

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. PWSC116/14-15

(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/F/2/1(12)B

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

**Minutes of the 9th meeting
held in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex
on Friday, 30 January 2015, at 10:45 am**

Members present:

Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC (Chairman)
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH (Deputy Chairman)
Hon LEE Cheuk-yan
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP
Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP
Hon Frederick FUNG Kin-kee, SBS, JP
Hon WONG Kwok-hing, BBS, MH
Prof Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long, SBS, JP, PhD, RN
Hon Ronny TONG Ka-wah, SC
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan, JP
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, JP
Hon CHAN Kin-por, BBS, JP
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-che
Hon IP Kwok-him, GBS, JP
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming
Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP

Hon CHAN Chi-chuen
Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN Ka-lok
Hon CHAN Yuen-han, SBS, JP
Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, JP
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
Hon Dennis KWOK
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung
Hon SIN Chung-kai, SBS, JP
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan
Hon IP Kin-yuen
Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, JP
Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, JP
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kiwok, BBS, MH, JP
Hon Christopher CHUNG Shu-kun, BBS, MH, JP
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS

Members absent:

Hon Albert HO Chun-yan
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Dr Hon LEUNG Ka-lau
Hon Claudia MO
Hon Gary FAN Kwok-wai
Hon CHAN Han-pan, JP
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, BBS, MH, JP
Hon Kenneth LEUNG

Public officers attending:

Mr YEUNG Tak-keung, JP	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) ³
Mr WAI Chi-sing, JP	Permanent Secretary for Development (Works)
Mr Thomas CHOW Tat-ming, JP	Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)
Ms Anissa WONG, JP	Permanent Secretary for the Environment
Ms Jasmine CHOI Suet-yung	Principal Assistant Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) (Works)

Mr Daniel CHUNG Kum-wah	Director of Drainage Services
Mr WONG Sui-kan	Chief Engineer (Sewerage Projects) Drainage Services Department
Miss Amy YUEN Wai-yin	Assistant Director (Water Policy) Environmental Protection Department
Mr LAU Ka-keung	Director of Highways
Mr Jimmy CHAN Pai-ming	Project Manager (Major Works) Highways Department
Mr James LEE Yan-wai	Chief Engineer (3) (Major Works) (Acting) Highways Department
Mr TANG Kin-fai	Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment) Environmental Protection Department
Mr Maurice YEUNG Kwok-leung	Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Assessment and Noise) Environmental Protection Department
Mr Kevin YEUNG Yun-hung	Under Secretary for Education
Miss Wendy CHUNG	Principal Assistant Secretary (Infrastructure and Research Support) Education Bureau
Mr LEUNG Koon-kee	Director of Architectural Services
Mr Frank WONG Tak-choi	Project Director (1) Architectural Services Department

Clerk in attendance:

Ms Sharon CHUNG	Chief Council Secretary (1)2
-----------------	------------------------------

Staff in attendance:

Ms Anita SIT	Assistant Secretary General 1
--------------	-------------------------------

Mr Fred PANG	Senior Council Secretary (1)2
Mr Hugo CHIU	Senior Council Secretary (1)6
Mr Raymond CHOW	Council Secretary (1)2
Ms Christina SHIU	Legislative Assistant (1)2
Ms Christy YAU	Legislative Assistant (1)7
Ms Haley CHEUNG	Legislative Assistant (4)8
Miss Joey LAW	Clerical Assistant(1)2

Action

The Chairman advised that there were seven funding proposals on the agenda for the meeting. The first three items on the agenda were carried over from the previous meeting of the Subcommittee on 23 January 2015 while the remaining ones were carried over from the meeting on 29 October 2014. He reminded members that in accordance with Rule 83A of the Rules of Procedure ("RoP") of the Legislative Council ("LegCo"), they should disclose the nature of any direct or indirect pecuniary interest relating to any item under discussion at the meeting before they spoke on the item. He also drew members' attention to Rule 84 of RoP on voting in the case of direct pecuniary interest.

Head 704 – Drainage

PWSC(2014-15)43 388DS Shek Wu Hui sewage treatment works—further expansion phase 1A

2. The Chairman said that the proposal, i.e. PWSC(2014-15)43, was to upgrade part of 388DS to Category A at an estimated cost of \$502.7 million in money-of-the-day ("MOD") prices for the construction of the advance works of the phase 1A of the further expansion of the Shek Wu Hui sewage treatment works ("SWHSTW") and for carrying out the detailed design and associated site investigation works for the main works of the phase 1A of the further expansion of the SWHSTW. The Panel on Environmental Affairs ("EA Panel") had been consulted on the proposal on 28 April 2014 and Panel members in general supported the submission of the proposal to the Subcommittee for consideration. A report on the gist of the Panel's discussion had been tabled at the meeting.

3. At the invitation of the Chairman, Director of Drainage Services ("DDS") briefed members on the proposal.

4. Mr WONG Kwok-hing said that EA Panel had been consulted on the proposal during the previous legislative session and Panel members in general supported it. He expressed concern about the delay in the

Subcommittee's examination of livelihood-related proposals submitted by the Administration and called on members to support the proposal.

5. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung enquired about the cause of the delay in the submission of the proposal to the Subcommittee for consideration. DDS responded that the proposal was submitted to the Subcommittee for consideration in accordance with the established procedures.

Environmental impacts of the project

6. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung and Mr WU Chi-wai pointed out that the local residents were concerned about the odour and possible adverse impact on water quality arising from the operation of SWHSTW and sought details of the mitigation measures to be implemented by the Administration. Mr Albert CHAN agreed that the odour issue should be handled carefully given the proximity of SWHSTW to residential areas. Mr CHAN and Mr WU also enquired about the treatment facilities in SWHSTW that would be covered to alleviate the odour impact of the facilities.

7. DDS responded that the Administration understood that local residents were mainly concerned about the odour and possible adverse impacts on the water quality of the Ng Tung River brought by SWHSTW. The Administration would adopt a number of odour mitigation measures including enclosing all treatment facilities that would produce odour and installation of appropriate deodourization facilities. Regarding the discharge quality, the project would upgrade the sewage treatment standard of SWHSTW from the secondary to the tertiary level, hence improving the quality of the treated effluent. In 2013, a number of site visits to SWHSTW had been arranged for local residents to enable them to gain an in-depth understanding of the mode of operation of SWHSTW and the main aspects of the expansion proposal. DDS added that SWHSTW had operated for over 30 years without causing major negative impacts on the environment.

8. Mr CHAN Hak-kan said that local residents were also concerned about the noise and air pollution brought by the project. DDS responded that the Environmental Impact Assessment ("EIA") of the project had covered noise and air pollution and recommended a number of mitigation measures. The Administration would implement the recommended measures and the relevant funding had been earmarked in the proposal.

Usage of the discharge from SWHSTW

9. Mr WU Chi-wai enquired whether the treated effluent from SWHSTW would be sufficient to meet the operational need of the proposed

district cooling system in the area and if so, whether preparatory works would be carried out to ensure compatibility of SWHSTW with the proposed district cooling system. He sought details of the quality of treated effluent from SWHSTW after the upgrading of its sewage treatment standard to the tertiary level. Mr WU further enquired if the treated effluent from SWHSTW would also be used for other purposes and whether corresponding preparatory works would be carried out.

10. DDS responded that after the upgrading of SWHSTW's sewage treatment standard to the tertiary level (which was the best level), the treated effluent from SWHSTW could be reused upon sterilization. The Administration's preliminary thinking was that the treated effluent from SWHSTW would be used for the proposed district cooling system, toilet flushing and irrigation in the region. The Drainage Services Department ("DSD") would study the matter with the Water Supplies Department. As the project would take a few years to complete, it was envisaged that there would be concrete progress in the study by then.

Determination of sewage treatment standard

11. Mr Albert CHAN said that the Siu Ho Wan sewage treatment works ("SHWSTW") caused odour nuisance at night and he had lodged complaints with the Government. He enquired whether SWHSTW and SHWSTW adopted similar sewage treatment methods and if not so, why the better sewage treatment method was not used for both sewage treatment works.

12. DDS responded that the respective sewage treatment standards for SWHSTW upon completion of the project in question and SHWSTW would be/were at the tertiary level and the chemically enhanced primary level respectively. The odour nuisance arising from the upgraded SWHSTW would be much less severe because of the enclosure of all treatment facilities that would produce odour and installation of appropriate deodourization facilities. In general, the Administration would determine the sewage treatment standard for a sewage treatment works by considering the requirements of the quality of discharge to the receiving water body. DDS added that the odour nuisance arising from SHWSTW was not directly related to the level of sewage treatment standard. Relevant works were being conducted to enclose the facilities of SHWSTW to alleviate its odour problem.

Public consultation at local level

13. While noting that the Administration had, since 2013, consulted relevant stakeholders including the North District Council, the Sheung Shui

District Rural Committee, village representatives and residents of Sheung Shiu Heung and Fu Tei Au, Mr CHAN Hak-kan was concerned that such consultation might stop after the approval of the funding proposal by the Finance Committee ("FC"). Referring to the Administration's past practice of establishing community liaison groups for some offensive works like landfill extension, Mr CHAN enquired whether the Administration would undertake to establish a community liaison group for the project and whether the Administration would take other measures to enhance communication at the local level.

14. DDS confirmed that a community liaison group would be established before the commencement of the project to enhance communication with relevant stakeholders. Unless so decided by group members, the community liaison group would not be automatically dissolved after the completion of the project.

15. Dr Fernando CHEUNG said that SWHSTW had been expanded once in 2005 and the villagers from Sheung Shui Heung had all along held strong reservations over the expansion of SWHSTW. PWSC(2014-15)43 only mentioned that the Administration had liaised with them without specifying the liaison's outcome. When the North District Council was consulted on the proposal, some members suggested that SWHSTW should be relocated to a remote place such as Sha Ling. He sought the Administration's view on this suggestion. Dr CHEUNG suggested that the project should only be commenced after a consensus had been reached between the Administration and the residents concerned.

16. DDS responded that the Administration had assessed the feasibility of relocating SWHSTW to other remote places including Sha Ling, a piece of abandoned land to the south of Lo Wu Station, Fu Tei Au, Cham Shan, Ki Lun Shan, Tai Shek Mo and areas to the north of Sheung Shui Heung, and concluded that in-situ expansion was the most appropriate arrangement as each of the alternative locations had its own limitations. The Administration had liaised with the nearby residents to address their concerns. The community liaison group to be set up would continue to consult local residents and enable them to gain an in-depth understanding of the project to alleviate their worries.

17. In reply to Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung's enquiry, DDS confirmed that the Administration had consulted nearby residents on the proposed landscape design of SWHSTW. Apart from reducing the height of the treatment facilities by putting part of the facilities below ground to minimize their visual impact, greening features including planting of vegetation, rooftop greening and vertical greening would be implemented. DDS further

explained that the actual landscape design of SWHSTW was to be determined during the detailed design of the project. The Administration would consider the views collected by the community liaison group and from the relevant stakeholders. The consultancy contract for the detailed design and associated site investigation works for the main works of phase 1A of further expansion of the SWHSTW would require the consultant to conduct public engagement exercises on the design of SWHSTW.

Other issues

18. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung noted that the Food and Health Bureau planned to establish temporary holding facilities in the vicinity of Fu Tei Au Tsuen next to Man Kam To Road for imported live poultry. He enquired whether SWHSTW had enough capacity to handle the sewage effluent from the temporary holding facilities.

19. DDS responded that the daily discharge of the proposed temporary holding facilities for imported live poultry would be about 100 cubic metres and SWHSTW had sufficient capacity to handle it.

20. Mr Albert CHAN noted with concern that some 330 tonnes of non-inert construction waste generated from the project would be disposed of at landfills and enquired whether the waste would be used for reclamation. DDS advised that non-inert construction waste could not be re-used or used for reclamation.

21. Mr WU Chi-wai enquired whether the Administration would re-locate relevant government offices to the site area of SWHSTW, which was relatively large, to vacate land in the urban areas, and whether the plot ratio of the site area had been fully utilized.

22. DDS responded that while the site area had been fully utilized by SWHSTW and could not accommodate other government offices, the Administration would examine the feasibility of allowing the public to use the greening facilities there. DDS also explained that as many facilities in sewage treatment works did not allow piling works and would produce odour, it would not be suitable to co-locate other types of buildings with sewage treatment works. Thus, plot ratio was not used to determine whether the site area had been fully utilized.

23. Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok said that he supported the proposal as the design capacity of the existing SWHSTW was expected to be fully utilized by 2018 and the Administration had assessed and concluded that it would be infeasible to relocate it to other remote places. Moreover, the project would upgrade

the treatment standard of SWHSTW, which would be beneficial to local residents. Citing the sewage treatment works inside a cavern at Stanley Bay as an example, he suggested that SWHSTW should also serve as an environmental protection and public education facility in future.

24. The item was voted on and endorsed. Dr Fernando CHEUNG requested that the item be voted on separately at the relevant FC meeting.

Head 706 – Highways

PWSC(2014-15)51 810TH Retrofitting of noise barriers on Tuen Mun Road (Town Centre section)

25. The Chairman said that the proposal, i.e. PWSC(2014-15)51, was to upgrade 810TH to Category A at an estimated cost of \$826.5 million in MOD prices for the retrofitting of noise barriers on Tuen Mun Road (Town Centre Section) between Rose Dale Garden and Lakeshore Building. EA Panel had been consulted on the proposal on 26 May 2014 and Panel members in general supported the submission of the proposal to the Subcommittee for consideration. A report on the gist of the Panel's discussion had been tabled at the meeting.

26. At the invitation of the Chairman, Director of Highways ("DHy") briefed members on the proposal.

Suggestion of retrofitting a full noise enclosure fronting the Church of Christ in China Tam Lee Lai Fun Memorial Secondary School ("the School")

27. Mr IP Kin-yuen referred to paragraph 16 of PWSC(2014-15)51 regarding the objections raised against the non-provision of noise mitigation measures on Tuen Mun Road fronting the School, and noted that according to the Administration's response made at the meeting of EA Panel on 26 May 2014, there were still over 1 000 objections on the matter after the objection resolution and the formulation of a modified noise barrier scheme of providing additional vertical noise barriers fronting the caretakers' quarters of the School. Mr IP considered that a full noise enclosure fronting the School should be retrofitted. He added that he learnt from the School's principal that although the School had been installed with double-glazed windows, it still suffered from traffic noise pollution and had to keep the air-conditioners running throughout the year to allay the problem. The School's principal further informed him that the Administration had said that the relevant legislation on controlling noise pollution did not cover non-residential buildings like schools. Mr IP enquired whether the

Administration would conduct site visits to the School and implement noise mitigation measures for it.

28. Mr LEE Cheuk-yan considered it undesirable for the School to keep the air-conditioners running throughout the year to reduce the noise pollution. Mr Albert CHAN considered the installation of absorptive panels inadequate and remarked that the Administration should also consider the echoing effect, which might cause serious noise pollution to the upper floors of a building. Mr LEE, Mr CHAN, Dr Helena WONG and Dr Fernando CHEUNG urged the Administration to retrofit a full noise enclosure on the section of Tuen Mun Road fronting the School instead of only retrofitting a noise semi-enclosure as currently proposed.

29. Miss Alice MAK and Mr WONG Kwok-hing also considered that relevant noise mitigation measures including the retrofitting of a full noise enclosure should be implemented for the School. Mr TAM Yiu-chung considered that apart from the School, the interests of some 1 800 dwellings to be benefitted from the project should also be taken into account. Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok said that the Administration should adopt consistent criteria for the provision of mitigation measures in all public works projects. He considered it more appropriate to review the provision of noise barriers for schools at the policy level. He enquired how long the project would be delayed if a full noise enclosure fronting the School was to be retrofitted.

30. DHy responded that the Administration accorded importance to controlling noise pollution levels at schools and would take relevant measures like the installation of double-glazed windows and air-conditioners as necessary. Under the present proposal, a noise semi-enclosure fronting the School with adsorptive panels at the bottom would be retrofitted. The section of Tuen Mun Road covered by the project would be resurfaced with low noise materials. These measures could alleviate the traffic noise impact on the School. Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment), Environmental Protection Department ("AD(EA)/EPD") added that, with the installation of double-glazed windows, the traffic noise level at the classrooms of the School had been reduced by at least 25 dB(A).

31. Regarding the suggestion of retrofitting a full noise enclosure fronting the School, DHy explained that it would have significant technical implications as additional foundations had to be built at the roadside section near the School. AD(EA)/EPD supplemented that such provision would be inconsistent with the Administration's existing policy. Besides, many classrooms of the School were also affected by traffic noise from other roads like the Tsing Tin Interchange ("TTI") and could not fully benefit from a full noise enclosure, which could cost up to some \$100 million if it were to be

retrofitted. On the policy of controlling traffic noise pollution, AD(EA)/EPD clarified that the Administration relied on administrative measures rather than legislation to control traffic noise pollution. He stressed that appropriate noise mitigation measures would be implemented for schools to provide a good teaching and learning environment. He said that the main targets of the proposal were the existing dwellings adjacent to the section of Tuen Mun Road covered by the project. As double-glazed windows with air-conditioners and mechanical air ventilation had been installed for the School under the School Insulation Programme to abate traffic noise to an acceptable level, no further noise mitigation measure would need to be provided to it under the project. Regarding the estimated timeframe for the retrofitting of a full noise enclosure fronting the School, DHy advised that the Administration had to carry out further studies to assess the impact of such provision on the implementation programme of the project and the changes to the detailed design that would be required.

32. Dr Helena WONG noted that the reasons provided by the Administration for refusing to retrofit a full noise enclosure fronting the School (i.e. cost and technical implications and that double-glazed windows had already been installed for the School) seemed to be arbitrary and were not consistent with one another. She was dissatisfied with the Administration's existing policy, under which the needs of non-residential buildings like schools and hospitals were not duly taken care of in determining the type of noise barriers to be retrofitted. Citing the experience of the Yaumati Catholic Primary School as an example, she was concerned that the proposed noise semi-enclosure fronting the School might actually aggravate the noise and air pollution impacts on the School. Dr Fernando CHEUNG echoed Dr WONG's concerns and enquired whether the Administration had conducted an EIA for the project.

33. DHy responded that while the project was not a designated project under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (Cap. 499), the Administration had conducted an environmental review in accordance with the criteria adopted in EIA. He clarified that the proposed noise semi-enclosure facing the School would not exacerbate the noise impact on the School.

Suggestion of conducting a fresh tendering exercise

34. Mr Albert CHAN suggested that the Administration should conduct a fresh tendering exercise for the project so as to benefit from the recent significant drop in the price levels of certain raw materials like copper and iron. Dr Helena WONG and Dr Fernando CHEUNG considered that the

Administration should also include mitigation measures to reduce traffic noise from TTI if it decided to conduct a fresh tendering exercise.

35. Mr TAM Yiu-chung said that as the Administration had specified the estimated cost of the project, he doubted whether the tenderers would be willing to submit new tenders below the estimated cost. He enquired about the time needed for conducting a fresh tendering exercise and the validity period of the project tenders.

36. DHy responded that the validity period of the project tenders would expire in end-January 2015 and the Administration would examine all feasible options, including negotiation with the tenderers and the conduct of a fresh tendering exercise, so that the project could be carried out by the most appropriate contractor at a reasonable cost. While the recent price drop of certain raw materials might be reflected in a new tendering exercise, it was not envisaged that lower tender prices would be received given that the costs of a number of other items were on the rise. DHy also clarified that the estimated cost of the project was only the estimated expenditure ceiling and would not necessarily be the outturn expenditure of the project.

Public consultation

37. Miss Alice MAK considered that the targets of the Administration's public consultation on capital works projects tended to concentrate on the beneficiaries only. Citing the inadvertent creation of noise pollution for some nearby residents in the retrofitting of a noise semi-enclosure at the Tsing Yi North Bridge as an example, Miss MAK called on the Administration to conduct consultation work in a more comprehensive manner.

38. Mr LEE Cheuk-yan said that some local residents complained about the proposed locations of the noise barriers under the project. He enquired whether the Administration had received such complaints and if so, how it would address them. Dr KWOK Ka-ki expressed reservation over the selective manner adopted by the Administration in conducting local consultation.

39. DHy responded that the Tuen Mun District Council had been consulted on the project in July 2010 and March 2012 and was strongly supportive of it. An environmental review conducted for the project concluded that it would not result in the aggravation of noise pollution owing to the installation of absorptive panels at the bottom of the noise barriers. DHy added that all objections against the project received by the Administration were related to the non-provision of a full noise enclosure

fronting the School. Miss MAK did not subscribe to the Administration's response and said that some local residents had reservations over the project.

Cost-effectiveness of the project

40. Noting that 157 and 748 dwellings would have their noise levels reduced by 1 dB(A) and 2 to 5 dB(A) respectively, Dr KWOK Ka-ki was concerned about the cost-effectiveness of the project and enquired about the number of dwellings still exposed to a traffic noise level exceeding 70 dB(A) upon the completion of the project. Mr Tony TSE shared Dr KWOK's concern. He observed that the project involved four types of noise barriers and enquired about the criteria adopted by the Administration for choosing the type of noise barriers. Mr TSE also called on the Administration to continue its effort in improving the aesthetical design of noise barriers.

41. DHy explained that many dwellings along the section of Tuen Mun Road covered by the project were also affected by traffic noise from other roads like TTI and the reduction in traffic noise levels of these dwellings as a result of the project was thus not significant. While the structure of the existing flyovers at TTI could not bear the retrofitting of additional noise barriers, TTI would be resurfaced with low noise surfacing materials. DHy drew members' attention to the fact that of the 1 800 dwellings to be benefitted from the project, the noise level of 1 300 dwellings would be lowered to below 70 dB(A). The Administration would select the type of noise barriers having regard to the locations of the dwellings subjected to traffic noise. On the aesthetical design of noise barriers, the Administration would install transparent and translucent panels for the noise barriers and provide roadside planters to improve aesthetics as well as to promote green surroundings.

Admin

42. Mr Tony TSE requested the Administration to provide information on the traffic noise levels, before and after the completion of the proposed works project, that the some 1 800 dwellings (to be benefitted from the project) were/would be exposed to. DHy undertook to provide the relevant information.

43. Dr KWOK Ka-ki was concerned that the proposal had reserved a large provision for price adjustment, which he considered was prone to abuse by contractors. He enquired whether the Administration would resolve the problem by revising its contracts for works projects in future. DHy responded that the Administration prepared works contracts in accordance with stringent procedures and would allow about 10% of the project cost for contingency. He stressed that the Administration was prudent in using public money.

Changes in the project estimates

44. Mr WONG Kwok-hing remarked that local residents were keen on the early implementation of the project and called on members to support it. He considered that the filibusters of some members had led to the delay in the implementation of the Administration's capital works projects and sought information on the additional cost of the project arising from the delay. Mr TAM Yiu-chung echoed Mr WONG's concern.

45. DHy advised that the estimated cost of the project as at April 2014 was \$623 million in MOD prices. As the tenders for the contract would expire in end-January 2015, the latest estimated cost was \$826.5 million in MOD prices.

46. Citing the cost escalation of the Hong Kong section of the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link as an example, Mr Albert CHAN remarked that the filibusters of some members were not necessarily the main cause of cost overrun in the Administration's capital works projects. He said that it was incumbent upon the Subcommittee to examine the Administration's capital works proposals prudently and the Development Bureau should assess the overall capacity of the local construction industry and adjust the Administration's public works programme as appropriate.

Motion proposed under Paragraph 32A of the Public Works Subcommittee Procedure ("PWSC Procedure")

47. The Chairman advised that he had received a motion proposed under Paragraph 32A of the PWSC Procedure from Mr Albert CHAN. He considered that the motion was directly related to the agenda item. The wording of the motion was as follows:

"就 PWSC(2014-15)51 屯門公路(市中心段)加建隔音屏障工程，本委員會要求政府應在中華基督教會譚李麗芬紀念中學的路段加建全密閉式隔音罩。"

(Translation)

"That, in connection with PWSC(2014-15)51 - Retrofitting of noise barriers on Tuen Mun Road (Town Centre Section), this Subcommittee requests the Government to retrofit a full-enclosure on the road section outside The Church of Christ in China Tam Lee Lai Fun Memorial Secondary School."

48. The Chairman put to vote the question that the proposed motion should be proceeded with. The question was carried.

49. The Chairman said that each member could speak on the motion for three minutes. The Administration would then be invited to respond. The mover of the motion would then have one minute to speak in reply. After that, he would put the motion to vote. The Chairman also suggested that the meeting be extended for 15 minutes up to 1:00 pm. Members raised no objection.

50. Mr Albert CHAN said that the noise pollution of Tuen Mun was getting more and more serious and he was dissatisfied with the Administration's proposed arrangements for the School. He also noted that noise barriers were retrofitted on the Tuen Mun Road after its construction and no statutory EIA was required. He was concerned that the School would be exposed to excessive traffic noise and did not accept the way the Administration dealt with the matter.

51. Dr Helena WONG expressed support for the motion and suggested that if a full noise enclosure fronting the School was to be retrofitted, it should also cover the road section fronting the Lakeshore Building and the caretakes' quarters of the School.

52. DHy remarked that the School was affected by traffic noise from Tuen Mun Road as well as other roads including TTI. The Administration had implemented a number of noise mitigation measures for the School. If a full noise enclosure fronting the School was to be retrofitted, the Administration had to conduct a study to assess its feasibility and the current estimated project cost might not be sufficient to cover the additional works. It was also likely that the feasibility study would lead to delay in the submission of the proposal to FC for approval. DHy called on members to consider the interests of the some 1 800 dwellings to be benefitted from the project, and remarked that the Administration might have to withdraw the proposal if the motion was carried in order to allow sufficient time for necessary study and revisions to the proposal.

53. The Chairman put the motion to vote. At the request of Mr CHAN Kam-lam, the Chairman ordered a division and the division bell was rung for five minutes. The Chairman announced that 13 members voted for, 10 voted against the motion and no one abstained. The voting result was as follows:

For:

Mr LEE Cheuk-yan
Mr Frederick FUNG
Ms Cyd HO
Mr Albert CHAN
Mr CHAN Chi-chuen
Dr Fernando CHEUNG
Mr IP Kin-yuen
(13 members)

Ms Emily LAU
Prof Joseph LEE
Mr LEUN Kwok-hung
Mr Charles Peter MOK
Dr Kenneth CHAN
Dr Helena WONG

Against:

Mr CHAN Kam-lam
Mr IP Kwok-him
Mr Frankie YICK
Dr Elizabeth QUAT
Mr Christopher CHUNG
(10 members)

Mr CHAN Hak-kan
Mr Michael TIEN
Miss Alice MAK
Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok
Mr Tony TSE

Abstain:

(0 member)

54. The Chairman declared that the motion was carried. Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury)³ clarified that the Administration did not intend to withdraw the proposal.

55. Mr IP Kin-yuen and Dr Helena WONG requested the Administration to provide information on its policy/administrative measures on the mitigation of impacts of noise and air pollution on schools, and whether non-residential buildings like schools and hospitals were not covered by relevant legislation on controlling noise pollution. Dr WONG further requested the Administration to provide information on the air pollution situation of the section of Tuen Mun Road covered by the project (like the level of respirable suspended particles) before and after the completion of the proposed works project. Permanent Secretary for the Environment responded that the Administration had implemented a number of noise mitigation measures for schools and the intended targets of the present proposal were the dwellings adjacent to the section of Tuen Mun Road covered by the project. She agreed to provide the information as requested.

Admin

56. Mr Albert CHAN considered that the reduction in the tender price of a fresh tender for the project would be sufficient to cover the additional cost for the retrofitting of a full noise enclosure fronting the School.

57. The item was voted on and endorsed. Mr Albert CHAN requested that the item be voted on separately at the relevant FC meeting.

Head 703 – Buildings

PWSC(2014-15)45 354EP A 36-classroom primary school in Area 36, Fanling

58. The Chairman said that the proposal, i.e. PWSC(2014-15)45, was to upgrade 354EP to Category A at an estimated cost of \$417.2 million in MOD prices for the construction of a 36-classroom primary school to re-provision Tung Wah Group of Hospitals Ma Kam Chan Memorial Primary School ("the primary school") in Area 36, Fanling. The Panel on Education had been consulted on the proposal on 12 May 2014 and Panel members in general supported the submission of the proposal to the Subcommittee for consideration. A report on the gist of the Panel's discussion had been tabled at the meeting.

59. At the invitation of the Chairman, Under Secretary for Education ("US(Ed)") briefed members on the proposal.

60. Mr Albert CHAN declared that he was a consultant of the Tung Wah Group of Hospitals.

61. Dr Helena WONG relayed the support of the Democratic Party to the proposal. Dr Fernando CHEUNG and Mr IP Kin-yuen also expressed support for the proposal and called for its early implementation.

62. Noting that the new and existing premises of the primary school were not close to one another and it was envisaged that the two premises would have to share a number of facilities, Dr Fernando CHEUNG enquired how the primary school would operate on the basis of "one school, two premises" during the transitional period and whether the Administration would provide assistance as necessary.

63. US(Ed) responded that the new and existing premises of the primary school were both close to the Sheung Shui railway station and the walking distance between them was around 10 minutes. If the primary school had to operate on the basis of "one school, two premises" during the transitional period, the Administration would liaise with the school on the implementation details to ensure that the learning of students would not be adversely affected. Dr Fernando CHEUNG considered that the liaison work should involve parents and should be transparent.

64. Mr IP Kin-yuen said that the primary school would like to seek further information on the design of the energy efficient facilities to be installed and the cost arrangement. He called on the Administration to further discuss the matter with the school.

65. The item was voted on and endorsed.

66. The Chairman consulted members on whether the item would require separate discussion and voting at the relevant meeting of FC. No member made such a request.

Any other business

67. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 12:58 pm.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
26 February 2015