

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. PWSC290/15-16
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/F/2/1(31)B

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

**Minutes of the 31st meeting
held in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex
on Wednesday, 29 June 2016, at 8:30 am**

Members present:

Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, SBS, MH, JP (Chairman)
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Hon Albert HO Chun-yan
Hon LEE Cheuk-yan
Hon James TO Kun-sun
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 WONG Kwok-hing, BBS, MH
Prof Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long, SBS, JP, PhD, RN
Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, GBS, JP
Hon Andrew LEUNG Kwan-yuen, GBS, JP
Hon WONG Ting-kwong, SBS, JP
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan, JP
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, JP
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, JP
Hon WONG Kwok-kin, SBS
Hon IP Kwok-him, GBS, JP
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon Claudia MO

Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH
Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen
Hon CHAN Han-pan, JP
Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN Ka-lok
Hon CHAN Yuen-han, SBS, JP
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, BBS, MH, JP
Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
Hon KWOK Wai-keung
Hon Dennis KWOK
Hon Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung, SBS, JP
Hon SIN Chung-kai, SBS, JP
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan
Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, JP
Hon TANG Ka-piu, JP
Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, JP
Hon Christopher CHUNG Shu-kun, BBS, MH, JP
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS
Hon Alvin YEUNG Ngok-kiu

Members absent:

Dr Hon LEUNG Ka-lau
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC
Hon Steven HO Chun-yin, BBS
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung

Public officers attending:

Mr Raistlin LAU Chun, JP	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) ³
Mr CHAN Chi-ming, JP	Deputy Secretary for Development (Works) ²
Mr Michael WONG Wai-lun, JP	Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)
Mr TANG Kin-fai, JP	Assistant Director of Environmental Protection (Environmental Assessment)

Ms Jasmine CHOI Suet-yung	Principal Assistant Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) (Works)
Mr Daniel CHUNG Kum-wah, JP	Director of Civil Engineering and Development
Mr MAK Chi-biu	Chief Engineer (Hong Kong)1 Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr SIU Kang-chuen	Chief Traffic Engineer (New Territories East) Transport Department
Mr Patrick LAI Chuen-chi	Assistant Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (Country and Marine Parks) (Acting)

Clerk in attendance:

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

Staff in attendance:

Mr Fred PANG	Senior Council Secretary (1)2
Mr Raymond CHOW	Senior Council Secretary (1)6
Ms Maggie LAU	Council Secretary (1)2
Ms Christina SHIU	Legislative Assistant (1)2
Ms Christy YAU	Legislative Assistant (1)7
Ms Clara LO	Legislative Assistant (1)8

Action

The Chairman advised that there were four funding proposals on the agenda for the meeting. These four items were those carried over from the last meeting of the Subcommittee. 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 interests relating to the funding proposals under discussion at the meeting before they spoke on the proposals. He also drew members' attention to Rule 84 of RoP on voting in case of direct pecuniary interest.

**Head 707 – New Towns and Urban Area Development
PWSC(2016-17)32 417RO Improvement works at Tai O**

2. The Chairman advised that the proposal, i.e. PWSC(2016-17)32, was to upgrade part of 417RO to Category A at an estimated cost of \$124 million in money-of-the-day ("MOD") prices to carry out improvement works for local facilities and provide additional parking spaces at Tai O. The Subcommittee had commenced the discussion on the proposal at the meeting on 20 June 2016. At the meeting on 22 June 2016, a member had moved a motion to adjourn the discussion on this paper, and the motion had been negated by the Subcommittee.

Proposed public open space

3. Dr Kenneth CHAN pointed out that although the Civil Engineering and Development Department ("CEDD") had undertaken that no iconic structure would be placed in the proposed public open space in the future, other relevant government departments, in particular the Home Affairs Department ("HAD"), had not made such a commitment. Also, some District Council ("DC") members had put forth the suggestion of constructing iconic structures there. As such, the Administration still failed to address the concerns of local residents in this regard. Dr KWOK Ka-ki was dissatisfied that no representative from HAD attended this meeting to give an undertaking to the Subcommittee that no iconic structure would be placed in the open space concerned in future. Mr WU Chi-wai opined that the authorities should undertake that no application for construction of iconic structures at Tai O would be approved in the future. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung suggested that the Administration should have further discussion with stakeholders on the design of the proposed project, especially the construction of a public open space at the western end of Tai O Road.

4. Director of Civil Engineering and Development ("DCED") responded that the Islands District Office had advised that they had no plan to place any iconic structure in the proposed public open space. In case there were suggestions from individuals or organizations for placing iconic structures in the open space concerned in the future, HAD and the relevant government departments (such as the Lands Department) would review the suggestion and consult the public before making a decision. He advised that the Islands District Office had contacted Mr LOU Cheuk-wing (Chairman of Tai O Rural Committee) and Mr Randy YU (Islands DC member). They indicated that they would not suggest or request the Government to place any iconic structure in the public open space. Dr Kenneth CHAN requested the Administration to provide a paper on the

abovementioned response.

(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC292/15-16\(01\)](#) on 7 July 2016.)

5. Mr Albert CHAN was concerned that the proposed public open space might be used for holding publicity activities in the future. He requested the Administration to give an undertaking that the public open space was designed to provide spaces to facilitate commuters of buses and coaches to assemble and queue up for boarding. DCED advised that the provision of the public open space aimed to provide an area with soft landscape, benches, etc. for use by Tai O residents and visitors while queuing up for boarding. Given its small area, the public open space was not suitable for holding publicity activities.

6. Dr KWOK Ka-ki was concerned that the trees to be planted in the proposed public open space in the future might block the sea view of Tai O. Referring to Enclosure 2 to PWSC(2016-17)32, DCED advised that the trees to be planted in the public open space would not be close to the shore. In drawing up the detailed design of green facilities in the future, the Administration would take the views of the public into account.

7. Mr Albert CHAN pointed out that the Administration had constructed a breakwater for the boat anchorage at Tai O many years ago, which had hindered the public from enjoying the scenic sunset view at the waterfront promenade. He enquired whether, in addition to layout plans, a three-dimensional ("3D") design computer model would be used to assess the compatibility of the design of the proposed public open space with the surrounding landscape. DCED advised that in designing the proposed project, computer-aided 3D design technology would be adopted.

Proposed measures to enhance the pedestrian circulation at the entrance of Tai O town centre

8. Dr Kenneth CHAN considered that the Administration should address the over-crowdedness at the entrance of Tai O town centre during holidays by enhancing crowd control measures without using a huge sum of public money to conduct the proposed works. He enquired whether the spaces at the boat anchorage and the waterfront promenade adjacent to the existing bus terminus at Tai O would be used to divert the flow of waiting passengers during holidays.

9. DCED replied that the Administration had considered various options of enhancing the pedestrian circulation. Given its proximity to the entrance of Tai O town centre, the public open space to be constructed under the project could facilitate the assembly of Tai O residents and visitors, and the provision of a public open space there would be the most effective way to enhance the pedestrian circulation.

10. Dr Kenneth CHAN enquired whether the staircases between the existing bus terminus and the waterfront promenade would be affected by the proposed project. DCED replied that the staircases would be converted into a ramp, so as to address the needs of different people. Dr CHAN suggested that after converting the staircases into a ramp, green and sitting-out facilities should be provided at the waterfront promenade to help enhance the pedestrian circulation.

11. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung pointed out that more waiting passengers currently gathering near the entrance of Tai O town centre was a result of inadequate provision of transport services, and there was no problem of vehicle-pedestrian conflicts as alleged by the Administration. He considered that instead of relocating the existing bus terminus, the Administration should widen the roads near the entrance of the town centre and remove the existing private car parking spaces.

12. DCED explained that the existing bus terminus only had two pick-up/drop-off bays, and bus routes Nos. 1 and 11 needed to share one such bay. If a bus No. 1 and a bus No. 11 arrived at the same time, passengers of one of these buses would have to walk on the carriageway after alighting, which would pose danger to them. Currently, pick-up/drop-off bays for coaches also had a similar problem. In the long run, implementation of the proposed works would be the best option to address the problem of vehicle-pedestrian conflicts during rush hours at the entrance of Tai O town centre. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung considered that the above allegation made by the Administration did not fully accord with the facts.

13. Mr CHAN Kam-lam said that the project had been thoroughly discussed by the Islands DC and the LegCo Panel on Development. The majority of Tai O residents also hoped that the proposed works could commence as soon as possible, so as to alleviate the congestion of pedestrians and vehicles at the entrance of Tai O town centre. He was dissatisfied that some members had deliberately delayed the consideration of this funding application.

14. Mr Albert CHAN considered that LegCo had the responsibility to monitor the work of the Government, and the questions raised by members regarding this project were vital to the well-being of the public.

Proposed public transport terminus

15. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen conveyed the views of Tai O residents that the cover to be installed at the bus passenger waiting area ("the bus stop") in the proposed public transport terminus ("PTT") could not address the effects of western sun exposure on the waiting passengers. Mr CHAN and Dr KWOK Ka-ki enquired about the detailed design of the new cover at the bus stop. DCED replied that all bus stops would be installed with covers that were up to the relevant standards, and trees would also be planted near the bus stop, so as to mitigate the effects of western sun exposure on the waiting passengers.

16. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung asked whether the Administration was aware of the worries of Tai O residents about the effects of western sun exposure on the proposed new bus stop during the consultation on "Improvement Works for Tai O Facelift - Feasibility Study" in 2007 and 2009. DCED replied that during the consultation, the majority of Tai O residents and local communities were in support of the proposed project.

Proposed public car park

17. Referring to the supplementary information (LC Paper No. PWSC273/15-16(01)) provided by the Administration at the meeting on 22 June 2016, Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung enquired how long the commencement date of the proposed project would be delayed, should the location of the proposed additional public parking spaces be changed at this stage. DCED replied that should the design of the proposed project be revised at this stage, the Administration had to carry out the gazettal procedure for the revised design all over again as well as go through other necessary procedures, including handling of opposing views (if any), revising the project design with reference to public opinions, consulting the relevant LegCo Panels and seeking funding approval from the Finance Committee ("FC"), etc. Such procedures were expected to take at least one year to complete. Mr LEUNG considered that as the facilities to be provided under the proposed project could be used for several decades, it might be worth delaying the commencement of the works for a year if the arrangements would then be more acceptable to the public. The Administration should listen to public opinions and improve the plan for provision of additional parking spaces.

18. Mr Alvin YEUNG enquired about the current number of vehicles holding Lantau Closed Road Permits ("LCRPs") for entering South Lantau. Chief Traffic Engineer (New Territories East), Transport Department ("CTE(NTE)/TD") replied that some 4 000 vehicles belonging to residents of South Lantau were currently holding LCRPs. Moreover, about 10 000 temporary LCRPs were issued annually for purposes such as transporting larger objects to South Lantau.

19. Mr Alvin YEUNG considered that, since the proposed project only provided some 100 private car parking spaces, even if the parking spaces at Tai O were to be increased continuously, they were still insufficient to meet the present needs. He asked whether the authorities would consider tightening the vetting and approval of applications for LCRPs, so as to reduce the number of vehicles entering Tai O. CTE(NTE)/TD explained that the some 4 000 vehicles belonging to local residents mentioned above were scattered in various locations of South Lantau. According to the record of the Transport Department, there were some 40 vehicles parking illegally at Tai O. The proposed project would provide 48 more private car parking spaces than those currently available, and they should be sufficient to meet the current parking needs. However, the supply of parking spaces would not be increased significantly, in order to prevent a possible surge in vacant parking spaces which would in turn incentivize local residents to purchase private cars. Each household in South Lantau could apply for one LCRP, which was valid for one year. Currently, the Administration had no plan to review the vetting and approving criteria of applications for LCRPs.

Motion on adjournment of further proceedings of the Subcommittee

20. At 9:13 am, when speaking on this discussion item, Dr KWOK Ka-ki moved a motion pursuant to Paragraph 33 of the Public Works Subcommittee Procedure to adjourn further proceedings of the Subcommittee.

21. The Chairman said that the Subcommittee would proceed to deal with Dr KWOK Ka-ki's motion. Each member could speak once on the motion, and the speaking time should not be more than three minutes.

22. Dr KWOK Ka-ki queried whether the project was aimed to pave way for future tourism developments at Tai O, so as to bring benefits to some members of the Lantau Development Advisory Committee who owned land in Lantau. He considered that with the commissioning of the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge and the availability of additional car parking spaces at Tai O, more mainland tourists would be attracted to visiting Tai O by car, thus destroying the natural environment of the place.

23. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Mr LEE Cheuk-yan, Dr Kenneth CHAN, Mr Alvin YEUNG and Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung spoke in support of Dr KWOK Ka-ki's motion. Mr TAM Yiu-chung spoke against the motion.

24. In response, DCED said that the sole purpose of the proposed project was to address the existing problems of vehicle-pedestrian conflicts and illegal parking near the entrance of Tai O town centre.

25. Dr KWOK Ka-ki stressed that he had no doubt about the position of CEDD in implementing the proposed project. Citing the construction of the boat anchorage at Tai O as an example, he pointed out that the project might turn out to be another "white elephant" project wasting public money.

26. The Chairman put to vote the question that further proceedings of the Subcommittee be then adjourned. At the request of Dr KWOK Ka-ki, the Chairman ordered a division and the division bell was rung for five minutes. Seven members voted for, 22 members voted against the motion and no one abstained. The votes of individual members were as follows —

For:

Mr LEE Cheuk-yan
Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung
Dr KWOK Ka-ki
Mr Alvin YEUNG
(7 members)

Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung
Dr Kenneth CHAN
Mr Dennis KWOK

Against:

Mr Albert HO
Mr TAM Yiu-chung
Mr Andrew LEUNG
Mr CHAN Hak-kan
Mr IP Kwok-him
Mr WU Chi-wai
Miss CHAN Yuen-han
Miss Alice MAK
Mr Christopher CHEUNG
Dr Helena WONG
Mr Christopher CHUNG
(22 members)

Mr CHAN Kam-lam
Mr WONG Kwok-hing
Mr WONG Ting-kwong
Mr WONG Kwok-kin
Mr Frankie YICK
Mr CHAN Han-pan
Mr LEUNG Che-cheung
Mr KWOK Wai-keung
Mr SIN Chung-kai
Dr CHIANG Lai-wan
Mr Tony TSE

Abstain:

(0 member)

27. The Chairman declared that the motion was negatived. The Subcommittee resumed the discussion on PWSC(2016-17)32.

Improvements to the facilities in the public toilet at the entrance of Tai O town centre

28. Mr WU Chi-wai considered that sanitary fitments currently provided in the public toilet at the entrance of Tai O town centre were insufficient to cope with the needs of visitors to Tai O during the holidays in the future. He enquired whether the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department ("FEHD") had any plan to improve the facilities of the toilet. DCED replied that according to FEHD's observation on the utilization rate of the toilet, the facilities in the toilet should be sufficient to meet the current demand of Tai O residents and visitors. In planning for the remainder of the improvement works at Tai O, CEDD would request FEHD to review afresh the need to improve the toilet. Mr WU urged that the improvement works to the toilet should be included into the remainder of the improvement works at Tai O.

29. Dr Helena WONG expressed dissatisfaction over the Administration's failure in following the people-oriented principle in implementing the proposed project, and its ignorance of the need for toilet facilities arising from the future increase in the number of visitors to Tai O. She urged CEDD to coordinate with FEHD for expeditious implementation of the improvement works of the toilet. Dr WONG requested the Administration to provide supplementary information elaborating on the following:

- (a) the respective numbers of water closet compartments in the male and female toilets and urinals in the male toilet currently provided in the public toilet;
- (b) the estimated number of visitors to Tai O during weekends and holidays upon the completion of the Improvement Works at Tai O, Phase 2 Stage 1; whether the facilities in the toilet could meet the future demand of visitors;
- (c) whether the number of water closet compartments and urinals in the toilet would be increased as soon as possible, so as to comply with the latest requirements of the relevant regulation; if so, when the works would commence; if not, the reasons for that; and
- (d) the estimated time when the construction of the Improvement Works at Tai O, Phase 2 Stage 2 would commence; whether the

improvement works of the toilet would be included in the project.

(*Post-meeting note:* The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC292/15-16\(01\)](#) on 7 July 2016.)

30. DCED reiterated that the proposed project was to address the problems of vehicle-pedestrian conflicts and illegal parking near the entrance of Tai O town centre, and it would not attract more tourists to Tai O. He said that the design and the consultation exercise of the project on Improvement Works at Tai O, Phase 2 Stage 2 was still under preparation, and there was yet any concrete timetable for implementation. He undertook to provide the information requested by Dr Helena WONG after the meeting.

Voting on PWSC(2016-17)32

31. There being no further questions from members on the item, the Chairman put the proposal PWSC(2016-17)32 to vote. At the request of Mr Albert CHAN, the Chairman ordered a division and the division bell was rung for five minutes. Twenty-five members voted for, six members voted against the proposal and no one abstained. The votes of individual members were as follows —

For:

Mr Albert HO	Mr CHAN Kam-lam
Ms Emily LAU	Mr TAM Yiu-chung
Mr WONG Kwok-hing	Mr Andrew LEUNG
Mr WONG Ting-kwong	Mr CHAN Hak-kan
Mr WONG Kwok-kin	Mr IP Kwok-him
Mr Albert CHAN	Mr Frankie YICK
Mr WU Chi-wai	Mr Charles Peter MOK
Miss CHAN Yuen-han	Mr LEUNG Che-cheung
Miss Alice MAK	Mr KWOK Wai-keung
Mr Christopher CHEUNG	Dr Helena WONG
Dr Elizabeth QUAT	Mr TANG Ka-piu
Dr CHIANG Lai-wan	Mr Christopher CHUNG
Mr Tony TSE	
(25 members)	

Against:

Mr LEE Cheuk-yan	Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung
Ms Cyd HO	Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung
Dr Kenneth CHAN	Mr Alvin YEUNG
(6 members)	

Abstain:
(0 member)

32. The Chairman declared that the item was endorsed by the Subcommittee. He consulted members on whether the item would require separate voting at the relevant FC meeting. No member made such a request.

Head 705 – Civil Engineering

PWSC(2016-17)36 290RS Expansion of mountain bike trail networks in Mui Wo and Chi Ma Wan, South Lantau

33. The Chairman advised that the proposal, i.e. PWSC(2016-17)36, was to upgrade 290RS to Category A at an estimated cost of \$41.6 million in MOD prices for the expansion of the mountain bike trail ("MBT") networks in Mui Wo and Chi Ma Wan, South Lantau. The Panel on Development had been consulted on the proposed works on 21 June 2016. Panel members supported the submission of the relevant funding proposal to the Subcommittee for consideration. A report on the gist of the Panel's discussion had been tabled at the meeting.

Mountain bike trail alignments and supporting facilities

34. Mr Albert CHAN welcomed the Administration's proposal to implement the proposed works. He was concerned that while cyclists were only allowed to cycle on designated cycle tracks in country parks, such tracks in various country parks in Lantau were not connected. Cyclists would contravene the law if they cycled on road sections in country parks that were not cycle tracks. Mr CHAN advised that a continuous round-the-island cycle track should be provided in Lantau (including country park areas) and the supporting facilities for the cycle track should be enhanced (such as by allowing the residents to operate home-stay lodgings along the track) to promote cycling tours in Lantau. Mr CHAN recalled he had suggested that the entrance to the proposed MBT be located near Mui Wo Village to allow cyclists to experience the unique flavour of the village. However, according to the current design, the entrance would be located at Mui Wo Ferry Pier Road. He urged the Administration to improve the design of the entrance in order to promote the development of tourism in Mui Wo.

35. DCED said that he would convey Mr CHAN's suggestion on the enhancement of MBT supporting facilities to relevant government

departments. Assistant Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (Country and Marine Parks)(Acting) said that in considering whether new MBTs should be provided in country parks, the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department("AFCD") would take into account various factors, such as the utilization of the existing road sections, the suitability of the terrains for mountain bike activities and the impact of constructing new MBTs on the environment and other country park users. AFCD would discuss with CEDD on how the MBT networks in Lantau could be further expanded.

36. Mr Albert CHAN advised that as many lands in Lantau had been zoned as country parks, coastal areas and green belts, the development of the lands were subject to strict planning control. Given that it was difficult for private land owners to obtain approval for applications for use of lands for other purposes, many private lands on the island could not be used for developing MBT supporting facilities. He suggested that the Administration should study how the development of MBT supporting facilities could be facilitated when handling such applications in the future. Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands) responded that the Administration would consider Mr CHAN's suggestion.

37. Dr Kenneth CHAN expressed support for the funding proposal. He noted that the Administration's "Mountain Bike Trail Networks in South Lantau – Feasibility Study" recommended improving and expanding the MBTs in South Lantau to international standards as far as practicable. He enquired whether the proposed MBTs would meet the international standards and could be used for holding international events upon completion.

38. DCED replied that there were currently no MBT standards for Hong Kong. References would be made as far as practicable to the design standards of overseas venues for international mountain bike events in designing the proposed MBTs.

Impact of the proposed works on trees

39. Dr Kenneth CHAN noted that there were currently about 2 600 trees along the proposed MBTs and the training ground. He enquired about the impact of the proposed works on the trees.

40. DCED explained that the design of the MBT alignments was more flexible than those of ordinary roads and bridges. The MBT alignments could be adjusted during the construction period so that felling of the existing trees could be minimized. At this stage, the Administration was uncertain about the number of trees that would be affected by the proposed works.

41. Dr Kenneth CHAN requested the Administration to release information on the affected trees in a timely manner. DCED undertook to release the relevant information.

42. There being no further questions from members on the item, the Chairman put the item to vote.

43. The item was voted on and endorsed. The Chairman consulted members on whether the item would require separate voting at the relevant FC meeting. No member made such a request.

44. The Chairman said that the time was up for the meeting. As the Subcommittee was unable to discuss the papers for Agenda Items 3 and 4 at the meeting, he would discuss with the Administration whether there was a need to hold further meetings. However, as the current legislative session would soon come to an end and the last FC meeting would soon be held, there were difficulties in arranging additional meetings for the Subcommittee.

(Post-meeting note: After discussion with the Administration, the Chairman decided not to hold any further meetings.)

45. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 10:26 am.