

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. PWSC73/09-10
(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 10th meeting
held in Conference Room A of Legislative Council Building
on Wednesday, 2 June 2010 at 8:30 am**

Members present:

Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai, SBS, S.B.St.J., JP (Chairman)
Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming, GBS, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Hon Fred LI Wah-ming, SBS, JP
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP
Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBM, GBS, JP
Hon Miriam LAU Kin-yee, GBS, JP
Hon Andrew CHENG Kar-foo
Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, SBS, JP
Hon WONG Kwok-hing, MH
Hon LEE Wing-tat
Prof Hon Patrick LAU Sau-shing, SBS, JP
Hon KAM Nai-wai, MH
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king
Hon CHAN Hak-kan
Hon WONG Kwok-kin, BBS
Hon IP Kwok-him, GBS, JP
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC
Hon CHAN Tanya

Member attending:

Ms Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP

Members absent:

Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, GBS, JP
Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP
Dr Hon LEUNG Ka-lau
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-ye, GBS, JP
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip

Public officers attending:

Ms Doris HO Pui-ling	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury)3
Mr MAK Chai-kwong, JP	Permanent Secretary for Development (Works)
Ms Gracie FOO Siu-wai, JP	Acting Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)
Ms Anissa WONG, JP	Permanent Secretary for the Environment
Miss Sandra LAM Ching-nga	Principal Assistant Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Works)
Miss Salina YAN Mei-mei, JP	Deputy Secretary for Home Affairs (3)
Mrs Avia LAI WONG Shuk-han	Principal Assistant Secretary (Home Affairs) (Culture)2 Home Affairs Bureau
Mrs Marigold LAU LAI Siu-wan, JP	Director of Architectural Services
Mr Wilson LEE Hung-wai	Project Director (3) Architectural Services Department
Ms Cynthia LIU Chiu-fun	Assistant Director (Performing Arts) Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Miss Amy YUEN Wai-yin	Principal Assistant Secretary (Planning and Lands)2 Development Bureau
Mr John CHAI Sung-ve, JP	Director of Civil Engineering and Development
Mr CHOW Man-tat	Deputy Project Manager (Hong Kong Island and Islands) Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr YUNG Cho-leung	Chief Engineer (Land Works) Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr Jack CHAN Jick-chi	Commissioner for Heritage Development Bureau
Mr HUI Chiu-kin	Chief Property Services Manager (1) Architectural Services Department
Mr Tom MING Kay-chuen	Executive Secretary (Antiquities and Monuments) Leisure and Cultural Services Department

Mr Andy LEE Shiu-chuen	Vice-President (Administration) and Secretary Hong Kong Baptist University
Mr LAM Long-chau	Director of Estates Hong Kong Baptist University
Dr BIAN Zhaoxiang	Director of Clinical Division, School of Chinese Medicine Hong Kong Baptist University
Mr Tony LAM Chung-wai	Director AGC Design Ltd.
Mr Michael WONG Yick-kam	Chairman, Executive Committee Hong Kong Youth Hostels Association
Mr John STRICKLAND, GBS, JP	Executive Committee Member Hong Kong Youth Hostels Association
Mr Anthony CHAN Tung-shan	Executive Committee Member Hong Kong Youth Hostels Association
Professor Bernard V LIM, JP	Lead Consultant and Authorized Person Hong Kong Youth Hostels Association
Mr Rex CHAN Chi-sing	Lead Consultant Hong Kong Youth Hostels Association

Clerk in attendance:

Ms Debbie YAU	Chief Council Secretary (1)6
---------------	------------------------------

Staff in attendance:

Ms Angel SHEK	Senior Council Secretary (1)1
Mr Frankie WOO	Senior Legislative Assistant (1)3
Ms Christy YAU	Legislative Assistant (1)1

Action

The Chairman advised that a total of 27 capital works projects costing \$98,624.1 million had been endorsed by the Public Works Subcommittee (PWSC) in the 2009-2010 session so far.

Head 703 – Buildings

PWSC(2010-11)7 59RE Construction of an Annex Building at the Ko Shan Theatre

2. The Chairman advised that the proposal was to upgrade 59RE to Category A at an estimated cost of \$683.2 million in money-of-the-day (MOD) prices for the construction of an annex building at the Ko Shan Theatre. The Panel on Home Affairs (HA Panel) had been consulted on the proposed works at the meeting on 14 May 2010, and Panel members in general supported the funding proposal.

Admin

3. Mr WONG Kwok-hing expressed support for the proposal. Referring to the site visit conducted for members of the HA Panel on 7 May 2010, he suggested that the outlook and design of the proposed building, in particular its main foyer, should reflect the unique features and aura of Cantonese opera. He requested the Administration to provide information on the detailed design of the proposed building when available. The Director of Architectural Services (D Arch S) agreed that it was essential to demonstrate the characteristics of Cantonese opera and xiqu in the design of the proposed Annex Building. The suggestions of Members, including that of Prof Hon Patrick LAU about drawing reference to the Suzhou Museum which was designed by the renowned architect Pei Ieoh Ming, had been conveyed to the consultant architect. ArchSD would provide additional drawings on the detailed design after the meeting.

4. Mr WONG Kwok-hing asked if the Administration would consider his suggestion of providing more cubicles in the female toilet in the design of the proposed project. The Project Director (3), Architectural Services Department (PD(3), ArchSD) said that the provision of male and female sanitary fitments in the proposed project had exceeded the standard imposed by the Buildings Department (BD)s' guidelines and the Leisure and Culture Services Department (LCSD)s' basic requirements. The male to female toilet cubicle ratio as stipulated by BD was 1:1.25 and that required by LCSD was 3:7 (or 1:2.33). Instead of providing 10 and 4 female toilet cubicles at the ground level/first floor and on the second floor respectively as required under BDs' guidelines, 18 and 7 cubicles would be provided in the respective floors. The Administration would look into the possibility of further enhancing the provision of female toilet cubicles during the detailed design stage, in order to shorten the waiting time for female visitors.

Admin

5. Prof Patrick LAU said that the site visit to Ko Shan Theatre and Yau Ma Tei Theatre had enhanced members' understanding of the operation of Cantonese opera and performance venues of different sizes in Hong Kong. As regards his concern about enhancing the accessibility of the Ko Shan Theatre to attract patronage, Prof LAU noted during the site visit that an escalator would be constructed in the vicinity of the theatre under a separate project. He urged the Administration to follow up the matter closely, and provide information on the relevant improvement works for members' reference. D Arch S agreed to provide the information when available.

6. The item was voted on and endorsed.

**Head 707 – New Towns and Urban Area Development
PWSC(2010-11)8 417RO Improvement works at Tai O**

7. The Chairman advised that the proposal was to upgrade part of 417RO to Category A at an estimated cost of \$151 million in MOD prices to implement the riverwall and ancillary improvement works at Tai O. The Panel on Development had been consulted on the proposed works at its meeting on 27 April 2010, and Panel members supported the funding proposal.

Project estimates

8. Mr TAM Yiu-chung expressed support for the proposal and urged for early implementation of the improvement works to alleviate the flooding risk at Wing On Street and the area to the south of Tai Ping Street where the ground level was lower than the water level of Tai O Creek during high tides. He noted that these areas had suffered from flooding several times in the past few years, which had damaged the properties of local residents and caused other adverse impact on their livelihood. He hoped that the improvement works would reduce flooding in these areas.

9. Mr IP Kwok-him expressed support for the proposal. He said that members of the Islands District Council (IDC) supported the improvement works, and sought clarification whether the estimated cost of \$151 million for the proposed works was part of the \$620 million earmarked for the overall improvement works under the Tai O Revitalization Concept Plan (Concept Plan).

10. The Director of Civil Engineering and Development (DCED) advised that the proposed works were the first package of the improvement proposals under the Concept Plan, and the \$151 million estimated cost was part of the overall project cost of \$620 million.

11. Mr TAM Yiu-chung was of the view that the Concept Plan aimed at carrying out improvement works to beautify and enhance the environment of Tai O, which was different from the proposed improvement works that was more related to flooding prevention. He opined that if the overall provision of \$620 million was insufficient to meet relevant expenditures, additional funding should be provided. DCED responded that the Administration would seek the Finance Committee (FC)'s approval for additional funding where necessary. At the request of Mr IP Kwok-him, the Administration agreed to provide a breakdown of the expenditures under the overall project cost of \$620 million.

Admin

Riverwall

12. Mr WONG Kwok-hing expressed support for the proposal, and asked the Administration to consider his suggestion made at the Panel on Development to beautify the riverwall by planting trees (such as willow) and greeneries along it to make it more compatible with the natural environment.

13. Prof Patrick LAU also expressed concern that the proposed riverwall of 1.1 metres (m) high (or 3.3 m above Principal Datum (mPD)) concrete structure might not be compatible with the natural environment and the unique stilted houses at Tai O. He was dissatisfied that the Administration had not provided more perspective drawings on the riverwall's design and associated landscaping for members' consideration.

Admin 14. DCED advised that the Administration would landscape the area formed behind the riverwall. As the local residents wished to minimize obstruction to the view overlooking the Tai O Creek, the current plan was to plant shrubs, instead of tall trees, at the landscaped area and along the riverwall. The Administration would consult the local residents about the suggestion of planting willow trees.

Admin With the aid of photographs and photomontages, the Deputy Project Manager (Hong Kong Island and Islands), CEDD (DPM(HKI&Is), CEDD) outlined the design of the proposed riverwall and the landscaped area behind. He stressed that the Administration had maintained communication with the local residents on the design and, in response to their views, proposed to use natural stone facing so that small marine creatures and plants could grow in the recesses formed between the stones as a result of the tidal movements. The stone materials would blend in well with the natural environment of Tai O as a fishing village. Prof Patrick LAU requested the Administration to provide more layout plans and perspective drawings in future submissions for members' reference.

15. Referring to the typical section for the riverwall in Enclosure 2 to PWSC(2010-11)8, Prof Patrick LAU enquired whether the proposed gravel layer behind the riverwall was decorative or structural in function. He suggested using soil in place of concrete at appropriate locations for growing plants. DCED advised that the stone surface was for decorative purpose, and the Administration would make use of soil and planters for greening at appropriate locations behind the riverwall.

16. Miss Tanya CHAN said that some local residents suggested narrowing the width of the area to be formed behind the proposed riverwall at certain parts to minimize the visual impact on the existing environment. DPM(HKI&Is), CEDD referred members to Enclosure 1 to PWSC(2010-11)8 and said that the proposed area to be formed and landscaped was shown in green, while the area shown in grey was existing ground to be landscaped only. He stressed that the riverwall would be built as close to the adjacent land as practicable, and the Administration would fine-tune the design during the construction stage having regard to Miss CHAN's suggestion.

17. Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming expressed support for the proposal to relieve flooding in Tai O areas. As the proposed riverwall would serve to drain excessive water from the land during rainstorms while preventing backward flow of water from flooding the land during high tides, Mr CHEUNG was keen to ensure that the river bed would be strengthened sufficiently to achieve both purposes. DCED advised that the height of the proposed riverwall at 3.3mPD was designed to cope with general high tides, bearing in mind that there were only five times in the past

50 years that the tide level had exceeded this proposed height. As such, the proposed height was considered optimum and should be effective to withstand high tides under average meteorological conditions while not obstructing the view of the Tai O Creek. He said that the Administration would also provide a stormwater pumping station and drainage system to handle the rain water collected behind the riverwall.

18. Miss Tanya CHAN enquired about the mooring arrangements for fishing vessels which used to anchor at the location of the proposed riverwall, in particular during the improvement works. DPM(HKI&Is), CEDD said that the Administration had discussed with the representatives of the fishing community at Tai O about the provision of mooring facilities at suitable locations along the proposed riverwall. The Administration would also identify suitable locations for temporary mooring during construction of the riverwall.

Sewerage system

19. Miss Tanya CHAN noted from Enclosure 2 to PWSC(2010-11)8 that the existing sewerage system would be upgraded at Yat Chung in order to intercept the sewage currently discharging directly into the Tai O Creek. Miss CHAN enquired about the technical and financial assistance available for the affected residents to connect their premises to the proposed sewerage system.

20. DPM(HKI&Is), CEDD said that during consultation with the local residents, the Administration had taken note of their concerns about the sewerage connection works. Under the existing policy, the Government would provide a reception point along the new public sewer for each premises to connect to the public sewer, and the residents would be responsible for constructing a terminal manhole and carrying out the sewer connections within their private lots at their own cost. Eligible owners could apply for financial assistance from certain grant and loan schemes to carry out sewer connection works from their houses to the public sewer. At the request of Ms Cyd HO, the Administration would provide, before the relevant FC meeting, information on the details of the assistance schemes for members' reference.

Admin

21. Ms Cyd HO stressed the importance to provide technical advice and assistance to the local residents for making sewer connections, in particular to ensure that the works would not affect the structures of those houses built in early days. She enquired about the measures to be taken if the residents concerned did not comply with the requirement to make connections for various reasons, such as lack of technical knowledge and/or financial means. DPM(HKI&Is), CEDD assured members that during implementation of the proposed sewerage works, the Administration would liaise with the residents concerned and help them resolve technical or site-specific problems where necessary. Under the existing practice, the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) would issue advisory letters to the village house owners concerned when the public village sewers were ready for connection. EPD would serve statutory notices to those owners who failed to carry out the connection works after the specified time period. Enforcement

action would be taken as the last resort if negotiation with the residents had failed to achieve compliance.

22. Ms Cyd HO asked whether the Administration would consider providing permanent, rather than temporary, connections when the residents did not comply with the requirement to carry out connection works. The Permanent Secretary for the Environment (PS(Env)) advised that under the existing policy, the Government would not be responsible for connecting the residents' premises to the reception points of public sewerage system, as it would have implications arising from works in private land or properties and their subsequent maintenance and responsibilities. Nevertheless, the Government would place the public sewer connection points as nearest to the village houses as possible. The Administration had maintained close communication with Heung Yee Kuk and the local community in the implementation of rural sewerage system. Most villages supported the Government's sewerage programme as it had significantly improved the environment of the villages and hence would be in their long-term interest.

23. Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming referred to the alignment of the proposed sewerage system which extended from houses 38 to 138 (even numbers only) in Wing On Street as shown in Enclosure 2 to PWSC(2010-11)8. He enquired about the timeframe for providing sewerage system for other houses in the same street. DCED said that the proposed works would cover sewerage works for the specified houses only as they would be affected by the riverwall construction. DPM(HKI&Is), CEDD added that for sewerage works outside these houses along Wing On Street, they would be undertaken by DSD under a separate project, and the relevant works would proceed to the detailed design stage, with the completion of the feasibility studies.

24. Ms Cyd HO noted that the annual recurrent expenditure arising from the proposed works was estimated to be about \$1.3 million. Though this was an insignificant amount, the Administration would take this into consideration when calculating the sewage charges in future. She was concerned as to whether the connected houses would be required to share the recurrent expenditure of \$1.3 million, thus paying a higher sewage charge than the others.

25. DPM(HKI&Is), CEDD explained that sewage charge was calculated based on the maintenance expenditure of overall sewerage facilities and provision of sewage services by DSD on a territory-wide basis. As such, the recurrent cost for maintaining the proposed sewerage system was considered immaterial compared to the overall recurrent cost of providing sewage services in Hong Kong. Nevertheless, the additional maintenance cost arising from the proposed sewerage system would be taken into account, together with other factors, when DSD reviewed the sewage charges for the entire territory.

26. Ms Cyd HO queried the Administration's justification to increase the sewage charges on a territory-wide basis to absorb additional recurrent cost on maintenance of new sewerage system in individual locality. PS(Env) explained that the Legislative Council (LegCo) had approved a mechanism for assessment of

sewage service charges. The mechanism worked on the polluter-pays principle. While the Government would meet the capital costs for sewerage projects, users of wastewater collection and treatment services would need to shoulder the operating costs of the sewage services through the sewage charging scheme. In other words, the recurrent costs of new sewerage projects would be taken into account in the review and updating of the sewage charges.

Facilities

27. Mr WONG Kwok-hing said that it had been difficult to secure water source for fire fighting at the stilted houses in the past, and it was important to put in place effective fire safety installations and fire hoses, since the stilted houses in Tai O were wooden structures prone to fire hazards. DCED said that the proposed riverwall and ancillary improvement works aimed to address the most pressing needs of Tai O residents. The remaining works under the Concept Plan, such as enhancing the function of fire hydrants and enlarging the service coverage, would be implemented in another package in due course. DCED added that at present, the fire rescue fleet at Tai O included a speedboat, a dinghy and a portable boat. A slipway had also been built to expedite the launching of these boats during emergency operations. The Administration considered that the existing capacity of the fire safety installations on site was sufficient to meet the needs of the area.

28. Ms Miriam LAU expressed support for the proposal. Noting that the Administration planned to set up a systematic and unified signage system in Tai O under the proposed works, she queried why the new signage cost as much as \$0.9 million. Referring to Enclosure 1 to PWSC(2010-11)8 and drawings presented at the meeting, DCED highlighted the locations of the proposed signage. As the system included the main information board, attraction information boards and directional signage at more than 10 locations, the Administration considered the estimated cost of \$0.9 million appropriate and reasonable. At the Chairman's request, the Administration would provide, before the relevant FC meeting, information on the details of the signage, including their number, location and design.

Admin

29. Miss Tanya CHAN enquired about the service life of the signage which she considered should include information on the distance and projected walking time between specific destinations or attractions. DPM(HKI&Is), CEDD said that the Administration would consider providing the suggested information in the signage. Given proper maintenance and repair, the proposed signage could serve more than 20 years.

30. Mr IP Kwok-him noted that the Administration planned to renovate the existing open space in front of the Kwan Tai Temple by providing a spacious and enhanced environment for a formal setting for religious and cultural events. As the existing area was rather small, he doubted the feasibility of converting it into a "spacious" area for religious or cultural events. With the aid of photographs and photomontages, DCED explained that the existing open space in front of the temple was segregated from nearby footways by some railings. Under the

Action

Admin

improvement works, these railings would be removed to create a larger area for public enjoyment. Mr IP suggested the Administration provide colour photographs and photomontages for members' consideration of future funding proposals.

Admin

31. Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming asked whether the local residents had been consulted on the provision of benches in the open area. Mr WONG Kwok-hing suggested that there should be more greening initiatives at the open space and the benches should be provided with backrest. Mr TAM Yiu-chung commented that the design of the open space should cater for the needs and habit of the local residents, especially the elderly which were frequent users of the open space. For instance, non-slippery materials should be used for road surfacing, and the benches should be water-resistant or covers be provided to shelter them from the rain. DCED responded that the Administration had consulted the local residents who agreed to the design. Nevertheless, the Administration would consider enhancing the design in the light of members' suggestions and further consultation with the local residents.

Land clearance

Admin

32. Referring to the breakdown of the estimated clearance costs in Enclosure 4 to PWSC(2010-11)8, Ms Miriam LAU queried the need for providing "domestic removal allowance" if the works did not involve land acquisition. She also enquired about the reasons for providing a relatively small amount of ex-gratia allowance of \$20,000 for the domestic removal, and \$30,000 for shops, workshops, go downs, slipways, schools and churches, and ornamental fish breeding undertakings. DCED clarified that the land clearance mainly involved temporary removal of certain structures, which would be reinstated afterward, or removal of temporary structures to make way for the improvement works. As the clearance was of a relatively small scale, it would not entail much cost. DPM(HKI&Is), CEDD added that as the land concerned was Government land, no land acquisition was involved. The clearance cost for each domestic or commercial unit was estimated by the Lands Department, and a total sum was given for each category. He agreed to provide further details on the land clearance works and the provision of ex-gratia allowance, before the relevant FC meeting.

Construction waste

33. Mr IP Kwok-him noted that the project would generate about 6 100 cubic metres of marine sediment as well as 280 tonnes of construction waste, and 56 tonnes of the inert construction waste would be reused on site. He asked for more information about the waste source and their re-usage. DPM(HKI&Is), CEDD said that most of the construction waste was generated from the land clearance near Yat Chung, which was mainly garbage and non-inert construction waste that would be disposed of at landfills. For inert construction waste, such as those excavated from the open space of Kwan Tai Temple during ground re-surfacing works, they could be re-used on site, such as for forming the land behind the riverwall. The

contractors would be encouraged to maximize the use of recycled or recyclable inert construction waste to help protect the environment. As for the contaminated sediment excavated from the seabed of Tai O Creek during the improvement works, they would be disposed of at the sediment disposal facility at East Sha Chau.

34. The item was voted on and endorsed.

PWSC(2010-11)5 681CL Formation, roads and drains in Area 54, Tuen Mun-phase 2

35. The Chairman advised that the proposal was to upgrade part of 681CL to Category A at an estimated cost of \$49.9 million in MOD prices to carry out improvement works to Tsing Lun Road in Area 54, Tuen Mun. An information paper on the proposed works had been circulated to the Panel on Development on 17 June 2009.

Facilities

Footbridge and pedestrian crossings

36. Mr WONG Kwok-hing expressed concern that as the site earmarked for providing about 5 000 public housing flats at Site 2 of Tuen Mun Area 54 had yet to be developed, the footbridge to be built across Tsing Lun Road would be under-utilized hence leading to a waste of public resources. Mr WONG suggested that the footbridge should link the public housing site to the nearest West Rail station instead, in order to provide direct access and convenience to the residents commuting between these areas.

37. DCED clarified the site boundary for the proposed road improvement works, and advised that the site formation works pertaining to the proposed public housing development at Site 2 would be undertaken separately. The Chief Engineer (Land Works), Civil Engineering and Development Department (CE(LW), CEDD) supplemented that the footbridge crossing Tsing Lun Road was not part of the current proposal, and it would be constructed together with the site formation works of the proposed public housing development at Site 2.

38. Mr WONG Kwok-hing requested that pedestrian road crossing facility should be provided at the junction of Tsing Lun Road and Siu Hong Road to avoid causing inconvenience to local residents. CE(LW), CEDD advised that the Administration would provide signalized pedestrian crossings at the junction of Tsing Lun Road and Siu Hong Road as part of the site formation works at Site 2. Mr WONG urged that the pedestrian crossings should be taken forward together with the proposed road improvement works, and it would be difficult for him to support the proposal if the Administration could not accept this request. CE(LW), CEDD said that CEDD would further discuss with the Transport Department the possibility of advancing the works for the provision of signalized pedestrian crossings in the current proposal.

Noise barriers

Admin 39. Mr WONG Kwok-hing and Prof Patrick LAU suggested incorporating greening features in the design of the proposed noise barriers on both sides of Tsing Lun Road near the footway and cycle tracks, to enhance the aesthetics of the environment. CE(LW), CEDD responded that while plastic would be used for the noise barrier panels, CEDD would consult landscape architects about incorporating climbing plants in the design where practicable. Mr WONG expressed disappointment that despite his previous requests for using climbing plants as noise barriers, the Administration still used plastic as the materials for the noise barrier panels.

40. Prof Patrick LAU noted that the proposed noise barrier on the eastern side of Tsing Lun Road near the Yau Tsz Tin Memorial College was just 45 metres long, and did not cover the College premises. He queried whether this could provide adequate protection to the College from the traffic noises.

Admin 41. CE(LW), CEDD explained that the design of the noise barrier followed the recommendations of the relevant environmental impact assessment (EIA) report, which had taken into account the fact that most of the classroom windows of the College were facing the Siu Hong Court and the side of the College facing Tsing Lun Road was mainly wall. The Chairman said that while he did not support the installation of noise barriers in general, he believed that the current design of the proposed noise barriers had incorporated the EIA recommendations made by relevant experts. He requested the Administration to review the design in the light of members' suggestions.

Heritage impact assessment and site formation

42. Mr WONG Kwok-hing expressed concern that the proposed works might have adverse impact on the Kei Lun Wai Archaeological Site. CE(LW), CEDD said that the area of the proposed works in discussion was already a built-up area and that the Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO) had advised that the proposed works did not have heritage implications and that further archaeological survey was not necessary for the proposed works. However, AMO would carry out archaeological survey at Site 2 before carrying out site formation works there.

43. Mr TAM Yiu-chung said that while the Administration would seek LegCo's approval for the site formation works for the public housing development at Site 2 at a later stage, he was concerned that some ongoing site formation works for public housing projects, such as those near Lung Mun Oasis and Po Tin Estate, did not require LegCo's approval. DCED clarified that he had no information about the said projects and added that site formation works below \$21 million would generally be classified as minor works funded under block allocations that would not require LegCo's approval.

Land resumption and compensation

44. Mr LEE Wing-tat noted that the Tuen Mun Outline Zoning Plan incorporating land use proposals recommended in the "Planning and development study of potential housing sites in Area 54, Tuen Mun" was approved by the Chief Executive in Council (CE in Council) on 30 September 2003, and an Environmental Permit (EP) was obtained on 17 March 2009 for the proposed road improvement works. However, it was not until 9 April 2009 that resumption of land for the proposed public housing development at Site 2 of Tuen Mun Area 54 was gazetted. As a result of the delayed gazettal, the compensation for land resumption required for the proposed public housing development was subject to an adjusted rate of \$474 per square foot effective between 1 April 2009 and 30 September 2009, instead of a higher rate of \$606 per square foot applicable between 1 October 2008 and 31 March 2009. He considered that the Administration should have expedited the gazettal process in the interests of the affected residents. Though the Administration had received only five objections to the proposed road improvement works which was gazetted in December 2007 under the Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance (Cap. 370), most of the residents affected by the land resumption at Site 2 held objections to the compensation and re-housing arrangements. He queried why the Administration had delayed the gazettal of the land resumption for the proposed public housing development.

45. DCED explained that the proposed road widening works could be taken forward immediately as land acquisition was not involved, and the development of public housing at Site 2 would be separately implemented. He stressed that the Government had no intention to delay the gazettal of land resumption nor was it possible to predict any changes in the rate of compensation.

46. Mr LEE Wing-tat expressed concern that the Administration neglected the interests of the affected landowners who would suffer a loss of as much as 20% in the amount of compensation. As independent surveyors engaged by some affected landowners had come up with an assessment of a higher land value than that assessed by the Government, he enquired about the mechanism for the affected landowners to negotiate with the Government for a more reasonable compensation. DCED responded that land resumption and compensation followed the prescribed mechanism and procedures which were under the purview of the Lands Department.

47. Mr TAM Yiu-chung considered that the proposed road improvement works was related to the development of the public housing at Site 2. He and Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming had met with the affected residents, and noted that they strongly objected to the reduced rate of compensation. He hoped that the Administration would address the residents' concerns and provide appropriate assistance to them. DCED responded that he understood the Lands Department was discussing the arrangements with the affected residents in this regard.

48. The Acting Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands) (Acting PS(PL)) explained that the proposed works did not involve land resumption. That said, she reckoned that the question of compensation and rehousing relating to land resumption for construction of public housing was being followed up closely by LegCo Members. The Transport and Housing Bureau (THB) had provided detailed reply to LegCo on 14 May 2010, and a case conference was held on 18 May 2010. The Administration had already explained in its reply the land resumption policy and the gazettal process. As some landowners affected had sought statutory claim, that process had progressed for them to seek redress as they disagreed with the compensation arrangements. The Lands Department would meet with the affected residents' appointed surveyors on 4 June 2010.

49. Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming said that local residents in general did not object to the proposed road improvement works but they were most concerned about the substantial reduction in the amount of compensation because of the late gazettal of the land resumption notice. As the Government had consulted the Environment, Hygiene and District Development Committee (EHDDC) of the Tuen Mun District Council (TMDC) since 17 November 2006 and liaised closely with the Working Group under the EHDDC for monitoring the proposed public housing development, he enquired about the views of the Working Group of EHDDC in the past few years and how affected residents were consulted on the project. CE(LW), CEDD said that the Working Group had held eight meetings since September 2008. The proposal to undertake the current road improvement works was put forth at the fourth meeting, the progress of which was further reported at the subsequent meetings. The Working Group was last informed of the project progress at the eighth meeting on 20 May 2010. During the process, the Working Group was informed of the detailed arrangements and it raised no objection to the proposed works.

50. Ms Emily LAU said that the proposed road improvement works and the land resumption at Site 2 were inter-related although they would be taken forward separately. She considered that the affected residents had legitimate cause for concern as they would suffer financial losses due to a less favourable rate of compensation applicable at the time of gazettal of the land resumption notice. She pointed out that Members belonging to different political affiliations had requested the Administration to put in place more reasonable arrangements to address the concerns. Since the Lands Department was discussing compensation arrangements with the affected residents, she hoped the Administration would genuinely address their concerns at the present stage and not put them off to a later stage. Ms LAU also enquired about TMDC's views on the compensation arrangements when the matter was discussed on 28 May 2010. DCED said that the concerns of TMDC were mainly related to the compensation arrangements, and the Lands Department would further discuss with the affected residents and their appointed surveyors.

51. Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming noted that the five objectors had maintained their objections to the proposed road improvement works. He queried whether the

Administration had made any effort to resolve the issues brought up by the objectors before the matter was taken to the CE in Council. CE(LW), CEDD said that the Administration had explained to the objectors the prevailing land resumption and re-housing policy, their statutory rights, as well as the implementation of the proposed works. Despite repeated explanations, the five objectors maintained their objections and these were passed to the CE in Council for consideration. The objections were subsequently overruled by the CE in Council.

52. Ms Emily LAU said that the affected residents had urged LegCo Members not to support the proposed works if the compensation issues remained unresolved. She questioned whether these issues could not be resolved before the road improvement project was considered by FC. DCED said that the Administration saw the merit of undertaking the proposed road widening works at an early stage, having regard to early improvement of road safety at the junction of Tsing Lun Road and Siu Hong Road for buses to turn from Tsing Lun Road to Siu Hong Road. The proposed works which were of a relatively small cost would also facilitate participation of small and medium-sized contractors. DCED added that the Administration also aimed to bring forward the site formation works for Site 2 so that the public housing facilities could be developed according to schedule.

53. Mr KAM Nai-wai expressed grave dissatisfaction that the Government still maintained that the road improvement works were not related to the land resumption for the proposed public housing development. In his view, the two stages of works were closely related to each other as the proposed works were to meet "future traffic needs arising from the planned housing development" as stated in paragraph 6 of PWSC(2010-11)5. He considered it unreasonable that the Administration had requested members to support the proposal without addressing the concerns about land resumption and compensation arrangements in respect of the proposed public housing development at Site 2. Given that there was a shortage of suitable sites for public housing development, Mr KAM hoped that the public housing project at Site 2 would not be affected by the land resumption problems. He stressed that it was unfair that the local residents should bear the loss due to a delay in the gazettal of the land resumption notice.

54. The Permanent Secretary for Development (Works), (PS(W)) advised that in undertaking large scale projects, the Administration would usually implement the works by stages. In this case, the Administration considered it appropriate to take forward the road improvement works ahead of the proposed public housing development at Site 2, as the former was a standalone project for improving the traffic circulation in the vicinity of Siu Hong Court. The Administration would submit the funding proposal for Site 2 works at a later stage when it was ready. In reply to Mr KAM Nai-wai, DCED said that the Administration intended to submit the funding proposal for the site formation works at Site 2 in late 2010/early 2011.

55. The Chairman commented that additional costs might be incurred if the current road improvement works and further road widening works complementing the public housing development project were undertaken separately. PS(W) said

that while this was a consideration, the Administration would also consider other factors. For instance, for the noise barriers adjacent to the future public housing development at Site 2, only the foundations would be constructed under the present funding proposal while the panels would be installed in a later stage. This would avoid repeated road openings and disturbances to the road users.

Admin

56. Ms Cyd HO said that while the public generally welcomed improvement of infrastructures and provision of more public housing flats, the Administration should keep in mind the interests of those affected by these projects. Referring to a recent land resumption project on the Hong Kong Island, she considered that the land resumption policy did not provide adequate compensation for affected residents to purchase a similar flat in the same district. She shared members' views that the two stages of works in question were closely related as the road improvement works were to cater for anticipated traffic increase of about 725 pcu/hour generated from the proposed public housing development during morning peak hours. She urged the Administration to address the issues of land resumption and compensation, and provide information on the progress of such discussions before the relevant FC meeting. Ms HO added that even if the proposed works were approved, the affected residents would be most aggrieved if the compensation issues were not resolved.

57. DCED advised that as the Administration was still discussing land resumption and compensation matters with the affected residents, it appeared unlikely that the issue could be resolved before the road improvement proposal was considered by FC. He appealed to members for support to take forward the proposed works first as they were unrelated to land resumption. Ms Cyd HO was of the view that members could exercise their voting right in this project to exert pressure on the Administration to resolve the land resumption disputes. She requested the relevant bureaux to collaborate to resolve the problems. Acting PS(PL) said that while the proposed works did not involve land resumption, she had explained the Administration's position and the follow-up work at the LegCo case conference. She would convey members' views and concerns to THB. Ms HO expressed dissatisfaction with the response and said that she could not support the funding proposal.

58. Mr LEE Wing-tat said that Members belonging to the Democratic Party would not support the funding proposal if the land resumption and compensation issues were not resolved. He reiterated his view that the two stages of works in fact came under the same project, and the land resumption and compensation issues should be dealt with at this stage. He remarked that the road improvement works should have been undertaken a decade earlier if it was indeed an independent project for improving the traffic circulation near Siu Hong Court. In his view, the works was obviously intended to cater for the needs arising from the proposed public housing development at Site 2. Mr LEE queried that it was the Administration's tactic to split the project into two stages for obtaining funding support, as it would be difficult for members to reject the Site 2 project after approving the road improvement works.

Way forward

59. PS(W) stressed that the Administration had not evaded the compensation issues and it was ready to provide more information on the progress of negotiation with the affected residents. He pointed out that the land resumption and compensation matters were being dealt with under the established mechanism and other discussion channels. Nevertheless, in view of members' concerns and reservations expressed at this meeting, the Administration would withdraw the proposal.

Admin

60. Mr WONG Kwok-hing and Mr LEE Wing-tat welcomed the Administration's decision to withdraw the proposal. Mr WONG requested the Administration to follow up on his concerns and suggestions before resubmitting the proposal to LegCo. Mr LEE requested that representatives from the Lands Department should also attend the PWSC meeting when the proposal was resubmitted for consideration.

Admin

61. Ms Miriam LAU asked whether the withdrawal of the proposal would delay the road improvement works and the proposed public housing development at Site 2. PS(W) said that the Administration would resubmit the funding proposal incorporating the two stages of work in one batch, with a view to implementing the proposed public housing development according to schedule as far as possible.

62. The item was withdrawn by the Administration.

Head 708 - Capital Subventions and Major Systems and Equipment

PWSC(2010-11)9 4QW Revitalization Scheme-Revitalization of Lui Seng Chun as the Hong Kong Baptist University Chinese Medicine and Healthcare Centre

63. The Chairman advised that the proposal was to upgrade 4QW to Category A at an estimated cost of \$24.7 million in MOD prices for revitalizing Lui Seng Chun into the Hong Kong Baptist University Chinese Medicine and Healthcare Centre (the Centre) by the selected non-profit-making organization (NPO), the Hong Kong Baptist University (HKBU). When consulted at the meeting on 27 April 2010, the Panel on Development expressed support in general for the funding proposal.

64. Ms Miriam LAU declared that she was a member of the HKBU Council and expressed support for the proposal.

Operation of the Centre

65. Miss Tanya CHAN stressed that it was important to achieve the dual objectives of preserving historic buildings and making them available for public access and appreciation under the Revitalizing Historic Buildings Through Partnership Scheme (the Revitalization Scheme). Miss CHAN enquired how the Commissioner for Heritage's Office (CHO) would ensure that HKBU would fulfil its obligations of providing free public access to the Centre, given that there would be Chinese medicine and herbal tea retail shop, multi-media display area and courtyard on the ground floor. She also asked about the mechanism to monitor the Centre's operation, and the measures to be taken if HKBU did not comply with the requirements.

66. The Commissioner for Heritage, Development Bureau (C for H, DEVB) advised that the Government recognized the importance in providing free public access to the revitalized historic buildings. Under the Revitalization Scheme, HKBU as the selected NPO would become Government's agent of heritage conservation, which would operate the Centre in the form of social enterprise (SE). HKBU's proposal would form part of the tenancy agreement to be signed between the Government and HKBU, which would specify the requirements on the level of service and provision of public access (including the opening hours and facilities). HKBU would also be required to provide annual audited financial statements as well as interim financial reports of the SE to CHO, and the latter could conduct site inspections and inspect the SE's books and accounts as necessary. Under the tenancy agreement, the Government could require HKBU to improve the Centre's operation, and if the service was not brought up to standard, the Government could resume the property as a last resort.

Design and facilities

67. Ms Cyd HO said that the existing staircase at Lui Seng Chun was steep and might pose danger to visitors, especially the elderly. She enquired about the estimated visitor flow for the building, and urged that HKBU should take into account visitor capacity when arranging guided tours to the historic building. C for H, DEVB responded that the estimated visitor flow would be around 140,000 a year. To address the problem of the existing steep staircase which was common among old Chinese tenements built in the 1930s, an additional staircase would be constructed near the back of the house, which would also serve as an emergency access for fire escape. Besides, a lift with a maximum capacity of eight persons would be provided to facilitate visitors in need.

68. Ms Cyd HO referred to Enclosure 3 to PWSC(2010-11)9 and expressed concern that the deep verandahs, which were unique features of the building, would be enclosed by glass pursuant to the revitalization works as the glass enclosure would affect natural ventilation and the original façade of the historic building. She requested the Government and HKBU to take this into account in revitalizing the building.

69. C for H, DEVB explained that the large open-fronted verandahs currently took up about 48% of the total floor area of Lui Seng Chun. To maximize the area of the historic building for adaptive re-use and to minimize the impacts of noise and poor air quality arising from the heavy traffic along the roads adjacent the building, it was considered necessary to enclose the verandahs. C for H, DEVB stressed that such works were acceptable by international conservation standards, as the works were based on genuine need, reversible, and posing the least impact on the visual appearance of the building. Non-reflective glass of top standard (National Level One) would be used and installed by using strong adhesives, in order to achieve a "seamless" appearance and best transparency.

70. Ms Cyd HO reiterated her reservations about enclosing the open-fronted design and natural ventilation which were essential characteristics of this historic building. She enquired whether the glass enclosure would be movable to allow for ventilation. Expressing similar concern, Prof Patrick LAU stressed that the historic building should be preserved in good shape as it had been accorded a Grade I status by the Antiquities Advisory Board (AAB). He remarked that preserving historic buildings by using glass visage was also adopted in Singapore. Nevertheless, such works required substantial resources as relatively large-sized glass fittings would have to be used.

71. C for H, DEVB advised that to minimize adverse impact on the appearance of the historic building, the non-reflective glass fittings would be installed about 45 centimetres inward from the front edge of the verandah to reduce light reflection. Under the current design, the glass fittings concealed behind the balustrade were movable to facilitate natural ventilation. He further advised that the project had undergone a heritage impact assessment (HIA) and AMO supported the report. HKBU had also consulted AAB on the HIA report for the project and received its support.

72. Prof Patrick LAU and the Chairman expressed concern about the location of the air-conditioning outlets at the deep verandah. C for H, DEVB and Mr Tony LAM, Director of AGC Design Limited advised that the main air-conditioning facilities would be installed at the roof floor, while associated pipes would be clustered above the roof of lift shaft which was away from the verandah areas. These facilities would be covered by materials that harmonized with the building to reduce their visual impact. The Administration would further examine the design in the light of members' comments.

Admin

Revitalization Scheme

73. Miss Tanya CHAN enquired whether the Administration would review the implementation of Batch I and Batch II projects under the Revitalization Scheme, and also the timeframe for rolling out historical building projects under Batch III. C for H, DEVB advised that the Revitalization Scheme was first launched in February 2008 with seven buildings included under Batch I and by February 2009, six NPOs were selected to undertake these projects. In April 2009, the

Administration reviewed the Revitalization Scheme based on experience gained in implementing Batch I projects. The findings and suggestions from the review had been incorporated in the documents inviting application for revitalizing projects in Batch II buildings started in August 2009. CHO would conduct a review again after the implementation of the Batch II projects. On the timeframe for rolling out the Batch III exercise, C for H, DEVB said that CHO would continue to identify and consider suitable government-owned historic buildings available for adaptive re-use for inclusion in the Revitalization Scheme.

74. The item was voted on and endorsed.

PWSC(2010-11)10 7QW Revitalisation Scheme-Revitalisation of Mei Ho House as City Hostel

75. The Chairman advised that the proposal was to upgrade 7QW to Category A at an estimated cost of \$209.5 million in MOD prices for Hong Kong Youth Hostels Association to revitalize Mei Ho House as City Hostel. The Panel on Development had expressed support for the proposal when consulted on 27 April 2010.

76. The item was voted on and endorsed.

77. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 10:40 am.