

**立法會**  
***Legislative Council***

LC Paper No. CB(1)1107/14-15

(These minutes have been seen  
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/PL/DEV

**Panel on Development**

**Minutes of meeting**  
**held on Tuesday, 28 April 2015, at 2:30 pm**  
**in Conference Room 3 of the Legislative Council Complex**

**Members present** : Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS (Chairman)  
Hon James TO Kun-sun  
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP  
Hon Frederick FUNG Kin-kee, SBS, JP  
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan, JP  
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, JP  
Hon CHAN Kin-por, BBS, JP  
Hon IP Kwok-him, GBS, JP  
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP  
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC  
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung  
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip  
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP  
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH  
Hon YIU Si-wing  
Hon Gary FAN Kwok-wai  
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen  
Hon CHAN Han-pan, JP  
Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN Ka-lok  
Hon CHAN Yuen-han, SBS, JP  
Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, JP  
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung  
Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, JP  
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, BBS, MH, JP

**Members attending** : Hon WONG Kwok-hing, BBS, MH  
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan

**Members absent** : Dr Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBM, GBS, JP  
(Deputy Chairman)  
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP  
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP  
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yee, GBS, JP  
Hon James TIEN Pei-chun, GBS, JP  
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, BBS, MH, JP

**Public officers attending** : **Agenda item IV**

Mr Francis CHAU Siu-hei  
Principal Assistant Secretary (Works)2  
Development Bureau

Mr Norman HEUNG Yuk-sai, JP  
Project Manager (Kowloon)  
Civil Engineering and Development Department

Ms YING Fun-fong  
Head (Kai Tak Office)  
Civil Engineering and Development Department

Mr Janson WONG Chi-sing  
Chief Engineer/Kowloon 2  
Civil Engineering and Development Department

**Agenda item V**

Mrs Dorothy MA CHOW Pui-fun  
Principal Assistant Secretary for the Environment (Energy)  
Environment Bureau

Mr Harry LAI Hon-chung, JP  
Assistant Director/Electricity & Energy Efficiency  
Electrical and Mechanical Services Department

Mr CHEUNG Yuen-fong  
Chief Engineer/Energy Efficiency B  
Electrical and Mechanical Services Department

**Agenda item VI**

Mr Eric MA Siu-cheung, JP  
Under Secretary for Development

Mr CHONG Wing-wun  
Principal Assistant Secretary (Planning & Lands)<sup>1</sup>  
Development Bureau

Mr LAM Sai-hung, JP  
Head of Civil Engineering Office  
Civil Engineering and Development Department

Mr Paul MOK Hei-tat  
Chief Engineer/Special Duties (Works)  
Civil Engineering and Development Department

**Attendance by  
Invitation : Agenda item VI**

Mr Eric CHING Ming-kam  
Divisional Director (Environmental)  
Mott Macdonald Hong Kong Limited

**Clerk in attendance:** Ms Sharon CHUNG  
Chief Council Secretary (1)<sup>2</sup>

**Staff in attendance :** Mr Fred PANG  
Senior Council Secretary (1)<sup>2</sup>

Mr Raymond CHOW  
Council Secretary (1)<sup>2</sup>

Ms Christina SHIU  
Legislative Assistant (1)<sup>2</sup>

---

**I Confirmation of minutes**

(LC Paper No. CB(1)753/14-15 -- Minutes of meeting on 27 January 2015)

The minutes of the regular meeting on 27 January 2015 were confirmed.

**II Information papers issued since the last meeting**

(LC Paper No. CB(1)698/14-15(01) -- Letter dated 31 March 2015 from Hon James TO and Hon Emily LAU on the resignation of Managing Director of the Urban Renewal Authority

LC Paper No. CB(1)704/14-15(01) -- Issues raised at the meeting between Legislative Council Members and Yau Tsim Mong District Council members on 29 January 2015 relating to problems arising from sub-divisions of flat units and measures to tackle the problems

LC Paper No. CB(1)735/14-15(01) -- Issues raised at the meeting between Legislative Council Members and Sai Kung District Council members on 26 March 2015 relating to problem of serious shortage of parking spaces and request for provision of carriageways

LC Paper No. CB(1)747/14-15(01) -- Issue raised at the meeting between Legislative Council Members and North District Council members on 22 May 2014 relating to suggestion on further opening up the Sha Tau Kok Frontier Closed Area

LC Paper No. CB(1)762/14-15(01) -- Letter from the Administration dated 13 April 2015 on its discussion with Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan on two items on the Panel's "list of outstanding items for discussion", i.e. (a) planning of Kowloon West; and (b) enhancement and beautification for streets in Kowloon West

LC Paper No. CB(1)764/14-15(01) -- Administration's further response to the letter from Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN dated 24 November 2014 on matters related to the Town Planning Ordinance and the Town Planning Board (LC Paper No. CB(1)299/14-15(01))

2. Members noted that the above information papers had been issued since the last meeting.

3. Dr Elizabeth QUAT said that the information papers included the referrals arising from various meetings between Legislative Council Members and members of District Councils (LC Paper Nos. CB(1)704/14-15(01), CB(1)735/14-15(01) and CB(1)747/14-15(01)). She suggested that the referrals should be included in the Panel's "List of Outstanding Items for Discussion". Members agreed with Dr QUAT's suggestion.

*(Post-meeting note: The three referrals have been included in the Panel's "List of Outstanding Items for Discussion" issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)860/14-15(01) on 21 May 2015.)*

4. Dr Fernando CHEUNG referred to the letter from Mr James TO and Ms Emily LAU to the Chairman on 31 March 2015 (LC Paper No. CB(1)698/14-15(01)) about the resignation of the Managing Director of the Urban Renewal Authority ("URA"). He said the resignation had aroused public concerns about the work of URA. The Panel should discuss with the

Administration and URA the matters related to the resignation and URA's future work at a meeting as soon as possible.

5. Mr CHAN Kam-lam said that according to the Panel's "List of Outstanding Items for Discussion" (LC Paper No. CB(1)759/14-15(01)), the work of URA was one of the items to be discussed at a future meeting of the Panel. He said that members might raise for discussion the matters related to the work of URA at that meeting. Mr IP Kwok-him shared Mr CHAN' view. He opined that while it was important for the Panel to discuss with the Administration the work of URA, it was not appropriate to hold a meeting specifically for an individual case such as resignation of a senior staff member of URA.

6. The Chairman said that the Administration had proposed to discuss the "Work of the Urban Renewal Authority" at the Panel's meeting in June 2015. He suggested that members might raise their concerns about issues relating to URA at the June meeting when discussing the item. Members raised no objection to the Chairman's suggestion.

### **III Items for discussion at the next meeting**

(LC Paper No. CB(1)759/14-15(01) -- List of outstanding items for discussion

LC Paper No. CB(1)759/14-15(02) -- List of follow-up actions)

7. Members agreed that the next regular meeting scheduled for Tuesday, 26 May 2015, at 2:30 pm would be extended to end at 6:15 pm and the following items proposed by the Administration be discussed --

- (a) PWP Item No. 259RS -- Cycle tracks connecting North West New Territories with North East New Territories -- Tuen Mun to Sheung Shui section (Remaining);
- (b) Regrading of multi-disciplinary directorate posts in the Architectural Services Department;
- (c) New measures for the training of skilled workers for the construction industry; and
- (d) Facilitating the redevelopment of buildings under the Civil Servants' Co-operative Building Society Scheme.

(*Post-meeting note:* At the request of the Administration and with the concurrence of the Chairman, the discussion on the item "PWP Item No. 259RS -- Cycle tracks connecting North West New Territories with North East New Territories -- Tuen Mun to Sheung Shui section (Remaining)" has been deferred to the regular meeting on 23 June 2015. The meeting on 26 May 2015 will end at 5:30 pm. Members were informed of the above meeting arrangements vide LC Paper No. CB(1)860/14-15 on 18 May 2015.)

**IV PWP Item No. 711CL -- Kai Tak Development – Infrastructure works for developments at the southern part of the former runway and Progress report on Kai Tak Development**

(LC Paper No. CB(1)759/14-15(03) -- Administration's paper on 711CL -- Kai Tak development -- infrastructure works for developments at the southern part of the former runway and Progress report on Kai Tak Development

LC Paper No. CB(1)759/14-15(04) -- Paper on Kai Tak Development prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat (Updated background brief))

8. Principal Assistant Secretary (Works)2, Development Bureau ("PAS/DEV(W)2") briefed members on the proposal to upgrade PWP Item No. 711CL for the construction of infrastructure works at the southern part of the former runway at Kai Tak Development ("KTD") ("the proposed project"). The details of the proposal were given in the Administration's paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)759/14-15(03)). PAS/DEV(W)2 advised that the estimated cost of the proposed project was about \$5,757 million.

9. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, PAS/DEV(W)2 and Head (Kai Tak Office), Civil Engineering and Development Department ("H/KTO/CEDD") explained the scope and design of the works under the proposal and briefed members on the progress of KTD. The progress report on KTD was given in Enclosure 2 to the Administration's paper.

(*Post-meeting note: A soft copy of the powerpoint presentation materials was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)798/14-15(01) by email on 29 April 2015.*)

10. The Chairman 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 interests relating to the subjects under discussion at the meeting before they spoke on the subjects.

#### Cost of the project

11. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen commented that the total estimated cost of the project, at \$5,757 million, was a substantial amount. The Administration should provide a detailed breakdown of the project cost in the discussion paper to facilitate members to consider the cost-effectiveness of the project and whether some expenditure items under the proposal were necessary. Mr Michael TIEN and Dr Fernando CHEUNG expressed similar views.

12. PAS/DEV(W)2 replied that of the estimated total expenditure of \$5,757 million in money-of-the-day ("MOD") prices, the provisions for the construction of an elevated landscaped deck ("the deck") cum roadside noise barriers and a supporting underground structure were about \$1,213 million and \$1,753 million respectively. The remaining \$2,800 million would cover other expenditure items such as "roads" (\$444 million), "landscaping works" (\$103 million), "drainage, sewerage, water mains and ancillary works" (\$234 million), "other costs and contingencies" (\$883 million) and provisions for "price adjustment" (\$1,127 million). He advised that the Administration would include a detailed breakdown of the estimated project cost in the paper on the proposal to be submitted to the Public Works Subcommittee ("PWSC").

13. Mr CHAN Kam-lam and Mr IP Kwok-him said that the Administration should provide all the relevant information about the project in the discussion paper to make it informative enough for members' consideration. Mr CHAN commented that important information about the project such as the cost breakdown just presented by PAS/DEV(W)2 should have been included in the paper.

14. Noting that the "provision for price adjustment" and "other costs and project contingencies" for the proposed project were \$1,127 million and \$883 million respectively, Dr Fernando CHEUNG opined that the cost of these two expenditure items was huge, as it represented more than one-third

of the total project cost. He requested the Administration to provide a detailed breakdown of the project estimate and the justifications for the substantial amount of provisions for price adjustment and contingencies.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's supplementary information was circulated to members on 3 June 2015 vide LC Paper No. CB(1)933/14-15(01).)*

15. Ms Cyd HO enquired how the Administration determined the proportion of the provision for price adjustment in the total cost of a public works project that would span over a period of four years or more. She asked whether in working out an estimate for the provision, the Administration would take into account the current high fluctuations in construction prices.

16. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung enquired whether the method adopted by the Administration for calculating the provision for price adjustment for the proposed project also applied to the public works projects with huge cost overrun, such as the Hong Kong section of the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link and the Liantang/Heung Yuen Wai Boundary Control Point. He queried whether cost overrun in public works projects was caused by the Administration's inaccurate estimation of the provision for price adjustment.

17. PAS/DEV(W)2 replied that in line with the established practice, the Administration had derived the MOD estimates of the proposed project based on the forecast yearly expenditure (in constant prices) and the Government Economist's forecast of the trend rate of change in the prices of public sector building and construction output for the contract period of the project. The existing calculation method for provisions for price adjustment had been adopted in public works projects for a long time. He explained that cost overrun in individual projects was not necessarily related to whether the provisions for price adjustment was accurate or not. H/KTO/CEDD advised that the provision for price adjustment under the proposed project was the difference between the MOD project estimate and the estimate in constant prices.

18. Ms Cyd HO requested the Administration to provide information on how the provision for price adjustment under the proposed project had been worked out, and, with examples of the best and worst scenarios, whether and how the provision for price adjustment would be affected by the duration of works.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's supplementary information was circulated to members on 3 June 2015 vide LC Paper No.*

CB(1)933/14-15(01).)

19. The Chairman and Ms Cyd HO sought clarification about the provision (\$883 million) for "other costs and contingencies". PAS/DEV(W)2 responded that the Administration proposed to allocate about \$400 million for project contingencies. H/KTO/CEDD advised that other items under "other costs and contingencies" included the costs for carrying out environmental mitigation measures, environmental monitoring and auditing, remuneration for resident site staff, and consultants' fees, etc.

20. Taking into consideration that prices such as labour wages and costs of construction materials might go downward during the deflationary period, Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung enquired whether the delayed completion of a project would necessarily lead to an increase in the project cost. PAS/DEV(W)2 replied that in an anticipated deflationary environment, the Administration might not need to use the funds set aside for price adjustment.

#### The supporting underground structure

21. Mr Michael TIEN noted that the Administration had included in the proposal an estimated cost of \$1,753 million for constructing a supporting underground structure ("SUS") along Shing Cheong Road and across Cheung Yip Street as enabling works to facilitate future construction of the Trunk Road T2 ("T2"). He asked whether the SUS was essential to the construction of T2. H/KTO/CEDD replied in the affirmative. PAS/DEV(W)2 explained that a section of T2 would pass through a site between the two hospital developments planned for KTD and so an SUS was needed. Dr Fernando CHEUNG commented that the Administration should include the expenditure for constructing the SUS in the cost of the T2 project instead of the present proposal, given that the structure was provided merely to facilitate the construction of T2.

22. Mr CHAN Kam-lam was concerned whether the construction of the SUS could dovetail with the implementation of the T2 project. He enquired when the Administration would submit the funding proposal for the construction of T2. H/KTO/CEDD replied that the construction programme for T2 forming the middle section of Route 6 would tie in with that for the proposed Central Kowloon Route ("CKR"). After completing the procedures in respect of the gazettal of the amendments to the original scheme of CKR, the relevant government departments would finalize the timetable for the construction of T2.

Elevated landscaped deck cum roadside noise barriers

23. Mr CHAN Kam-lam was concerned whether and how the deck would interface with the proposed Environmental Friendly Linkage System ("EFLS") for Kowloon East (covering KTD) if the system would take the form of an elevated monorail. He enquired when the Administration would firm up the transport mode to be adopted for the proposed EFLS. Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok asked about the background for the proposal of developing an elevated landscaped deck. He said that the Administration should adopt a holistic approach in planning the use of the deck and the land use of the surrounding areas. Considering that EFLS would play an important role in enhancing the connectivity within Kowloon East, he opined that the Administration should explore how to take the opportunity of providing the deck to support the operation of EFLS.

24. H/KTO/CEDD replied that the Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan ("OZP") had indicated a possible alignment for a rail-based EFLS alongside the commercial sites. Under the Kai Tak OZP, the centre strip of the former runway was zoned "Open Space (2)" in the form of an elevated landscaped deck. The deck would be designed to be iconic. When carrying out the preliminary feasibility study for EFLS, the Administration had considered how EFLS in form of an elevated monorail would interface with the deck and had tentatively identified the location of the relevant EFLS station. H/KTO/CEDD advised that, with the support obtained from the Panel in October 2014, the Administration would proceed to seek funding approval from the Finance Committee ("FC") for commencing a detailed feasibility study on EFLS as soon as possible. Having regard to members' views on the subject, as part of the detailed feasibility study, the Administration would look into whether EFLS could take the form of at-grade transport mode.

25. Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok was concerned about the relative positions of the proposed EFLS and the deck. He requested the Administration to provide, with plans/drawings including layout and cross-section plans, details on how the deck would interface with EFLS. Mr CHAN Kam-lam raised a similar request and said that the relevant plans/drawings should be included in the paper to be submitted to PWSC. Mr CHAN held the view that the Administration should integrate EFLS into the design of the deck so that alighting passengers of EFLS could reach the adjoining developments via the deck. To enable the integration, the Administration should reserve sufficient space for accommodating the supporting structures. In response, Project Manager (Kowloon), Civil Engineering and Development Department ("PM(K)/CEDD") assured members that space would be reserved for erecting supporting structures to enable the linkage between EFLS and the

deck.

26. Dr Helena WONG and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen expressed concerns about the lack of progress of the EFLS project. Mr CHAN asked whether the design of the deck had taken into account the fact that EFLS might not take the form of an elevated monorail. PAS/DEV(W)2 replied that the design of the deck had taken into account the possibility that EFLS would take the form of a transport mode other than an elevated monorail. H/KTO/CEDD advised that, to realize the planning theme of a green hub, about one-third of the land at KTD had been reserved for providing green spaces. If EFLS would take the form of an at-grade transport mode, some areas originally designated for providing green spaces might need to be reserved for the use of EFLS. She said that while EFLS would not be provided on the deck, the Administration would explore under the EFLS detailed feasibility study the linkage among EFLS, the deck and the developments at KTD.

27. Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok enquired whether the Administration would link up the deck with the developments and facilities in the vicinity. Noting that the deck would be provided between the residential and commercial sites at the former runway, the Chairman asked about the Administration's plan to connect the deck with these sites.

28. PM(K)/CEDD replied that the present design of the deck allowed flexibility for future developers to link up at the elevated level the developments at the commercial sites with the deck, so that pedestrians from the deck did not need to travel at-grade to the commercial areas. The design had not made provision for connection with the adjacent residential developments, taking into consideration that members of the public who were not residents would not normally enter the nearby residential buildings from the deck.

29. Mr CHAN Kam-lam suggested that the Administration should consider refining the design of the deck to make provision for its connection with the adjacent residential buildings given that these buildings would accommodate quite a large number of residents in future. PM(K)/CEDD replied that he would liaise with relevant government departments to study Mr CHAN's suggestion.

30. Mr Paul TSE enquired about the connectivity of the deck with the surrounding areas at the elevated and the ground levels. He was concerned whether the number of pedestrians using the deck would justify its construction cost. He opined that the Administration should accord priority to providing a floating bridge linking Kwun Tong to the Kai Tak Cruise Terminal. Mr IP Kwok-him and Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok were concerned

whether the deck would be well received by the public. Mr IP enquired about the Administration's projection on the future patronage of the deck.

31. H/KTO/CEDD advised that the Administration had not conducted an assessment on the number of pedestrians using the deck. To tie in with the disposal programme of commercial and residential sites at KTD starting in end-2015, there was an imminent need to commence the construction of the deck to facilitate pedestrian movements in future. She advised that the Kai Tak OZP had been formulated to meet public aspirations for a distinguished, vibrant, attractive and people-oriented community by the harbour. The deck would serve as a leisure walkway connected to the Metro Park to its north and the Cruise Terminal, the Tourism Node and the Runway Park to its south to facilitate residents and visitors to participate in the events and activities held in these venues. Pedestrian facilities such as staircases and lifts would be provided along the deck for connection with the footpaths leading to adjacent development sites.

32. Mr CHAN Kin-por opined that the Administration should provide more information about the future use of the deck to justify its construction cost. Noting that under the proposed design, noise barriers on the deck would be installed at the side near the residential developments but not the side near the commercial developments, Mr CHAN was concerned that the noise level of road traffic at the commercial side would discourage street activities. He asked about the reasons for adopting such a design.

33. PM(K)/CEDD advised that the deck was about 1.4 kilometres long. While the total construction cost of the deck had constituted a noticeable proportion in the proposed estimate, its unit construction cost was comparable to that for other similar pedestrian footbridges. He explained that the deck cum roadside noise barriers would serve as a noise mitigation measure to prevent the road traffic from causing adverse noise impact on the adjoining residential developments pursuant to the requirements of the relevant Environment Impact Assessment ("EIA") report, as well as a public open space and a leisure walkway for public enjoyment in accordance with the approved Kai Tak OZP. Members of relevant District Councils had been consulted on the Administration's design proposals for the deck and considered that the present design would meet pedestrians' aspirations. PM(K)/CEDD further advised that installing noise barriers along the side of the realigned Shing Fung Road fronting the commercial developments was not necessary in accordance with the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance and the Environmental Permit. The installation of noise barriers on both sides of the road would compromise the deck's design of allowing

good light penetration and maintaining a comfortable environment for the public to stay on the deck or underneath it.

34. Mr CHAN Kin-por requested the Administration to provide information on why it had adopted the present design for the noise barriers; whether and how the design would mitigate the impact of the noise generated from road traffic on users of the deck in future; the estimated additional expenditure required for the installation of noise barriers at the side near the commercial developments. The Chairman echoed Mr CHAN's concern about the noise impact on users of the deck in the circumstance that the noise barriers would only be provided on one side, but not both sides. He asked the Administration to further consider Mr CHAN's views.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's supplementary information was circulated to members on 3 June 2015 vide LC Paper No. CB(1)933/14-15(01).)*

35. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen commented that the Administration's responses at the meeting had yet to address members' questions on why the deck was necessary. Noting that the commercial sites at KTD would be disposed of in the near future, he cast doubt on whether the purpose of providing the deck was to enable the Administration to fetch better prices for the sites. PAS/DEV(W)2 replied that the proposal to provide the deck cum roadside noise barriers was not merely for the purpose of enhancing the connectivity of the commercial sites. Even if the Administration did not proceed with the construction of the deck, the noise barriers had to be constructed to meet the requirements of the relevant EIA report.

36. The Chairman shared members' concern about the background giving rise to the proposal to construct the deck and the use of the deck. He asked the Administration to provide information about the benefits of constructing the deck to the local communities and pedestrians, and how the deck would be connected to other pedestrian facilities, the commercial and other major developments at KTD. Mr CHAN Kin-por requested the Administration to provide information about the justifications for providing the deck given that the cost incurred by the item was significant.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's supplementary information was circulated to members on 3 June 2015 vide LC Paper No. CB(1)933/14-15(01).)*

Shing Fung Road

37. Mr Albert CHAN said that as KTD had been the subject of a decade-long planning, the Administration should explain more to members about the original planning intention for the area. He recalled that to minimize the impact of vehicular emission on pedestrians, the planning for the alignment of the roads in KTD had incorporated the idea of pedestrian-vehicle segregation. Noting that the proposed project included the construction of realignment of Shing Fung Road, he enquired about the reason for the realignment.

38. H/KTO/CEDD replied that the realignment of Shing Fung Road was made in response to public aspiration for bringing the harbour to the people. Pursuant to the Kai Tak OZP, the existing single two-lane Shing Fung Road along the waterfront serving the Cruise Terminal and the Runway Park Phase 1 would be shifted to the centre of the former runway and widened to a dual two-lane road to facilitate the future developments at the southern part of the former runway.

39. Mr Albert CHAN enquired about the proportion of the total project cost to be incurred in undertaking the realignment works. H/KTO/CEDD advised that as far as the at-grade road works was concerned, the cost for constructing Shing Fung Road under the original alignment was about \$65 million. The proposed realignment works would not incur a significant proportion to the project cost.

40. Dr Helena WONG stressed the importance for the Administration to provide a pedestrian-oriented environment at KTD. Taking in view that Shing Fung Road was close to the waterfront, she suggested that, to enhance pedestrian mobility as well as to provide more waterfront space for public enjoyment, the Administration should depress Shing Fung Road to underground. As regards the Administration's proposal to provide the deck on top of the realigned Shing Fung Road, Dr WONG commented that compared with at-grade pedestrian facilities, the elevated walkway might not be convenient to wheelchair users and pedestrians with impaired mobility.

41. H/KTO/CEDD replied that there were technical constraints that made it difficult for the Administration to take forward Dr WONG's suggestion because, as part of the construction works for the District Cooling System ("DCS") at KTD, the Administration needed to install underground chilled water distribution pipes and other utility pipes beneath the realigned Shing Fung Road. Moreover, depressing the road to underground would make its connection with adjoining roads difficult. In response to the Chairman's enquiry, H/KTO/CEDD advised that the DCS's main plant rooms and part of

the underground pipes connected to the Cruise Terminal had been installed underneath the future Shing Fung Road.

42. Dr Helena WONG requested the Administration to provide details on the technical constraints, with plans/drawings (including cross-section plans) showing how the installation of the relevant underground chilled water distribution pipes and other utility pipes would make her suggestion not practicable.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's supplementary information was circulated to members on 3 June 2015 vide LC Paper No. CB(1)933/14-15(01).)*

#### Pedestrian streets

43. Mr IP Kwok-him noted that the proposed project included the construction of pedestrian streets with a total length of 0.4 kilometres. He enquired about their locations and uses and how they were different from ordinary streets. H/KTO/CEDD replied that the Administration proposed to construct a number of pedestrian streets in different areas of KTD to enhance connectivity and air ventilation. To beautify these streets, trees and other green features would be provided. She advised that the provision of pedestrian streets and other pedestrian facilities would link up the promenades on the two sides of the Runway Precinct.

44. Mr CHAN Kam-lam sought clarification on whether the proposed pedestrian streets would be segregated by roads and how pedestrians could walk from one pedestrian street to another. PM(K)/CEDD responded that at-grade pedestrian facilities would be provided at suitable locations for pedestrians to cross the roads separating the proposed pedestrian streets. Pedestrians might also travel between the pedestrians streets via the deck.

### Other projects at Kai Tak Development

45. Dr Helena WONG enquired about the government departments that would be accommodated in the Trade and Industry Tower. H/KTO/CEDD replied that the Trade and Industry Tower would mainly accommodate the offices of the Trade and Industry Department. The Census and Statistics Department would also set up offices in the building.

46. Mr Frederick FUNG said that according to the Administration's replies to a question raised by him at a meeting of FC, upon the completion of Road D2 under PWP Item No. 761CL in mid-2017, the vehicular and pedestrian traffic from To Kwa Wan Road could access Kowloon Bay and Kwun Tong areas directly via Road D2 without the need to route through Prince Edward Road East. Road D2 would also be connected with the proposed Road D3 in the former runway. He enquired whether, before the completion of construction of Road D2 in 2017, the Administration could use the vacant land at the former north apron of Kai Tak Airport to provide a temporary vehicular and pedestrian access to divert part of the existing busy traffic.

47. H/KTO/CEDD replied that in the former north apron area, there were currently works areas for the upgrading of Kai Tak Nullah, the construction of stage 4 infrastructure works for KTD and the Shatin-Central Link. As a large number of construction trucks traversed the area daily, it was unsafe to provide a temporary access road in it.

48. Mr Paul TSE recalled that the Secretary for Food and Hygiene had said that a bypass would be constructed to link up the hospital developments planned for KTD with Wong Tai Sin. He enquired about the progress of the matter. H/KTO/CEDD replied that as part of the stage 3A infrastructure works at the former north apron area, the Administration would construct a vehicular underpass across Prince Edward Road East to enhance the connectivity of KTD with San Po Kong. Vehicles from San Po Kong could adopt the vehicular underpass and local roads in KTD to go to the Hong Kong Children's Hospital.

49. Dr Helena WONG enquired about the progress of development of a park between Kai Ching Estate and Tak Long Estate. H/KTO/CEDD replied that a site in the vicinity of Kai Ching Estate and Tak Long Estate had been earmarked for the development of a park, namely Avenue Park, which would be delivered in two phases. The Administration had completed the design of the phase one works and consulted the Kowloon City District Council. Funding required for the project would be sought in accordance with the

established mechanism. Dr WONG requested the Administration to provide information on the timetable for the construction and commissioning of the park, and the site plan of the park.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's supplementary information was circulated to members on 3 June 2015 vide LC Paper No. CB(1)933/14-15(01).)*

50. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung noted that the approved Kai Tak OZP included a Tourism Node which was located at the tip of the former runway and was designated "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Tourism Related Uses to Include Commercial, Hotel and Entertainment". He queried whether the facilities planned to be provided there by the Administration were to cater for the need of tourists instead of local residents and working people. H/KTO/CEDD replied that the Tourism Node comprised tourism, hotel, entertainment and catering facilities, waterfront restaurants, etc., and these facilities would be open for public enjoyment.

51. Dr Fernando CHEUNG said he was all along concerned whether the Administration, in planning KTD, had made a good use of the land resources to help address Hong Kong people's demand for public housing. Taking in view that only about one-tenth of the land at KTD would be reserved for residential development and a considerable proportion of the land would be used for private low-density residential developments, he commented that the development plan for KTD was aimed at providing a back garden for the people living in luxurious flats and hotels in the area.

52. Dr Helena WONG referred to paragraph 27 of Enclosure 2 to the Administration's paper which stated that a study confirming the technical feasibility and environmental viability of increasing office and housing supply at KTD had been completed. She requested the Administration to provide a copy of the study report.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's supplementary information was circulated to members on 3 June 2015 vide LC Paper No. CB(1)933/14-15(01).)*

Submission of the proposal to the Public Works Subcommittee

53. Concluding the discussion, the Chairman said that members supported the Administration's submission of the proposal to PWSC for its consideration.

**V PWP Item No. 45CG -- District Cooling System at Kai Tak Development**

(LC Paper No. CB(1)759/14-15(05) -- Administration's paper on 45CG -- District Cooling System at the Kai Tak Development

LC Paper No. CB(1)759/14-15(06) -- Paper on the provision of a District Cooling System at Kai Tak Development prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat (Updated background brief))

54. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Chief Engineer/Energy Efficiency B, Electrical and Mechanical Services Department ("CE/EE(B)/EMSD") briefed members on the proposed works for Phase III (Package B) ("Phase IIIB") of PWP Item No. 45CG, entitled "District Cooling System ("DCS") at the Kai Tak Development ("KTD")" ("the DCS project"). The estimated cost of the proposed Phase IIIB project was about \$606.1 million in money-of-the-day ("MOD") prices. Subject to the Panel's support, the Administration would seek endorsement from PWSC and funding approval from FC for the proposed project in the second quarter of 2015.

*(Post-meeting note: A soft copy of the powerpoint presentation materials was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)798/14-15(02) by email on 29 April 2015.)*

55. The Chairman reminded members that in accordance with Rule 83A of RoP of LegCo, they should disclose the nature of any direct or indirect pecuniary interests relating to the subjects under discussion at the meeting before they spoke on the subjects.

### Operation and maintenance of the District Cooling System

56. Mr CHAN Hak-kan expressed support for the development of DCS, an energy-efficient air-conditioning system, at KTD. He enquired whether there had been any operation problems since the commissioning of the system in 2013, and opined that information about the operation problems, if any, would be useful for LegCo Members' consideration on whether to support the development of DCS in the New Development Areas in Hung Shui Kiu and North East New Territories. He further suggested that the Administration should update Members on the operation of DCS at KTD on an annual or a half-yearly basis. The Chairman remarked that, if FC approved the funding for the proposed Phase IIIB project, the Administration would further seek funding approval from FC for the remaining works under Phase III at a later stage. It would be opportune for the Administration to update the Panel on the operation of the DCS at KTD when it briefed the Panel on the funding proposal for the remaining works under Phase III.

57. CE/EE(B)/EMSD responded that there had not been any major operation problems with DCS at KTD since its commissioning. A customer liaison group had been set up to collect users' feedback on the district cooling services on a regular basis with a view to enhancing the performance of DCS. Drills on handling of pipe bursts were also conducted annually by the operator of the system.

58. Noting that the estimated service life of the major equipment of DCS was around 30 years, Mr CHAN Han-pan enquired about the replacement arrangements for such equipment after 30 years of operation, including whether a complete reconstruction of DCS would be necessary.

59. Principal Assistant Secretary for the Environment (Energy), Environment Bureau ("PAS(EG)/ENB") replied that while the major equipment would eventually have to be replaced in phases, it was not envisaged that a complete reconstruction of DCS would be necessary after 30 years of operation.

60. Mr CHAN Han-pan requested the Administration to provide information about the maintenance cost for the DCS at KTD in the next 30 years (i.e. within the expected payback period), including the amount of the cost per year, how the cost would be funded, and the operation cost for the DCS at KTD per year, etc.

61. PAS(EG)/ENB advised that the repair and maintenance cost of the DCS at KTD would be covered by the capacity charges to be collected from the users. It was not envisaged that expenditure on repair and maintenance would have any substantial impact on the cost recovery of the project. Assistant Director/Electricity & Energy Efficiency, Electrical and Mechanical Services Department ("AD/EE/EMSD") added that the Administration had engaged an experienced contractor to operate the DCS at KTD, and the operation and maintenance of the system had been in full compliance with the prevailing international standards. Given the estimated service lives of the plants and the major equipment (which stood at around 50 and 30 years respectively), the Administration was confident that the capacity charges to be collected would be sufficient to cover the maintenance cost to be incurred in future. Moreover, the charging mechanism for DCS could be reviewed as appropriate in the future.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's supplementary information was circulated to members on 3 June 2015 vide LC Paper No. CB(1)932/14-15(01).)*

62. Mr YIU Si-wing expressed support for the proposed project. He was concerned that some major equipment of DCS might break down before they reached the end of their service lives. He enquired whether the Administration had any contingency plan to prevent the disruption of district cooling service in such circumstances, and whether the Administration would review the replacement schedule for the equipment on a regular basis.

63. AD/EE/EMSD responded that DCS was a highly reliable system. A large number of chiller units would be installed in the Northern DCS Plant Room and the Southern DCS Plant Room. Some of the units could serve as backup if other units broke down. In addition, each main distribution pipe set would have at least three pipes and one of the pipes could serve as a backup. As regards the replacement schedule, PAS(EG)/ENB advised that the DCS project would be implemented in phases having regard to the development programme and progress of KTD. Therefore, different pieces of equipment would also be procured in phases as necessary, and they would not reach the end of service lives at the same time.

64. In response to Mr YIU Si-wing's further enquiry about whether the Administration could provide detailed information on the procurement plan for the DCS project (such as the time for the procurement and installation of the chiller units), PAS(EG)/ENB said that the information was not available at the present stage, as the timing for commencing the remaining works of Phase III had yet to be confirmed. AD/EE/EMSD advised that of the chiller

units which made up the DCS at KTD, nine units had been installed, while four would be installed in due course as part of the Phase III (Package A) works, which were in progress. As for the remaining chiller units, they would be installed in phases in the future.

#### Unit cost of district cooling services

65. Referring to the information given by the Administration in Annex 2 to the discussion paper about the unit cost of district cooling services for different types of buildings, Mr CHAN Hak-kan enquired why the unit cost of the services for government premises was higher than that for the facilities of public bodies and commercial developments. PAS(EG)/ENB explained that in general, the unit cost would be lower for user buildings with longer daily operation hours, as in the case of certain public bodies such as hospitals, which operated round-the-clock. The unit cost would be higher for buildings with relatively short daily operation hours, such as office buildings of government departments.

#### Payback period

66. Mr YIU si-wing enquired how the estimation of the payback period, i.e. 30 years, for the capital and operation costs of the DCS at KTD had been arrived at, and whether it was possible that the DCS project would eventually end up in deficit. PAS(EG)/ENB advised that given the estimated service lives of the plants and the major equipment of the DCS at KTD were 50 years and 30 years respectively, the Administration had set the target of cost recovery in 30 years. All public developments at KTD, which accounted for around 35% of the total air-conditioned floor area in KTD, would subscribe to district cooling services. All private non-domestic developments using central air-conditioning installation at KTD would be required to connect to DCS under the relevant provisions in the conditions of land sale, and would be charged based on the level of charges as provided in the District Cooling Services Ordinance (Cap. 624).

#### Other issues

67. Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok expressed support for the proposed project. Noting that part of the works of the proposed project (i.e. pipe laying under sections of Shing Fung Road, Cheung Yip Street and Shing Cheong Road) would be entrusted to a project of the Civil Engineering and Development Department, i.e. PWP No. 711CL (Kai Tak Development -- infrastructure works for development at the southern part of the former runway), Ir Dr LO enquired about the cost of that part of the project. CE/EE(B)/EMSD

responded that the cost of the works to be entrusted to PWP No. 711CL was around \$180 million, and would be covered by the funding for the proposed Phase IIIB project.

Submission of the proposal to the Public Works Subcommittee

68. Concluding the discussion, the Chairman said that members agreed that the proposal be submitted to PWSC for consideration.

**VI PWP Item No. 570CL -- Ground decontamination works at the site of ex-Kennedy Town Incineration Plant/Abattoir and adjoining area**

(LC Paper No. CB(1)759/14-15(07) -- Administration's paper on PWP Item No. 570CL -- Ground decontamination works at the site of ex-Kennedy Town Incineration Plant/Abattoir and adjoining area)

69. Under Secretary for Development ("USDEV") briefed members on the proposal to upgrade PWP Item No. 570CL for the ground decontamination works at the site of the ex-Kennedy Town Incineration Plant ("KTIP"), the ex-Kennedy Town Abattoir ("KTA") and the adjoining area ("the project site"). The details of the proposal were given in the Administration's paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)759/14-15(07)). USDEV advised that the total estimated cost of the proposed works was \$1,111.9 million. Subject to the funding approval of FC, the Administration planned to commence the project in late 2015 for completion in late 2022.

70. The Chairman reminded members that in accordance with Rule 83A of RoP of LegCo, they should disclose the nature of any direct or indirect pecuniary interests relating to the subjects under discussion at the meeting before they spoke on the subjects.

### Ground decontamination works

71. Mr IP Kwok him and Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok said that they were supportive of the proposed ground decontamination works. Mr IP recalled that the Administration had completed in 2009 the demolition of most buildings and structures within the project site. He enquired why the Administration did not carry out the proposed works as part of the demolition project. Ir Dr LO said that given KTIP and KTA had ceased to operate in 1993 and 1999 respectively, the Administration should have proposed to carry out the work earlier.

72. USDEV replied that the Administration had originally planned to commence the ground decontamination works immediately after the completion of the demolition works of KTIP and KTA. As the public had a strong aspiration for the early implementation of the Mass Transit Railway ("MTR") West Island Line ("WIL") project, the project site had been temporarily used as the WIL works area since 2009. USDEV advised that the WIL works were approaching completion. Subject to members' support for the present proposal, the Administration would commence the ground decontamination works upon the handover of the WIL works area by the MTR Corporation Limited.

73. Mr WONG Kwok-hing said that local residents were all along concerned about the bad smell emitted from the sites of KTIP and KTA. He considered it appropriate for the Administration to carry out the proposed works to provide a contamination-free project site for future development. In response to Mr WONG's enquiry on the cause of the contamination, Chief Engineer/Special Duties (Works), Civil Engineering and Development Department ("CE/SD(W)/CEDD") advised that the underground soil of the project site had been contaminated with heavy metals and hydrocarbons. The Administration believed that the contamination was caused by infiltration of machine oil / diesel fuel during the operation of KTIP and KTA.

### Environmental mitigation measures

74. Mr CHAN Hak-kan said that the project site was close to the waterfront and was windy during the typhoon season. He enquired how the Administration would prevent the pollutants at the project site from entering the sea and the surrounding area when carrying out the proposed works. The Chairman asked about the measures to prevent runoff of pollutants on rainy days.

75. CE/SD(W)/CEDD replied that the contractors for the project would be required under the relevant contract terms to carry out regular water spraying on-site during excavation in order to suppress dust generation. They were also required to cover all exposed soil with tarpaulin sheets which would be securely fixed in position. To collect surface runoff, temporary drainage facilities would be provided around the perimeter of the site. The collected water would be treated before it was discharged.

76. The Chairman enquired about the underlying consideration for not delivering the contaminated soil away from the site and treated it elsewhere. Miss CHAN Yuen-han expressed concern about the effectiveness of the proposed works in decontaminating the soil and how the method for treating the contaminated materials under the project would be different from that for cleaning up the Kai Tak Nullah.

77. USDEV replied that different from the Kai Tak Nullah, where the pollution sources still existed, the level of contamination at the project site remained stable. To comply with the relevant environmental protection requirements and to avoid causing potential pollution to other areas, the Administration would treat the excavated contaminated soil in-situ. Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok remarked that it was appropriate for the Administration to treat the contaminated soil and backfill the treated soil on-site to minimize the environmental nuisances arising from the proposed works.

78. Mr IP Kwok-him asked whether the Administration would build a canopy-like structure to cover the project site so that the proposed works would be conducted in an enclosed area. In reply, USDEV said site investigation had indicated that contaminants were scattered over the project site at different depths and some were found 13 metres below the ground surface. It was technically difficult to build a large roof structure covering the entire site with a clear headroom of about 20 metres high. The supporting columns of the roof structure would also seriously hinder the excavation works. To minimize the environmental impact caused by the project, the Administration would restrict the active excavation area to a small size at any one time.

79. Mr IP Kwok him recalled that the Administration had carried out works to remove dioxins found at the project site. He enquired about the measures to be adopted by the Administration to ascertain whether there were dioxins in the area. He further enquired about the actions that would be taken by the Administration in case of discovery of dioxins.

80. USDEV replied that before carrying out any excavation works, the contractors were required to collect soil samples for testing to ascertain the types of contaminants and the extent of contamination. In the event that some unexpected contaminants were discovered, resident engineers would liaise with consultants and contractors to formulate an appropriate strategy before resuming the works. He added that the dioxins should have been treated and removed during the demolition of KTIP and KTA. CE/SD(W)/CEDD supplemented that site investigation, including about 200 drill holes, had been carried out at the project site. The site investigation did not identify dioxin in the soil.

81. Mr YIU Si-wing noted that the Administration would adopt quieter equipment as part of the implementation of the measures recommended in the approved Environmental Impact Assessment ("EIA") report for the project. He enquired about the maximum level of the noise that would be received by pedestrians and nearby residents following the use of the equipment.

82. Mr Eric CHING Ming-kam, Divisional Director (Environmental), Mott Macdonald Hong Kong Limited replied that to minimize the noise impact of the project, apart from the use of quieter equipment, the contractor would adopt movable noise barriers and noise insulating fabric. He explained that pursuant to the relevant requirements of the Environmental Protection Department, the noise limit was 70 decibels at the facades of residential dwellings and 65 decibels at the facades of schools during examinations. As indicated in the approved EIA report, following the adoption of the proposed noise mitigation measures, the noise impact of the project would comply with the requirements.

#### Monitoring of the implementation of the project

83. Mr IP Kwok-him and Mr CHAN Hak-kan asked about the community liaison efforts that would be made by the Administration to strengthen the communication with the local community on the implementation of the proposed works. USDEV replied that the Administration would establish a community liaison group to enhance communication with the Central and Western ("C&W") District Council members, residents' representatives and owners' incorporations of nearby residential buildings on environmental matters and to facilitate enhancement of the proposed environmental mitigation measures.

84. Mr YIU Si-wing opined that the Administration should take an active role in ensuring that the contractors for the project would properly execute

the proposed environmental mitigation measures. He enquired whether the Administration would include in the relevant contract the appropriate environmental standards that should be met by the contractors and penalty clauses for non-compliance with such standards.

85. USDEV replied that the contractors for the project would be required to establish an environmental monitoring team to regularly monitor air, noise and water quality, etc., and to ensure that the environmental impacts would not exceed the relevant limits. CE/SD(W)/CEDD advised that upon the commencement of the proposed project, there would be a team of resident engineers and professionals overseeing the contractors and their environmental team in carrying out the monitoring work and mitigation measures. In case of under-performance by the contractors, the Administration would reflect the actual performance in the contractor's performance reports to be prepared on a quarterly basis. The assessment results would be taken into account in the tendering exercises for other public works projects. He advised that in line with the general practice, payments to the contractors would only be made upon satisfactory completion of specified tasks at different stages of the project. If the tasks or works were not completed satisfactorily, payments for the corresponding works would be withheld.

86. The Chairman echoed Mr YIU's view that the Administration should consider introducing penalty clauses to deter contractors' non-compliance with the relevant standards. On the Chairman's enquiry about whether the Administration had launched the tendering exercise for the project, USDEV replied in the negative. He said that the Administration would finalize the tender documents having regard to members' views on the proposed project. Mr YIU Si-wing remained of the view that with the introduction of the penalty clauses, the Administration would be in a proactive position against the failure on the part of contractors to execute the environmental mitigation measures.

#### Impact on trees

87. Mr CHAN Hak-kan said the Administration had stated in its paper that the proposed works would involve the removal of 195 trees, including five important trees, and had assessed that these five trees would have a low survival rate after transplanting. He enquired whether the Administration had engaged independent tree consultants in conducting the assessment.

88. CE/SD(W)/CEDD replied that CEDD had commissioned a consultant to prepare a tree preservation and removal proposal for the proposed works at the project site. The consultant recommended the removal of all the 195

trees, including the five important trees at the project site, as the root balls of those trees were contaminated and some of the trees adhered to disused structures, rendering them unsuitable for in-situ retention or transplantation.

89. The Chairman requested the Administration to provide information about the consultancy study commissioned by the Administration on the trees, including the scope of the study, the study period and a summary of the findings/recommendations of the study, etc.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's supplementary information was circulated to members on 15 May 2015 vide LC Paper No. CB(1)854/14-15(01).)*

#### Cost of the project

90. Mr CHAN Hak-kan said the Administration had advised at a meeting of the C&W District Council in 2013 that the estimated cost of the proposed works was about \$600 million. He enquired about the reasons for the increase in the project estimate under the proposal.

91. USDEV replied that when briefing the C&W District Council at the relevant meeting in 2013, the Administration had advised that the estimated expenditure for the proposed works was \$630 million at September 2012 prices. With the price adjusted to that of the September 2014 level, the corresponding estimated cost was about \$710 million. The latest estimated cost of the relevant work items under the present proposal at September 2014 prices was revised to about \$810 million, because the amount of soil to be excavated and treated under the project was larger than that originally anticipated, and the Administration would carry out more environmental mitigation measures having regard to the local community's views.

92. Mr YIU Si-wing asked about the justification for providing \$294 million for the provision for price adjustment under the proposal. He enquired whether the provision was in line with the general practice of other public works projects. USDEV replied that according to the established practice, the Administration estimated the provision for price adjustment based on the Government's latest assumptions on the trend rate of change in the prices of public sector building and construction output in the relevant contract period as well as the anticipated project cash flow. The provision for price adjustment had constituted a noticeable proportion in the total estimated cost due to the relatively long span of cash flow requirement of the project and the fact that the work items which would incur heavy

expenditure, such as earthworks and treatment of contaminated soil, would be carried out at a later stage of the project.

#### Future use of the project site

93. Mr WONG Kwok-hing and Miss CHAN Yuen-han enquired about the developments to be provided at the project site upon completion of the proposed works. Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok commented that in view of its proximity to the waterfront, the project site would provide precious land resources for future development.

94. In reply, USDEV said that the project site covered an area of about three hectares and it currently accommodated, among others, a works area, a temporary public car park, a temporary refuse collection point, a short-term bus depot and a temporary garden. The Administration had worked out a land use proposal under the Land Use Review on the Western Part of Kennedy Town, which covered the project site. The proposed land uses at the project site included the provision of a waterfront promenade, a school, a public transport interchange, and a public car park beneath a residential development, etc.

95. Mr WONG Kwok-hing said that he was supportive of the developments under the land use proposal. He opined that the Administration should provide information about the proposed land uses of the project site in the funding proposal for the project to be submitted to FC. USDEV said that the Administration had briefed the C&W District Council on the land use proposal in March 2015.

#### Submission of the proposal to the Public Works Subcommittee

96. Concluding the discussion, the Chairman said that members agreed that the proposal be submitted to PWSC for consideration.

**VII Any other business**

97. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 5:42 pm.

Council Business Division 1  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
15 July 2015