

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. PWSC 67/01-02
(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 9th meeting
held in the Chamber of Legislative Council Building
on Wednesday, 9 January 2002, 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 Cyd HO Sau-lan

Hon Eric LI Ka-cheung, JP

Hon Fred LI Wah-ming, JP

Hon James TO Kun-sun

Hon CHAN Yuen-han, JP

Hon CHAN Kam-lam

Hon SIN Chung-kai

Hon Andrew WONG Wang-fat, JP

Hon WONG Yung-kan

Hon LAU Kong-wah

Hon Miriam LAU Kin-yea, JP

Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP

Hon Andrew CHENG Kar-foo

Hon LAW Chi-kwong, JP

Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP

Dr Hon TANG Siu-tong, JP

Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, JP

Hon Henry WU King-cheong, BBS

Hon WONG Sing-chi

Hon IP Kwok-him, JP

Hon LAU Ping-cheung

Member absent:

Hon MA Fung-kwok

Public officers attending:

Miss Elizabeth TSE, JP	Deputy Secretary for the Treasury (3)
Mr John C TSANG, JP	Secretary for Planning and Lands
Mr S S LEE, JP	Secretary for Works
Mr Rob LAW, JP	Director of Environmental Protection
Miss Janice TSE	Principal Assistant Secretary of the Treasury (Works)
Mr Raistlin LAU	Principal Assistant Secretary Environment and Food (B)1
Mr John COLLIER, JP	Director of Drainage Services
Mr Y T CHEUNG	Chief Engineer/Consultants Management Drainage Services Department
Mr William C G KO, JP	Director of Water Supplies
Mr LEUNG Mang-chiu	Assistant Director/New Works Water Supplies Department
Mr WAN Man-leung	Principal Assistant Secretary for Housing (Project Management)
Mr LO Yiu-ching, JP	Director of Highways
Mr LEE Kai-chao, Francis	Regional Highway Engineer/New Territories Highways Department
Mr CHENG Hung-leung	Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories East Transport Department
Mr William SHIU	Principal Assistant Secretary for Transport (4)
Mr S Y LO	Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories West Transport Department
Mr Paul TANG	Deputy Secretary for Transport (1)
Mr K K NG	Deputy Project Manager/Major Works (3) Highways Department
Mr George LAI	Deputy Commissioner for Transport (Planning and Technical Services)
Mr Tony SO	Chief Engineer/Strategic Roads Transport Department

Clerk in attendance:

Ms Anita SIT	Chief Assistant Secretary (1)6
--------------	--------------------------------

Action

Staff in attendance:

Ms Pauline NG Assistant Secretary General 1

Ms Bonnie KAN Senior Assistant Secretary (1)9

HEAD 704 - DRAINAGE

PWSC(2001-02)87 203DS North District sewerage

Members noted that the present proposal had been discussed at a meeting of the Environmental Affairs Panel on 26 November 2001.

2. The item was voted on and endorsed.

HEAD 709 - WATERWORKS

PWSC(2001-02)90 249WF Expansion of fresh water distribution system in Fanling West

3. The item was voted on and endorsed.

HEAD 711 - HOUSING

PWSC(2001-02)85 645TH Sai Sha Road widening between Kam Ying Road and future Trunk Road T7 junction

4. In reply to Mr IP Kwok-him's enquiries about the disposal of construction and demolition (C&D) waste under this project, the Director of Highways (DH_y) advised that in order to minimize the generation of C&D waste, the contractor would be required under the contract to use metal signboards instead of wooden ones as metal signboards were reusable. The contractor would also be encouraged to use reusable materials for hoarding and other temporary structures at the project site. As regards the cost for disposal of C&D materials, DH_y advised that the contractor would bear the cost of transporting C&D waste for disposal at landfill sites. For the C&D materials that could be re-used for the project, the contractor might store the materials on site or transfer them to another place for storage and re-use some time later. Lastly, disposal of C&D materials at public filling areas was not subject to any

Action

charge but the contractor was required to obtain a licence from the Director of Civil Engineering for such disposal.

5. Mr LAU Kong-wah pointed out that households of Kam Lung Court facing Kam Ying Road were suffering from excessive traffic noise of Kam Ying Road but they would not be protected by the noise barriers to be constructed along Sai Sha Road under this project. DHy explained that the proposed noise barriers to be installed under this project were designed to mitigate the traffic noise impact of the future Ma On Shan (MOS) Rail Viaduct and the widened section of Sai Sha Road. As Kam Ying Road was outside the scope of this project, the noise impact of Kam Ying Road could not be addressed under this project but in the context of the policy to tackle the noise impact of existing roads. DHy further explained that for the households of Kam Lung Court facing Kam Ying Road, they would not be directly affected by the future traffic of the MOS Rail Viaduct and the widened Sai Sha Road.

6. Mr LAU Kong-wah queried whether the future traffic of MOS Rail Viaduct and the widened Sai Sha Road would generate additional noise impact on those dwellings of Kam Lung Court facing Kam Ying Road, and if that was the case, these dwellings should also be provided with noise mitigation measures under this project. In response, DHy and the Regional Highway Engineer/New Territories, Highways Department (RHE/NT, Hy) advised that should there be such additional noise impact, the impact would be greatest at the dwellings of Lung Yiu House, which was adjacent to the junction of Sai Sha Road and Kam Ying Road. However, according to the findings of the environmental impact assessment (EIA) for the project, there would be minimal increase in the noise level at those dwellings of Lung Yiu House facing Kam Ying Road upon the commissioning of MOS Rail Viaduct and the widened Sai Sha Road. The traffic noise impact currently assessed at these dwellings was 72dB(A) on average.

7. Mr LAU Kong-wah and Miss Emily LAU expressed doubt on the aforesaid EIA findings. They considered that given the close proximity of Kam Lung Court to Sai Sha Road, it appeared unreasonable not to provide noise mitigation measures under this project to alleviate the excessive noise impact on those dwellings facing Kam Ying Road. In reply to members' enquiry about the EIA for the project, DHy and RHE/NT, Hy advised that the noise impact of the future MOS Rail Viaduct, which was planned earlier than this project, as well as the noise impact of the widened Sai Sha Road had been taken into account in the EIA for this project. The Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) also advised the EIA report in respect of this road widening project concluded that with the provision of the recommended mitigation measures, the resultant noise impact of the project could be controlled to within the criteria under the EIA Ordinance and the Technical Memorandum on the EIA process. The Advisory Council on the Environment endorsed the EIA report

Action

without conditions on 27 September 1999 and he had approved the EIA report under the EIA Ordinance on 19 October 1999. DEP confirmed that the EIA had taken into account the noise impact to be generated from the future MOS Rail Viaduct and the widened Sai Sha Road. The source of the excessive traffic noise for those dwellings in Kam Lung Court facing Kam Ying Road was and would continue to be the traffic of Kam Ying Road. The Administration was studying feasible measures to alleviate the situation. The current assessment was that there were technical constraints for retrofitting noise barriers at Kam Ying Road.

8. In reply to Miss Emily LAU's enquiry on whether insulated windows and air-conditioners would be installed for those households suffering from excessive noise impact of Kam Ying Road, DHy advised that as far as he understood, there was currently no plan to provide insulated windows and air-conditioners for these households according to the relevant policy. However, the Administration was actively considering the provision of low-noise road surfacing at Kam Ying Road.

9. Mr WONG Sing-chi expressed dissatisfaction with the Administration for not taking expeditious measures to tackle the noise problem of Kam Ying Road, despite the fact that the noise impact of the road on nearby residents was currently and would continue to be above the 70dB(A) limit. The Principal Assistant Secretary for Housing (Project Management) (PAS(H)PM) explained that there were technical constraints, including the lack of sufficient space and the need to ensure emergency access, for retrofitting noise barriers at Kam Ying Road. DHy reiterated that the Administration did not intend to evade responsibility to tackle the traffic noise problem of Kam Ying Road. The fact was that the present project did not cover Kam Ying Road and therefore noise mitigation measures in respect of Kam Ying Road had to be considered in a separate context. If low-noise road surfacing was found suitable for Kam Ying Road, the road re-surfacing works might be carried out in two to four years. With the completion of these works, the noise level would be reduced by 3 to 5 dB(A).

10. Noting that about 110 dwellings of Kam Lung Court would be subject to excessive noise impact of Kam Ying Road, members requested and the Administration agreed to provide information on the current and future traffic noise impact at these 110 dwellings and the type of remedial measure(s) to be taken at Kam Ying Road before the relevant FC meeting (on 1 February 2002).

Admin.

11. Miss Emily LAU queried why the noise problem of Kam Ying Road was not reflected in the discussion paper. DHy explained that as the present proposal was concerned with the widening of Sai Sha Road, the noise impact of other roads in the neighbourhood including Kam Ying Road had therefore not been covered in the discussion paper. Miss LAU commented that in future, the Administration should provide more comprehensive information on the possible traffic noise impact of a

Action

Admin. project on nearby residents. The Administration took note of the comment for appropriate follow-up action.

12. In response to Mr WONG Sing-chi's enquiry, DHy advised that at present some 600 existing roads in the territory were generating traffic noise higher than the 70dB(A) limit. Under the policy to address the noise impact of existing roads, noise barriers or enclosures would be retrofitted along 29 existing roads. For the remaining existing roads generating excessive traffic noise, the Administration would carry out resurfacing with low-noise materials or make appropriate transport arrangements to alleviate the noise impact where feasible and appropriate.

13. Mr CHAN Kam-lam commented that upon the commissioning of Trunk Road T7, some traffic on Sai Sha Road and Kam Ying Road would be diverted to Trunk Road T7 and therefore, it was unlikely that there would be significant increase in traffic on Kam Ying Road upon completion of the proposed road widening works. The Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories East, Transport Department (CTE/NTE, TD) expressed concurrence with Mr CHAN's analysis. He explained that with the completion of T7, some traffic on Sai Sha Road would be diverted to T7 and there would be changes to the traffic pattern on Sai Sha Road. Without the proposed road widening, the section of Sai Sha Road in question would become a bottleneck, in particular the junction with Sha On Street, and the present proposal was to deal with this anticipated problem. CTE/NTE, TD confirmed that the volume to capacity ratios set out in the discussion paper for the section of Sai Sha Road in question referred to those to the east of its junction with Sha On Street and had taken into account the impact of T7. He also confirmed that the proposed dualling of the road would be extended up to T7.

14. Mr WONG Yung-kan said that the section of Sai Sha Road between the future Trunk Road T7 junction and Kei Ling Ha might also be overloaded upon the commissioning of Trunk Road T7 and asked if there was any plan to deal with the future increase in traffic in this road section. CTE/NTE, TD advised that the Administration would closely monitor the traffic on this road section and would take on board the relevant road improvement project in due course.

15. In reply to Mr LAU Kong-wah's enquiries about the design of the noise barriers to be provided under this project, DHy advised that noise barriers would be made of metal frames and semi-transparent panels. The short break of the cantilever noise barrier at a location facing Lee On Estate was due to the presence of a planned bus stop at this location.

Action

16. In reply to Mr Albert CHAN's enquiry about the design of the two proposed footbridges, DHy advised that a new design would be adopted for the two footbridges and that both bridges would be made of steel. He added that the Advisory Committee on Appearance of Bridges and Associated Structures, the membership of which comprised professionals from both the public and private sectors, was keen to improve the aesthetic aspects of footbridges and it had adopted new requirements in assessing footbridge designs. DHy took note of Mr Albert CHAN's suggestion of constructing footbridges instead of subways as far as possible for public security considerations.

17. The item was voted on and endorsed. Miss Emily LAU requested that her reservation on the project be recorded.

HEAD 706 - HIGHWAYS

PWSC(2001-02)91 745TH Grade separation at Light Rail Transit junction LT1 at Tsing Lun Road, Tuen Mun

18. Members noted that a paper on the present proposal had been circulated to LegCo Transport Panel for information on 10 December 2001.

19. Miss Emily LAU was concerned about the noise impact arising from the project. DHy explained that the Kowloon-Canton Railway Corporation (KCRC) had taken experimental measurements of the noise impact of the proposed grade separation. Measurements at most sensitive locations indicated a noise level of slightly higher than 60dB(A), while the noise level measured at a nearby school approached 70dB(A). Measurements would again be taken upon works completion. If the noise level was found to exceed the statutory limit of 70dB(A), technical evaluation would be made and KCRC would have to implement feasible noise mitigation measures to alleviate the situation. Addressing Miss LAU's concern on the effectiveness of the noise absorptive lining to be installed on the parapet wall on the sides facing the rail tracks, DHy said that KCRC was experienced in noise control and its absorptive lining had proved effective in noise mitigation.

20. Mr Albert CHAN enquired about the apportionment of costs between the Government and the KCRC for the construction of the grade separation in question. DHy advised that in line with the agreed arrangements for this type of projects, the Government was responsible for site formation and associated infrastructural works while KCRC was responsible for railing, signaling, electrical and mechanical works.

Action

21. Mr Albert CHAN queried whether the current on-cost rate of 16.5% of the project base cost to be payable to KCRC for entrustment works was too high. Mr Abraham SHEK shared Mr CHAN's concern. DHy explained that the 16.5% on-cost would be paid to KCRC on a reimbursement basis, and its components included 4% on design work, 8.8% on project management and site supervision, 0.7% on insurance and 3% as recurrent costs related to the above. A review on the on-cost rate had been made in late 2000 and it was concluded that the 16.5% charge ceiling remained appropriate. The Chairman remarked that the Administration should review the on-cost rate on a periodic basis to take into account the latest market situation.

22. The item was voted on and endorsed.

PWSC(2001-02)92 759TH Shenzhen Western Corridor
736TH Deep Bay Link

23. Members noted that the two projects in question had been discussed at the meetings of the Transport Panel on 26 October 2001, 8 November 2001, 23 November 2001 and 17 December 2001.

24. Miss Miriam LAU, Chairman of the Transport Panel, informed members that the Panel had held several meetings to discuss the Shenzhen Western Corridor (SWC) and Deep Bay Link (DBL) and the Route 10 project and another meeting of the Panel to discuss these projects would be held on 11 January 2002. She expressed her disappointment that the Administration had decided to put forward the SWC and DBL projects to the Public Works Subcommittee (PWSC) before the Panel concluded its deliberation on the three projects where were inter-related. She said that during the discussions at the Panel, members were particularly concerned about the additional traffic brought to Tuen Mun town centre and Tuen Mun Road upon the scheduled commissioning of SWC and DBL in 2005. Severe traffic congestion would be resulted if there was inadequate planning to support the operation of SWC and DBL. Ms LAU pointed out that a number of issues had yet to be addressed by the Administration; a decision on the SWC and DBL projects at this stage seemed to suggest that the Administration intended to create a fait accompli for the transport infrastructure in that area.

25. Miss Emily LAU concurred that the SWC and DBL projects should be considered in conjunction with their impacts on the traffic conditions of the connecting roads and the affected areas such as Tuen Mun and Yuen Long. Although the capacity of Route 3 and Tuen Mun Road (TMR) taken together might be able to cope with the increased traffic brought about by SWC and DBL before the

Action

completion of Route 10, it was unclear how an adequate proportion of the additional traffic would be channeled to Route 3 to safeguard against congestion on TMR and in Tuen Mun town area.

26. The Deputy Secretary for Transport (1) (DS(T)1) explained that the Crosslinks Further Study completed in March 2001 confirmed the need for constructing the fourth land boundary crossing of SWC together with the connecting road, DBL, to satisfy the future traffic demand. Early commissioning of the SWC would bring about substantial economic benefits to Hong Kong. The present proposal was concerned with the site investigations and detailed design for SWC and DBL. Further views from Members and other parties could be further examined during the detailed design stage. The Administration had decided to put forward the two projects as there would not be any regular FC meetings during the Budget period. Further delay in taking forward the detailed design and site investigation works would make it difficult to meet the target completion date of 2005 for SWC and DBL to tie in with the completion of the SWC (Mainland Section) in 2005.

27. DS(T)1 stressed that the Administration had the intention to bring forward the completion of Route 10 northern section to 2007. Route 3 and TMR would be able to cope with the additional traffic generated from SWC and DBL during the transient period. The Administration would take into account any views from Members on Route 10 and related issues in the detailed design of SWC and DBL.

28. Miss Emily LAU was not convinced that satisfactory solutions to the low utilization of Route 3 and the prospective congestion on TMR could be worked out in the detailed design of SWC and DBL. She considered it necessary to consider all three projects i.e. SWC, DBL and Route 10 together to devise viable interim and long term plans.

29. Mr Albert CHAN conveyed the view of Members of the Democratic Party that SWC, DBL and the entire Route 10 should be conceived as an integrated road scheme, since any interface problem between/among these projects might lead to dire traffic conditions in Tuen Mun, Yuen Long and other related areas. Mr CHAN suggested that the Administration withdraw the present proposal and put up the funding requests for SWC, DBL and Route 10 together at a later date so as to allow more time for the Transport Panel and other concerned parties to deliberate on these projects.

30. DS(T)1 said that DBL would involve more complicated EIA and land resumption work and therefore the Administration made every effort to enable earlier commencement of the detailed design for DBL. As the Mainland section of SWC was scheduled for completion in 2005, any delay in the two proposed projects would have profound adverse impact on both Shenzhen and Hong Kong.

Action

31. Mr Albert CHAN pointed out that Members had earnestly requested early planning and implementation of SWC for years. It was the Administration who had taken such a long time at the planning stage that had resulted in the tight implementation schedule. Mr CHAN criticized the Administration's attitude of expecting members to give hasty approval for the proposal on the two important projects in question. He maintained that notwithstanding the tight schedule, thorough consideration of the SWC, DBL and Route 10 projects was necessary.

32. Dr TANG Siu-tong stated his support and conveyed the support of the Yuen Long District Council for the SWC and DBL projects. He however reminded the Administration the need to properly address the concerns of the Yuen Long community, which included the need to promote the utilization of Route 3 and provision of a branch road off DBL to Route 3 via Tin Shui Wai. DS(T)1 confirmed that the Administration would examine the feasibility and desirability of building a local link or an expressway from DBL to Route 3 in the detailed design for DBL. He however cautioned that environmental issues might be involved.

33. Mr TAM Yiu-chung conveyed the support of Members of the Democratic Alliance for Betterment of Hong Kong for the current proposal. He however also expressed serious concern on possible traffic interface problems in Tuen Mun and Yuen Long and urged the Administration to continue to listen to different views of the community. He also commented that in the past, some traffic projections made by the Administration had not been accurate and therefore members had become sceptical of the reliability of the current projections.

34. Miss Miriam LAU referred to the traffic projections in the discussion paper that the average daily two-way traffic demand in 2006 and 2011 at SWC, assuming that SWC would be commissioned in 2005-06, would be 28 400 and 46 100 vehicles respectively. Since according to the Administration, Route 10 would not be completed until 2007-08, she asked what measures the Administration would take to safeguard against congestion on TMR.

35. DS(T)1 clarified that the traffic increase would be incremental and the Administration envisaged that TMR together with Route 3 would be able to cope with the situation during the first few years of operation of SWC and DBL. He advised that the traffic data for the past few years showed that the traffic flow on Route 3 had been increasing while that on TMR had been on the decrease. Route 3 had clearly served a diversion function for TMR. The Deputy Commissioner for Transport (Planning and Technical Services) (DC(P&TS), TD) elaborated that the estimated 28 400 vehicles per day, i.e. 1 183 vehicles per hour, would be two-way traffic. The Administration estimated that about one third of this traffic would be channeled to TMR, one third to Route 3, one sixth to Tolo Highway and one sixth to

Action

Yuen Long district. DC(P&TS), TD further advised that these traffic estimates were worked out scientifically by way of a computerized programme. Miss LAU questioned if the same programme had been used in planning the Western Harbour Crossing and Route 3, where utilization had turned out to be exceptionally low. DC(P&TS), TD responded that the programme was constantly updated and enhanced.

36. Mr Henry WU expressed doubt on the sudden emergence of 28 400 vehicles per day in 2006 upon the completion of SWC, while the traffic demand at Lok Ma Chau, Man Kam To and Sha Tau Kok would remain at similar levels in 2001 and 2006. DC(P&TS), TD explained that the completion of SWC would result in the release of a suppressed demand of some 17 000 vehicles per day for cross-boundary traffic. If the SWC was not completed by 2006, the estimated total traffic demand at Lok Ma Chau, Man Kam To and Sha Tau Kok in 2006 would be 48 000 vehicles per day.

37. Addressing Dr TANG Siu-tong's concern about possible traffic congestion on Yuen Long Highway upon completion of the SWC and DBL, the Chief Engineer/Strategic Roads, Transport Department (CE/SR, TD) advised that currently projects were underway to widen the Yuen Long Highway to dual three-lane in 2005 and then to dual four-lane by 2016 if necessary. He also confirmed that the Administration would study the traffic situation at the roundabouts in the vicinity of Yuen Long Highway and plan for necessary improvements accordingly.

38. Mr CHAN Kam-lam expressed support for the present proposal. Noting from the discussion paper that a slip road would be constructed in Ha Tsuen area under the DBL project, Mr CHAN pointed out that drivers from Tin Shui Wai would most likely use the slip road to DBL and SWC and asked whether the Administration would improve the narrow road network in Ha Tsuen area to cope with the increased traffic. The Deputy Project Manager/Major Works (3), Highways Department (DPM/MW3, Hy) informed members that the Administration had been liaising with the Ha Tsuen Rural Committee in this regard and would accommodate the requests of the rural committee as far as possible in the course of detailed design.

39. Mr CHAN Kam-lam also expressed concern about the alignment of Route 10 and whether improvements to TMR and Castle Peak Road would be made to cope with the increased traffic upon completion of SWC and DBL. He suggested that the Administration should address these issues in the detailed design of both projects. DHy advised that the widening of Castle Peak Road had been approved by FC on 9 March 2001 (Project 365TH: Castle Peak Road improvement between Area 2 and Sham Tseng, Tsuen Wan and Project 553TH: Castle Peak Road improvement between Sham Tseng and Ka Loon Tsuen, Tsuen Wan.)

Action

40. Mr Andrew WONG said that while he supported the SWC project, he had strong reservation on the DBL project because the Administration had not confirmed the provision of a local link between DBL and Route 3. He also commented that if such a local link was to be built, the scope of the DBL project would need to be revised. Mr Abraham SHEK shared Mr WONG's view and said that he could not support the DBL project in its present form. They both stated that they would support the DBL project only if the Administration committed to the construction of a local link between DBL and Route 3 under the project. In response, DS(T)1 and DHy advised that DBL was required to tie in with the long-term development of Route 10. However, if resources were available, the possibility of providing a local link from DBL to Route 3 would be explored in the detailed design of DBL and its construction would be incorporated into the DBL project if such was found feasible and desirable.

41. Mr Abraham SHEK said that the inclusion of the local link should be stated in the DBL project and should not be subject to availability of resources. Mr Andrew WONG suggested that the Administration split the present proposal into two proposals, one on the SWC project and the other on the DBL project so that members could vote on the two projects separately. DS(T)1 said that as DBL would serve as the necessary link for SWC to the territory's road networks, the two projects should be considered as a single package.

42. Regarding the toll levels of Route 3, DS(T)1 advised that the charging criteria and mechanism for Route 3 were stipulated in the Tai Lam Tunnel and Yuen Long Approach Road Ordinance (Cap. 474) and it would be up to the operator to decide the feasibility of toll reduction. As regards the future toll levels for Route 10, DS(T)1 advised that the Administration would work out the relevant details at a later stage, probably at the time when completion of Route 10 was imminent.

43. Mr LAU Ping-cheung enquired about the reasons for the differences in the estimated costs for consultants' fees and site investigations for the two projects. DHy explained that the site investigations for SWC and DBL would cost \$23.3 million and \$12.0 million respectively. The site investigation works for SWC would be more complicated as most of the works had to be undertaken at sea. Moreover, some site investigation works for DBL had been carried out during the preliminary design, and thus a lesser amount of site investigation works for DBL would be required at the detailed design stage. As regards the consultants' fees, DHy said that the estimated consultants' fees of \$43.4 million for DBL was higher than the estimated consultants' fees of \$37 million for SWC as DBL would stretch over 5.4 kilometre in length as compared to the 3.2 kilometres of SWC. DHy also advised that the estimated total project cost of \$6.4 billion for DBL was much higher than that of \$2.8 billion for SWC. This was because SWC could be constructed by the

Action

more cost effective precast segmental method whilst the more winding alignment of DBL would entail insitu construction of its viaducts and cutting into hillsides.

44. In response to members' enquiries about the exceptionally fast-track programme for SWC and DBL as mentioned in the discussion paper, DHy explained that basically, SWC would be a bridge structure spanning across Deep Bay. No land resumption would be required for this project. With extensive feasibility works carried out under the Crosslinks Further Study completed by Planning Department in September 2000, the preliminary design stage for SWC could be dropped. These factors contributed to the possible completion of SWC and DBL in late 2005. Subject to FC's approval for the present proposal, detailed design for the SWC and DBL would be carried out in early 2002 and site investigations would be conducted concurrently at the initial stage of detailed design to save time for the projects.

45. Noting that the detailed design of SWC and DBL was proposed to commence in early 2002 pending the completion of the EIA studies, Miss Emily LAU was concerned that some of the detailed design work would be wasted if problems were discovered during the EIA studies. DHy responded that the Administration had conducted early consultation with green groups on SWC and DBL with a view to incorporating their views into the design for the projects. In fact, having regard to the views of some green groups, the Administration had revised the spacing between the piers of SWC from 50 to 75 metres and the alignment of the SWC from a straight line to an "S" shape to minimise the impact on sea water flow. DEP confirmed that it would not be a problem to conduct EIA studies and detailed design concurrently provided that conscious efforts were made to comply with the relevant requirements in the EIA Ordinance in drawing up the detailed design. He also expressed support for the works departments making close liaison with green groups at the early planning stage. In reply to Miss Emily LAU's enquiry, DS(T)1 and DHy advised that the adoption of the exceptionally fast-track programme for the SWC and DBL projects would unlikely give rise to significant additional costs.

46. In reply to the Chairman's enquiry, DHy advised that the "design-and-build" approach had been considered for the SWC project. However, as the design for SWC required close co-ordination with the Shenzhen side, it would be too risky to adopt the "design-and-build" approach for the SWC project.

Action

47. In reply to Mr CHAN Kam-lam's enquiry about the planned immigration and customs clearance facilities at SWC, DS(T)1 advised that the Administration was studying with the Shenzhen authority the feasibility of co-locating the boundary crossing facilities of the Hong Kong SAR Government and those of the Shenzhen Municipal Government for immigration and customs clearance at the SWC boundary-crossing. The Administration would revert to Members on this matter in due course.

48. The Deputy Secretary for the Treasury advised that in view of members' concerns about the present proposal, the Administration would withdraw the proposal for further consideration.

49. The item was withdrawn by the Administration.

50. As the meeting had overrun, the Chairman suggested and members agreed that consideration of the remaining item PWSC(2001-02)93 would be deferred to the next meeting on 30 January 2002.

51. The meeting ended at 1:00 pm.

Legislative Council Secretariat

31 January 2002