP
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 Daniel CHENG	Principal Assistant Secretary for Planning and Lands (Planning)
Mr H K WONG, JP	Director of Territory Development
Mr H H YEUNG	Chief Engineer (Hong Kong 1), Territory Development Department
Mr Stephen IP	Assistant Commissioner (Ferry and Paratransit) (Acting), Transport Department
Mr C J CHIVERS	Chief Engineer (New Territories West 1), Territory Development Department
Mr T F LEUNG	Chief Engineer (Port Works) (Acting), Civil Engineering Department
Ms Maria L Y SIU	District Planning Officer (Tsuen Wan & West Kowloon) (Acting), Planning Department
Mr Francis LO	Principal Assistant Secretary for Home Affairs
Mr S H PAU, JP	Director of Architectural Services
Mr Bob TONG	Assistant Director of Home Affairs (Acting)
Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung	Project Manager (Acting), Housing Department
Mr Patrick LI	Principal Assistant Secretary for Education and Manpower
Mr Peter P Y LEUNG	Assistant Director of Education (Special Duties)
Mr K S SHUM	Chief Technical Advisor/Subvented Projects, Architectural Services 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

7. Mr Kenneth TING expressed support for the proposal. He shared Mr IP Kwok-him's concern about the aforesaid statement and opined that the Administration should have stated its position on the provision of the suggested facility in a clear and positive manner.

8. In response, the Principal Assistant Secretary for Planning and Lands (Planning) PAS(P&L)(P) confirmed that the Administration considered the facility justified. He also clarified that the Administration kept an open mind to different views and in this case, pressure from the then Central and Western District Board had served as a catalyst in bringing about the provision of additional facility.

9. Mr Kenneth TING referred to the problem of uncharted underground utilities which had necessitated modifications to the design of the affected cooling water mains and drainage works. He expressed concern about the recurrence of the problem in public works projects and enquired about the remedial measures being taken. In reply, DTD said that the records on underground utilities, particularly those laid decades ago, were often inadequate or incorrect as was the case of the underground utilities along Connaught Road Central. He confirmed that measures to improve the records on underground utilities were being taken by relevant works departments and public utilities companies. For newly laid underground utilities, the Government would require the relevant utility companies to provide detailed records, most of which were now in digital form. The digitized records were more accurate and could facilitate easy retrievals. For Government projects, there was on-site monitoring to ensure that the relevant utility facilities were laid at designated locations.

10. The Chairman pointed out that based on his professional experience, while accurate records might be available for newly laid underground utilities, the original locations of underground utilities had often been altered subsequently when works were undertaken for other utilities at the same site or in the vicinity. Hence, there existed practical difficulty in maintaining very accurate records on underground utilities.

11. Mr Kenneth TING queried why the presence of soft material adjacent to the existing seawall, which necessitated additional dredging works, had not been detected at the site investigation stage. The Chief Engineer (Hong Kong 1), Territory Development Department (CE(HK1),TDD) confirmed that site investigation had been carried out for the project but the presence of soft material at certain spots had not been detected at that stage. When actual dredging works were carried out, it was found that soft material had accumulated near the existing seawall.

12. Miss Emily LAU enquired about the extent of the soft material and whether the dredging works would have any environmental impact. DTD and CE(HK1),TDD advised that the dredging works under this project had already been completed. The actual amount of material removed by dredging was about 14% higher than the original estimate and the cost for the dredging works had increased by \$4 million to \$28 million. Contaminated material removed during the dredging works had been

disposal of at East Sha Chau and necessary precautionary measures had been taken in accordance with the relevant environmental requirements.

13. On the information provided on the additional piling works, DTD took note of the Chairman's comment that the proper Chinese term for "bored piles" should be "大口徑鑽孔樁" rather than "螺旋樁" as used in the Chinese version of the discussion paper.

14. Mr Henry WU sought elaboration on the increase of \$13 million in the cost for implementation of traffic management measures at Connaught Road Central. DTD advised that due to the heavy traffic in Central, the Administration had to implement additional traffic diversion schemes during the construction period to minimize disruption to normal traffic. The Administration had maintained close liaison with C&WDC on the traffic arrangements for the project and some additional traffic diversion schemes had been implemented in the light of the views of the District Council. The Administration considered the additional cost justified as the overall traffic condition in Central during the construction period had been satisfactory.

15. Mr Henry WU enquired about the total sum in dispute between the Government and the Hong Kong Yamati Ferry Co Ltd (HYF). Mr CHAN Kam-lam questioned why the Administration had adhered to the modified design of the Central Piers drawn to cater for a development proposed by HYF notwithstanding that HYF had already abandoned the development proposal in 1998. In response, DTD advised that as the legal proceedings on the dispute were in progress, it would not be appropriate for him to disclose the details of the dispute. He confirmed that the Government had instituted legal proceedings to seek indemnity from HYF for all the additional costs arising from the modifications to the original design of the Central Piers. He also informed members that under the original design, Central Piers 4 to 7 were not as high because the original plan was to locate the water tanks, plant rooms etc. on top of the piers. Under the modified design, the height of all the piers had increased, thus necessitating additional costs to provide more curtain walls and other associated works.

16. Miss Emily LAU referred to the information on the estimated notional cost of \$125 per cubic metre (m³) for accommodating construction & demolition (C&D) waste at landfill sites and queried whether the notional cost estimate had realistically reflected the actual cost for the disposal of C&D waste at landfills. She also asked whether the notional cost estimate would form the basis for determining the charges for disposal of waste at landfills when the Administration contemplated to introduce such charges.

17. The Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) advised that the estimated notional cost of \$125 per m³ had taken into account the actual costs for developing, operating and restoring the landfills after they were filled, as well as the aftercare work required. The cost however had not taken into account the cost incurred in building the existing landfills which was about \$90 per m³ and the cost for building

new landfills in future. As regards the cost basis for the future landfill charges, DEP said that he was not in a position to advise on the future charging regime as the matter was still under consideration.

18. The Chairman said that issues relating to the cost for disposal of C&D waste at landfills and the charging for landfills were policy issues which should be pursued at the relevant Panel if members so wished.

19. The item was voted on and endorsed.

HEAD 707 - NEW TOWNS AND URBAN AREA DEVELOPMENT

**PWSC(2001-02)54 410CL Reclamation works for district open space
and government/institution/community
facilities in north Tsing Yi**

20. Members noted that a paper on the present proposal had been circulated to PLW Panel on 2 May 2001.

21. Mr SIN Chung-kai understood that this project had suffered serious delay due to land resumption problems. However, as five years had passed since the then Kwai Tsing District Board was last consulted on the project in 1996, he considered that the Administration should have reported the latest position of the project to the Kwai Tsing District Council before submitting the present proposal to this Subcommittee. The Administration took note of the comment for appropriate action in future.

Admin

22. Mr SIN Chung-kai enquired about the arrangements for tackling the land/seabed contamination at the project area, which had previously been occupied by shipyards, to safeguard nearby residents and workers against the risks arising from the contamination. In reply, the Chief Engineer (Port Works) (Acting), Civil Engineering Department (CE(PW),CED) clarified that contamination was mainly found on land where the former shipyards had carried out their operations. As the contamination would not disperse in the air, the risk associated with the contamination was low, and the decontamination works would not affect nearby residents. The workers engaged for the decontamination works would be required to wear protective gears when working and the decontamination works would also be monitored under the environmental monitoring and audit (EM&A) programme for the project.

23. In reply to Mr SIN Chung-kai's further enquiry, CE(PW),CED advised that the safety programme for the proposed works would include requirements on the contractor to ensure that necessary precautionary measures were taken by the workers and other persons involved in the decontamination works before making contacts with the contaminated soil. He added that similar decontamination works had been carried out in the Kai Tak area.

Admin

24. Mr Albert CHAN said that according to a study conducted by the Chinese University of Hong Kong at the request of the Tsuen Wan District Council, the seabed stretching from Tsuen Wan to Tsing Yi was covered with highly contaminated chemical materials. He pointed out that unlike the Kai Tak area, the project area in north Tsing Yi was close to residential developments and the Ma Wan fish culture zone. He recalled that in many previous projects, the treatment of contaminated materials had given rise to problems notwithstanding the implementation of an EM&A programme. He was therefore gravely concerned about the risk associated with the seabed and land contamination in the project area. At his request, the Administration agreed to provide, before the relevant Finance Committee (FC) meeting, detailed information on the type and extent of contamination in the project area, the risk associated with the contamination during the reclamation works and decontamination works, their possible effects on nearby residents, and details of the relevant precautionary and monitoring measures.

25. Mr TAM Yiu-chung enquired about the noise impact of the proposed works and the arrangements for transportation of public fill for the proposed reclamation. In reply, CE(PW),CED advised that with the implementation of noise mitigation measures such as the use of temporary noise barriers and silenced construction plant (in which the decontamination works would be carried out) and the appropriate programming of works to reduce noise generation, the noise impact of the proposed works on nearby noise sensitive receivers during the construction period would be within the prescribed limit of 70 dB(A). To minimize environmental and traffic impacts, the public fill for the proposed reclamation would be transported by sea.

26. Noting that the project had been gazetted in July 1994 and authorized by the Governor in Council in January 1997 but the construction works would only commence in January 2002 for completion in June 2006, Miss Emily LAU enquired about the reasons for the serious delay of the project and the feasibility to shorten the construction period.

27. In reply, PAS(P&L)(P) pointed out that implementation of the project required the relocation of 18 shipyards in northern Tsing Yi. The land resumption process involved complicated issues and in fact, several case conferences had been held between Legislative Council Members and the Administration. Clearance of the shipyard was not completed until June 2000. On whether the construction period could be shortened, he advised that to ensure strict compliance with the relevant environmental requirements, the decontamination works and the reclamation works would be carried out sequentially rather than concurrently. Hence, the project works would require a longer time to complete. In reply to Miss Emily LAU's further enquiry, PAS(P&L)(P) and DTD advised that the land resumption work for a project normally took about 18 to 24 months, while land resumption in the New Territories usually took a longer time. Miss Emily LAU urged the Administration to expedite the project as far as possible.

28. Mr Henry WU expressed support for the proposal. In reply to his enquiry, DTD and PAS(P&L)(P) advised that the curved-in area between the existing seawall

and the future seawall of the proposed reclamation was the location of the outfall of an existing stormwater drain and thus, it was not proposed to reclaim this area. They also confirmed that the curved-in area would not affect the continuity of the seawall and the presence of the outfall would prevent the accumulation of rubbish or soil at this area.

29. The item was voted on and endorsed.

Head 703 - Buildings

PWSC(2001-02)50 183SC Community hall at Yau Tong Estate Redevelopment, phase 4

30. Mr LAU Ping-cheung declared interest that his firm had been engaged by the Housing Authority (HA) to provide consultancy services for some of its projects.

31. Mr Fred LI expressed support for the proposal. Noting that the population in the Yau Tong area would grow to 155 000 upon full redevelopment of the area by year 2009-10, he enquired about the standard provision of community hall (CH) facilities for a population of this size and whether the proposed CH would be adequate to meet the requirements. In reply, the Assistant Director of Home Affairs (AD/HA) advised that under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, there was no standard ratio between the population size for a planning area and the number of CHs. Apart from population, other factors including the availability and accessibility of existing CHs or similar facilities nearby, the characteristics of the area in question and the aspirations of the community etc. would also be taken into account in planning for CHs. Having regard to the planned development of the Yau Tong area, the Administration considered it appropriate to provide a CH to serve this area.

32. Mr Fred LI further enquired whether additional CH facilities would be provided for the Yau Tong area if there was such a need in future. In reply, AD/HA advised that if there was a proven need for additional CH facilities in future, the Administration would plan for the facility accordingly. If building an additional CH was not feasible, the Administration would explore alternative arrangements such as making use of existing facilities managed by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department.

33. Members noted that the Government would entrust the proposed CH project to HA. Apart from consultants' fees, the Government would pay HA a 2% on-cost for the administrative and supervisory work undertaken by HA for the project. Mr Fred LI and Mr CHAN Kam-lam queried the necessity and cost-effectiveness of such a cumbersome arrangement given that the proposed CH was a relatively small-scale project.

34. The Project Manager (Acting), Housing Department (PM/HD) explained that the proposed CH was part of the Yau Tong Estate Redevelopment, phase 4 project

which also included a commercial centre, a public transport interchange (PTI) and a carpark. HA had engaged a consultant for the design and supervision of construction works for the whole redevelopment project. According to the agreed arrangement between the Government and HA for entrustment projects, the Government would share the consultants' fees on a pro-rata basis and pay an on-cost of 2% to HA for undertaking the administrative and supervisory work. PM/HD further advised that the CH and the carpark would be built unbeneath the PTI while the commercial centre would be located above the PTI. The entrance of the CH however would be located at the ground level. The entire redevelopment project was estimated to cost about \$1.2 billion. The total floor area of the CH was 2 000 m², representing about 3% of the total floor area of some 66 000 m² of the entire redevelopment project. The appropriation of the costs for the common works items including consultants' fees between the CH and other components of the project was based on this ratio.

35. Mr IP Kwok-him said that according to his observation and feedbacks from District Council members, the standard of sound and lighting equipment provided for CHs, even for newly built ones, generally fell short of present-day requirements. In reply to his enquiry about the standard of the furniture and equipment estimated at \$0.8 million for the proposed CH, the Principal Assistant Secretary for Home Affairs (PAS(HA)) advised the furniture and equipment to be provided for the proposed CH would include sound and lighting equipment. The items to be procured would not be lavish but would be adequate to meet the basic requirements of community activities held at the CH.

36. Mr IP Kwok-him reiterated his view that the existing provision of furniture and equipment, in particular the sound and lighting systems, was inadequate in meeting present-day requirements of community activities involving a few hundred participants. He urged the Administration to critically review and adjust the provision of furniture and equipment in this and future CH projects. Mr CHAN Kam-lam echoed the concern of Mr IP. He pointed out that voluntary agencies often had to hire sound and lighting equipment for their activities held at CHs. He considered it more cost-effective for the Government to provide modern sound and lighting systems at newly built CHs.

37. Mr Albert CHAN commented that the present design and facility provision for CHs were generally outdated and inadequate. He urged the Administration to critically review these aspects in planning for further CHs. He in particular pointed out that the existing provision of medium-sized multi-purpose rooms which could accommodate 20 to 30 people at CHs was generally inadequate to meet the demand. PAS(HA) said that the Administration would take into account Mr CHAN's view in planning for future CHs.

Admin

38. In this regard, Mr IP Kwok-him said that members in general considered the current standard of furniture and equipment provided for CHs far from adequate. At his request, the Administration agreed to provide, before the relevant FC meeting, an information paper to set out the items of furniture and equipment to be provided for the proposed CH, and to consider enhancing the provision of furniture and equipment,

Admin

if appropriate.

39. Miss CHAN Yuen-han said that as a measure to bridge the digital divide in the community, the Government had set up a number of cyberpoints equipped with computer facilities with Internet connection at existing community halls. In reply to her enquiry, AD/HA confirmed that the proposed CH would be equipped with the necessary facilities for the setting up of cyberpoints as in the case of existing community centres/CHs.

40. In reply to Miss CHAN Yuen-han's enquiry about the need for an environmental impact assessment (EIA) for the project, DEP advised that the types of projects that were subject to the EIA requirement were set out in the relevant Schedule under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (Cap. 36). In general, an EIA was required for projects which might have major impacts on the environment or for projects located at environmentally sensitive areas. Projects involving commercial buildings and housing estates were usually not subject to the EIA requirement unless the project concerned occupied a very large area of more than 20 hectares.

41. As regards the construction schedule, PM/HD advised that the Mass Transit Railway Corporation Limited would hand over the project site to HA in September 2002. The construction works for the entire redevelopment project were thus scheduled for commencement in September 2002 for completion in July 2004.

42. The item was voted on and endorsed.

43. Mr IP Kwok-him said that subject to the supplementary information to be provided by the Administration, he might raise further queries on this item at the relevant FC meeting. In this connection, the Clerk suggested that if members would wish to further discuss this item at FC after perusal of the information to be provided by the Administration, they should notify her prior to the relevant FC meeting (i.e. 6 July 2001) so that arrangement would be made for this item to be put to FC as a separate item for discussion and voting.

XX 44. Mr Fred LI suggested and the Chairman agreed that the provision of facilities in CHs involved general policy issues and should therefore be further discussed at the relevant Panel.

PWSC(2001-02)48	272EP	Primary School in Area 56, Tuen Mun
	288EP	Primary School in Ma Wan, Tsuen Wan

45. Mr Albert CHAN expressed grave concern about the impact of aircraft noise on the proposed primary school 288EP in Ma Wan. He said that according to the data collected by the Civil Aviation Department, the aircraft noise levels recorded at Ma Wan were sometimes as high as 78 dB(A) to 80 dB(A). He therefore enquired whether the design of the school had taken into account such an impact, and whether

air-conditioning and reimbursement of relevant electricity charges would be provided for the school.

46. The Principal Assistant Secretary for Education and Manpower (PAS(EM)) and the Assistant Director of Education (Special Duties) (AD/E(SD)) advised that under the existing policy, the Government would provide feasible noise abatement measures if it was envisaged that a planned school would be subject to traffic noise exceeding 65 dB(A). If a planned school would be subject to excessive aircraft noise, the Government would provide air-conditioning and would pay for the relevant electricity charges for the school. In this case, the Preliminary Environmental Review for proposed school 288EP had concluded that the school would not be subject to adverse environmental impacts.

47. DEP supplemented that while the stipulated limit for traffic noise impact on schools was 65 dB(A), the standard for aircraft noise currently adopted in Hong Kong is the Noise Exposure Forecast (NEF) Contour 25 standard. The site for school 288EP was outside the NEF 25 contour and the school would therefore not be subject to excessive aircraft noise impact. He further advised that traffic noise tended to be a constant noise source while aircraft noise was often intermittent. The general consensus among environmental authorities worldwide was that aircraft noise at 78 to 80 dB(A) lasting for a very short duration was not a highly intrusive noise and would not cause excessive impact on educational activities. He said that although some Members did not accept the NEF 25 contour standard, the standard was in line with the relevant international standard which had been established on the basis of extensive research.

48. Mr Albert CHAN said that he could not accept the Administration's approach in handling aircraft noise. He pointed out that during day time, aircraft passed over Ma Wan at two-minute intervals, and the aircraft noise had seriously affected the normal operation of schools in Ma Wan. In fact, since the opening of the new airport at Chek Lap Kok, many schools in Ma Wan had no alternative but to raise funds to install air-conditioners. He considered that the current planning policy in respect of aircraft noise had failed to address the problem of aircraft noise impact on schools as well as other noise sensitive receivers. He stated that he could not support the proposed school project 288EP if the Administration obstinately ignored his request to tackle the aircraft noise problem.

49. Miss Emily LAU also expressed concern about the aircraft noise impact on proposed school 288EP and called on the Administration to find ways to rectify the situation.

50. In response, AD/E(SD) advised that the Administration was actively reviewing the provision of air-conditioning for public sector schools with a view to enhancing the teaching and learning environment. In this regard, financial provision under the Quality Education Fund had been earmarked for installation of air-conditioners for half of the number of classrooms in proposed school 288EP. The Administration was actively seeking funds from other sources for installation of air-conditioners for

the remaining classrooms before the school commenced operation. Although he was unable to make a firm commitment at this stage, he was optimistic that sufficient funds could be secured for installation of air-conditioners for all the classrooms of the school. At Miss Emily LAU's request, AD/E(SD) agreed to report to the Subcommittee the final arrangement for the provision of air-conditioning for this school in due course. AD/E(SD) also confirmed that the Tsuen Wan District Council supported the proposed school project 288EP.

51. Noting that non-standard designs were adopted for the two proposed schools, Miss Emily LAU enquired about the major characteristics of the school designs and the actual provision of open space for students. In reply, the Director of Architectural Services advised that the school designs had been tailor-made to tie in with the shape and topography of the school sites. The design for school 288EP could obviate the need for the construction of retaining walls and site leveling, which would require an additional cost of some \$14 million. The design could also capture the scenic views to the west of the site. He also advised that the open space provision for school 272EP was 2.3 square metres (m²) per student and that for 288EP was 2.14 m² per student.

52. Miss Emily LAU enquired whether the two proposed schools had been allocated to school sponsoring bodies (SSBs) and whether the existing bi-sessional schools to be converted into whole-day operation upon completion of the proposed schools had been consulted on the conversion arrangements. In reply, AD/E(AD) advised that the current policy was to allocate planned schools to SSBs as early as possible. The Administration planned to allocate the two schools to SSBs at the coming school allocation exercise in July 2001. In view of the additional time required for drawing up the school designs, it was not feasible to allocate the two proposed schools to SSBs at an earlier planning stage. AD/E(SD) further advised that due to the special characteristics of the two school sites, there would be limited scope for alterations to the layout and other basic design features of the schools, but there would still be considerable scope for the relevant SSBs to provide input for the detailed design.

(Post-meeting note: The Administration advised after the meeting that the school in Ma Wan, 288EP, had in fact been allocated to a school in Tsuen Wan, the CCC Kei Wai Primary School, for whole day schooling in the School Allocation Exercise announced on 14 June 2001. AD/E(SD) apologized for an error in his reply at the meeting.)

53. Mr Albert CHAN requested that the two school projects be voted on by the Subcommittee separately. In reply to the Chairman, the Deputy Secretary for the Treasury had no objection to putting the two school projects to separate vote.

54. The Chairman put the proposal for project "272EP - Primary school in Area 56, Tuen Mun" to vote. The proposal was voted on and endorsed.

55. The Chairman then put the proposal for project "288EP - Primary school in Ma Wan, Tsuen Wan" to vote. Five members voted for the proposal, five members voted against and two members abstained -

For:

Miss CHAN Yuen-han
Mr CHAN Kam-lam
Mr TAM Yiu-chung
Mr Henry WU King-cheong
Mr IP Kwok-him
(5 members)

Against:

Mr Fred LI Wah-ming
Mr SIN Chung-kai
Mr Andrew CHENG Kar-foo
Mr Michael MAK Kwok-fung
Mr Albert CHAN Wai-yip
(5 members)

Abstention:

Mr Eric LI Ka-cheung
Miss Emily LAU Wai-hing
(2 members)

As the votes of members for and against the proposal were equally divided, the Chairman exercised his casting vote in accordance with paragraph 39 of the PWSC Procedure. The proposal was therefore negated.

HEAD 708 - CAPITAL SUBVENTIONS AND MAJOR SYSTEMS AND EQUIPMENT

**PWSC(2001-02)55 82EB Prevocational school at Northcote Close,
Pokfulam, Hong Kong**

56. Mr Henry WU noted that the Northcote Close was a sloping road and enquired whether due consideration had been given to the safety and noise factors in designating a lay-by by the side of the road for the proposed school. In reply, AD/E(SD) confirmed that the lay-by would be on level ground and therefore its operation would not cause safety and noise problems.

57. The item was voted on and endorsed.

58. As this was the last PWSC meeting of the 2000-01 legislative session, the Chairman thanked members and the Administration for their participation in the

deliberation of the Subcommittee during the session.

59. On behalf of the Subcommittee, the Chairman also thanked Mr Gordon SIU, the Secretary for Planning and Lands, and wished him the best for his impending retirement from the civil service.

60. The meeting ended at 10:10 am.

Legislative Council Secretariat

5 July 2001