

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. PWSC 78/01-02
(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 11th meeting
held in the Chamber of Legislative Council Building
on Wednesday, 6 February 2002, at 8:30am**

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 Fred LI Wah-ming, JP
Hon SIN Chung-kai
Hon LAU Kong-wah
Hon Miriam LAU Kin-yee, JP
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP
Hon Andrew CHENG Kar-foo
Dr Hon TANG Siu-tong, JP
Hon WONG Sing-chi
Hon IP Kwok-him, JP

Members absent:

Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan
Hon Eric LI Ka-cheung, JP
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon CHAN Yuen-han, JP
Hon CHAN Kam-lam

Action

Hon Andrew WONG Wang-fat, JP
Hon WONG Yung-kan
Hon LAW Chi-kwong, JP
Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, JP
Hon Henry WU King-cheong, BBS
Hon LAU Ping-cheung
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 for the Treasury (Works) |
| Mr Paul TANG, JP | Deputy Secretary for Transport (1) |
| Mr LO Yiu-ching, JP | Director of Highways |
| Mr E J ROBLIN | Deputy Project Manager/Major Works (1) Highways Department |
| Mr Brian GROGAN | Assistant Commissioner/Planning Transport Department |
| Mr Tony SO | Chief Engineer/Strategic Roads Transport Department |
| Mr John LEUNG | Principal Assistant Secretary Education and Manpower (9) |
| Mr S L MA | Assistant Director of Education (Infrastructure) |
| Mr K S SHUM | Chief Technical Adviser/Subvented Projects Architectural Services Department |
| Mr John COLLIER, JP | Director of Drainage Services |
| Mr W H KO | Assistant Director/Projects and Development Drainage Services Department |
| Mr Y T CHEUNG | Chief Engineer/Consultants Management Drainage Services Department |
| Mr W C IP | Chief Engineer/Project Management Drainage Services Department |

Action

Clerk in attendance:

Ms Anita SIT

Chief Assistant Secretary (1)6

Staff in attendance:

Ms Pauline NG

Assistant Secretary General 1

Ms Bonnie KAN

Senior Assistant Secretary (1)9

HEAD 706 – HIGHWAYS

PWSC(2001-02)97 519TH Route 10 – North Lantau to Yuen Long Highway

Members noted that the project of Route 10 – North Lantau to Yuen Long Highway (Route 10) had been discussed at the meetings of the Transport Panel on 26 October 2001, 8 November 2001, 23 November 2001, 17 December 2001, 11 January 2002, 17 January 2002 and 23 January 2002.

2. Mr LAU Kong-wah said that having regard to the discussions at the Transport Panel and the viewpoints expressed by different parties, he considered that there was no urgency to construct Route 10. He suggested that the project should not be proceeded with until a clearer picture of future logistics development in Hong Kong and other economic development aspects of Hong Kong and the Mainland was available, as these developments had important bearing on the need and timing of the project.

3. Ms Miriam LAU concurred with Mr LAU Kong-wah that there was no urgency to proceed with the project at this stage. She stressed that the Administration had also confirmed that Tuen Mun Road together with Route 3 had adequate capacity to cope with the additional traffic brought about by Shenzhen Western Corridor and Deep Bay Link until 2010-11. She pointed out that it was still questionable whether the proposed Route 10 could effectively serve to cope with the future traffic demand generated by cross-boundary activities and the population growth and developments in north west New Territories (NWNT) and Lantau, as purported by the Administration. She also highlighted that during the discussions at the Transport Panel, members had expressed grave concern on whether Route 10 would be compatible with and complementary to Hong Kong's future logistics development. In this regard, she as Chairman of the Transport Panel had written to the Financial Secretary, Chairman of the Steering Committee on Logistics Development (LOGSCOM), on 26 January 2002 to seek confirmation on whether

Action

LOGSCOM had discussed the Route 10 project and whether there was a consensus view on the project, given the Government's initiative of "Logistics Hong Kong". The Financial Secretary's Office had provided a reply on 29 January 2002 stating that the P-logistics Project Group of the Hong Kong Logistics Development Council would further study the short-term and long-term needs for transport infrastructure to support the development of logistics. Ms LAU said that as there was no conclusion even within the Administration on whether Route 10 would be effective in meeting the needs of logistics development, it would not be prudent for members to approve a substantial provision of \$133.7 million for the detailed design for the northern section of Route 10 at this stage. She stated that Members of the Liberal Party would not support the present proposal.

4. In response, the Deputy Secretary for Transport (1) (DS(T)1) said that the Administration had explained to the P-logistics Project Group that Route 10 had been planned mainly on the basis of the planned developments on Lantau (including the Hong Kong Disneyland), the increase in traffic from the boundary to the urban area, the need to relieve the Lantau Link and to provide a second strategic link to the Airport and not just logistics development. Proceeding with the detailed design for the northern section of Route 10 right now would not bring any adverse impact on the logistics development in Hong Kong. The future decisions regarding the location of the new container terminal and the future logistics development in Hong Kong would be taken into account in the course of the detailed design of Route 10 and consideration would also be given as to whether any other more dedicated road infrastructure was needed. DS(T)1 stressed that early commencement and completion of the detailed design for the northern section of Route 10 would provide flexibility for the construction schedule; the construction could be completed by 2007-08 the earliest as requested by some District Councils and some LegCo Members. DS(T)1 assured members that further public consultation would be conducted upon gazettal of the project. The future proposal for the construction of the project would also be subject to the approval of the Public Works Subcommittee and the Finance Committee.

5. Mr Albert CHAN recalled that the need for Route 10 had been raised more than ten years ago. All along, the controversies had centred on the alignment and other related planning aspects. It was only in recent months when objections from the affected corporations were aired that some Members had become doubtful of the need for constructing Route 10. Mr CHAN stated that Members of the Democratic Party considered that Shenzhen Western Corridor (SWC), Deep Bay Link (DBL) and Route 10 formed an integrated strategic road network to cope with the increasing traffic generated from the developments in NWNT and Lantau and the increasing cross-boundary activities. If the SWC and the DBL projects were to be implemented without the Route 10 project, residents of NWNT would suffer from serious traffic congestion upon completion of SWC and DBL. Members of DP therefore held a

Action

strong view on the need to synchronize the completion of SWC, DBL and Route 10. Noting that SWC and DBL were scheduled for completion by 2005 while the earliest completion time for the northern section of Route 10 was 2007-08, Mr CHAN asked whether the Administration would endeavour to further advance the completion of Route 10 and what measures would be available to safeguard against traffic congestion in NWNT during the time gap between the completion of SWC and DBL and that of Route 10.

6. DS(T)1 advised that based on the latest traffic projections, the Administration considered that there would not be serious traffic congestion in Tuen Mun and Yuen Long in the early years of operation of SWC and DBL until 2010-11. If early planning could be made for the northern section of Route 10, more time would be available for improvement and refinement to the design for the project taking into account public views and latest developments, as in the case of the southern section of Route 10. He also reiterated that early approval for the present proposal would provide greater flexibility for the construction schedule for the project. The Chief Engineer/Strategic Roads, Transport Department, supplemented that according to the latest traffic projections, the morning peak-hour volume/capacity ratio at Tuen Mun Road (Sham Tseng Section) would be 1.19 in 2006 (with the commissioning of Shenzhen Western Corridor in 2005 as scheduled) which would still be acceptable. However, the ratio at the same section would rise to 1.31 in 2011 without Route 10 and hence the traffic congestion situation would become very serious by 2011.

7. Dr TANG Siu-tong expressed support for the Route 10 project on account of the need for the trunk road to meet the increasing traffic demand of the developments in NWNT and Lantau and the increasing cross-boundary traffic. According to his understanding, the residents of Yuen Long, Tuen Mun, Tai Po and New Territories North at large were supportive of the project. He highlighted that residents of Yuen Long had been suffering from the unreasonably high toll of the Route 3 Tai Lam Tunnel. Route 10 would provide residents with an alternative route for access to the urban areas. Dr TANG further said that as funds had been approved for the detailed design of the southern section of Route 10 in December 1999, there would be wastage on the work of the southern section if funds were not provided for the detailed design of the northern section of Route 10. He supported that the detailed design for Route 10 should be proceeded with while the construction schedule could be further considered.

8. Ms Miriam LAU said that controversies over the need and timing of Route 10 had arisen in the past few months because members were not convinced that constructing another tolled road, Route 10, would be a cost-effective solution to meet future traffic demand. While she fully appreciated the concerns of residents in Tuen Mun and Yuen Long, she indeed had serious reservation over the cost-

Action

effectiveness of the Route 10 project having regard to the substantial spare capacity of Route 3, which was a tolled road, and the fact that Route 3 had not been effective in diverting traffic from Tuen Mun Road and Yuen Long Highway. Ms LAU informed members that the Transport Panel would further deliberate the issues arising from the Route 10 project. The policy on the provision and operation of tunnels would be discussed at the Panel meeting to be held on 22 February 2002 and the measures to maximize the utilization of Route 3 would be discussed at another forthcoming meeting. She considered that a decision on whether and how the Route 10 project should be proceeded with should only be made after thorough discussion of these issues.

9. DS(T)1 responded that based on the relevant traffic figures, the utilization of Route 3 had been increasing over the years, indicating that Route 3 had performed the traffic diversion function. However, Route 3 together with Tuen Mun Road would not be able to cope with the increasing traffic demand from 2011 onwards. Hence, there was a clear need to construct Route 10 to meet future traffic demand. The Administration considered that there was no conflict between the design work for Route 10 and the examination of the related issues referred to by Ms Miriam LAU.

10. The item was put to vote. Six members voted for the proposal, four voted against and none abstained.

For:

Mr Fred LI
Mr SIN Chung-kai
Mr Andrew CHENG
Dr TANG Siu-tong
Mr Albert CHAN
Mr WONG Sing-chi
(6 members)

Against:

Mr Kenneth TING
Mr LAU Kong-wah
Mr Miriam LAU
Mr IP Kwok-him
(4 members)

11. The item was endorsed.

Action

HEAD 708 – CAPITAL SUBVENTIONS AND MAJOR SYSTEMS AND EQUIPMENT

PWSC(2001-02)95 29EC A private independent school at Po Kong Village Road, Wong Tai Sin

12. The item was voted on and endorsed.

HEAD 704 – DRAINAGE

PWSC(2001-02)98 111CD Drainage improvement in Tsuen Wan, Kwai Chung and Tsing Yi – Tsuen Wan drainage tunnel

13. Members noted that this project had been discussed at the meeting of the Planning, Lands and Works Panel on 4 January 2002.

14. Mr Albert CHAN said that Members of the Democratic Party (DP) supported this project and the projects under the following items PWSC(2001-02)99 and PWSC(2001-02)100 in principle, and appreciated the extensive consultations undertaken by the Administration with professional bodies and academics on the proposed drainage tunnel schemes for flood prevention after the previous submission on the proposed Tsuen Wan drainage tunnel had been withdrawn at the PWSC meeting on 4 April 2001. Mr CHAN further said that Members of DP had been very concerned about the technical feasibility and cost-effectiveness of the interception approach, i.e. the construction of drainage tunnels to intercept and convey the surface runoff in mid-hill area for discharge into the sea. However, if there were no other better alternatives for flood prevention in built-up urban areas, Members of DP would accept that the interception approach would be a better alternative to the traditional approach of enlarging drains and box culverts along urban roads. Mr CHAN also urged the Administration to make better forward planning for new development areas to avoid the need to take remedial measures for flood prevention in future.

15. The Director of Drainage Services responded that the drainage systems for new towns had been and would be planned according to the prevailing standard, with the impact of the future development on surface runoff fully taken into account. In the old urban areas, the Drainage Services Department had reviewed the existing flooding protection systems and studied ways to update and bring them in line with the prevailing standard. For the areas in question, the Administration considered that the interception approach was a better solution than the traditional approach of enlarging drains and box culverts along urban roads, which would give rise

Action

extensive social costs in terms of disruption to traffic and the environment of urban areas.

16. The item was voted on and endorsed.

| | | |
|------------------------|--------------|---|
| PWSC(2001-02)99 | 103CD | Drainage improvement in Northern Hong Kong Island – Hong Kong West drainage tunnel |
| | 104CD | Drainage improvement in Northern Hong Kong Island – lower catchment improvement |

17. Members noted that this project had been discussed at the meeting of the Planning, Lands and Works Panel on 4 January 2002.

18. The item was voted on and endorsed.

| | | |
|-------------------------|--------------|--|
| PWSC(2001-02)100 | 108CD | West Kowloon drainage improvement – Lai Chi Kok Transfer Scheme |
|-------------------------|--------------|--|

19. Members noted that this project had been discussed at the meeting of the Planning, Lands and Works Panel on 4 January 2002.

20. The item was voted on and endorsed.

21. The meeting ended at 9:07am.

Legislative Council Secretariat
5 March 2002