

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. PWSC140/16-17
(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 11th meeting
held in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex
on Thursday, 16 March 2017, at 9:00 am**

Members present:

Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, SBS, MH, JP (Chairman)
Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP
Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, GBS, JP
Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, GBS, JP
Hon WONG Ting-kwong, SBS, JP
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, SBS, JP
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, BBS, JP
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP
Hon WONG Kwok-kin, SBS, JP
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung
Hon Claudia MO
Hon Steven HO Chun-yin, BBS
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, JP
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH
Hon YIU Si-wing, BBS
Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen

Hon CHAN Han-pan, JP
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, BBS, MH, JP
Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, JP
Hon Alvin YEUNG
Hon Andrew WAN Siu-kin
Hon CHU Hoi-dick
Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP
Hon HO Kai-ming
Hon LAM Cheuk-ting
Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding
Hon Wilson OR Chong-shing, MH
Hon CHAN Chun-ying
Hon Tanya CHAN
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, JP
Hon HUI Chi-fung
Hon LAU Kwok-fan, MH
Hon KWONG Chun-yu
Hon Jeremy TAM Man-ho
Hon Nathan LAW Kwun-chung
Dr Hon YIU Chung-yim
Dr Hon LAU Siu-lai

Members absent:

Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP
Hon KWOK Wai-keung
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan
Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, JP
Hon SHIU Ka-chun
Hon Kenneth LAU Ip-keung, MH, JP

Public officers attending:

Mr Raistlin LAU Chun, JP	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury)3
Mr Albert LAM Kai-chung, JP	Permanent Secretary for Development (Works)(Acting)
Mr Maurice LOO Kam-wah	Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)2
Mr Donald TONG Chi-keung, JP	Permanent Secretary for the Environment
Ms Margaret HSIA Mai-chi	Principal Assistant Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) (Works)
Mr Kenneth LEUNG Tak-yan	Chief Civil Engineer (Public Works Programme) Transport and Housing Bureau
Mr LAM Sai-hung, JP	Director of Civil Engineering and Development
Mr David LO Kwok-chung	Chief Engineer (Islands) Civil Engineering and Development Department
Ms Ann Mary TAM Kwai-yee	Chief Architect (5) Housing Department
Mrs Alice YU NG Ka-chun	Project Director (3) Architectural Services Department
Mr Peter KWOK Chung-kai	Assistant District Officer (Sai Kung)1 Home Affairs Department
Mr KOK Che-leung	Assistant Director of Social Welfare (Subventions)
Mr Kenneth WOO Chi-man	Chief Executive Officer (Subventions/Planning) Social Welfare Department

Mr Kevin YEUNG Yun-hung, JP	Under Secretary for Education
Mrs Elina CHAN	Principal Assistant Secretary for Education (Infrastructure and Research Support)
Mr CHAN Fu-man	Principal Education Officer (Special Education) Education Bureau
Mr LEUNG Koon-kee, JP	Director of Architectural Services
Ms Winnie HO Wing-yin	Project Director (1) Architectural Services Department
Mr John LEE Ka-chiu, PDSM, PMSM, JP	Under Secretary for Security
Mr Andrew TSANG Yue-tung	Principal Assistant Secretary for Security (E)
Mr Dennis CHING Chung-cham	Assistant Secretary for Security (E)1
Mr Raymond SIU Chak-yee	Assistant Commissioner of Police (Personnel) Hong Kong Police Force
Mrs Anissa LI CHIU Wai-yin	Chief Superintendent of Police (Planning and Development)(Acting) Hong Kong Police Force
Ms Melinda FONG M Y	Superintendent of Police (Conditions of Service)(Quartermaster) Hong Kong Police Force
Mr LEUNG Koon-kee, JP	Director of Architectural Services
Mr David CHAK Wing-pong	Project Director (2) Architectural Services Department
Ms Maggie CHIN Man-yi	District Planning Officer (Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East) Planning Department

Mr YAU Shing-mu, JP	Under Secretary for Transport and Housing
Ms Rebecca PUN Ting-ting, JP	Deputy Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport)1
Mr Raymond CHENG Nim-tai	Principal Assistant Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport)7
Mr Daniel CHUNG Kum-wah, JP	Director of Highways
Mr Jimmy CHAN Pai-ming	Principal Government Engineer (Railway Development) Highways Department
Mr Frankie CHOU Wing-ping	Chief Engineer (Railway Development)1-2 Highways Department

Attendance by invitation:

Dr Philco WONG	Projects Director MTR Corporation Limited
Mr Ken WONG	General Manager (Projects) MTR Corporation Limited
Mr Stephen YAU	Manager (Estimates, Cost Control and Logistics) MTR Corporation Limited
Ms Prudence CHAN	Senior Manager (Projects and Property Communications) MTR Corporation Limited

Clerk in attendance:

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

Staff in attendance:

Miss Rita YUNG	Senior Council Secretary (1)2
Ms Mandy LI	Council Secretary (1)2
Miss Queenie LAM	Senior Legislative Assistant (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 seven funding proposals on the agenda for the meeting, which were carried over from the previous meeting of the Subcommittee. He reminded members that in accordance with Rule 83A of the Rules of Procedure ("RoP") of the Legislative Council, 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 711 - Housing

PWSC(2016-17)39 781CL Infrastructure works for public housing development at Area 54, Tung Chung

2. The Chairman advised that the proposal, i.e. PWSC(2016-17)39, was to upgrade 781CL to Category A at an estimated cost of \$284.8 million in money-of-the-day ("MOD") prices for the construction of infrastructure to support the proposed public housing development at Area 54, Tung Chung. The Administration had consulted the Panel on Housing on the proposal on 5 December 2016. Panel members supported the submission of the funding proposal to the Subcommittee for consideration. A report on the gist of the Panel's discussion had been tabled at the meeting.

Engineering contract and costs

3. Ms Tanya CHAN enquired about the differences between the New Engineering Contract ("NEC") form and conventional engineering contracts, and the criteria for deciding the adoption of different forms of engineering contracts in delivering public works projects. The Administration advised that NEC form emphasized cooperation, mutual trust and collaborative risk management between contracting parties. The Administration would provide a response in writing to Ms CHAN's enquiries after the meeting.

(*Post meeting note:* The written response provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC121/16-17\(01\)](#) on 31 March 2017.)

4. Mr YIU Si-wing noted that the capital cost of the proposed works was estimated in September 2016 prices. He asked whether the cost of the proposed works would go up if funding approval of the Finance Committee ("FC") was not available in time, and hence the construction works were unable to commence as scheduled in mid-2017. In response, Director of Civil Engineering and Development ("DCED") advised that the construction works were expected to commence in mid-2017 and the expenditure would be phased starting from 2017-2018. The funding being sought encompassed a provision of \$42.8 million for price adjustment to meet the inflationary increase or other changes in the phased expenditure for subsequent years. The cost of the proposed works also included contingencies to cope with other unforeseeable circumstances. The Administration took the view that the funding being sought was sufficient to cover the works expenditure unless there was a significant delay in the commencement of the construction works.

5. Dr YIU Chung-yim enquired about the details of the "ancillary works" under item (c) of paragraph 6 of the paper for discussion (PWSC(2016-17)39), including the differences between the "landscaping works" under that item and the "amenity areas" under item (a) of the same paragraph. Chief Engineer (Islands), Civil Engineering and Development Department ("CE(Is)/CEDD"), responded that the works for the "amenity areas" would be carried out in the area to the north of Ying Hei Road. The ancillary works referred to drainage construction and landscaping works for the 500-metre-long new carriageway, as well as laying of fresh water mains to support the proposed public housing development at Area 54, Tung Chung.

6. Noting that the proposed sewer construction incurred the highest cost of \$81.2 million as shown in the cost breakdown of this project, Dr YIU Chung-yim enquired about the details of the works required. In response, CE(Is)/CEDD said that the sewer works involved the construction of a sewer with an approximate length of 900 metres along the proposed new carriageway, Yi Tung Road, Man Tung Road and Chun Tung Street, and across the MTR Airport Express Line and Tung Chung Line, North Lantau Highway and Cheung Tung Road, to connect Tung Chung Area 54 with the existing Tung Chung Sewage Pumping Station. Part of the sewer would be constructed using the pipe jacking method.

Supporting transport facilities for Area 54, Tung Chung

7. Mr Holden CHOW and Mr KWONG Chun-yu expressed concern about the transport arrangements to be implemented in the vicinity of Area 54, Tung Chung, to meet the needs arising from the future population increase. In response, Chief Civil Engineer (Public Works Programme), Transport and Housing Bureau ("CCE(PWP)/THB"), said that the Transport Department ("TD") had arranged bus services to tie in with the population intake of the two existing private housing developments at Ying Hei Road. The proposed works included the provision of two bus lay-bys on the eastbound carriageway of Ying Hei Road and another bus lay-by on the proposed new carriageway near the proposed public housing development. Upon the future population intake of the proposed public housing development, TD would re-examine the transport service arrangements for the area and consult the Islands District Council ("DC") at an appropriate time. DCED said that there were two traffic lanes each on eastbound and westbound Ying Hei Road, which would be able to cope with the traffic flow arising from the future population increase.

8. Mr CHAN Han-pan said that parking spaces for vehicles were in short supply in Tung Chung. He enquired about the number of parking spaces for vehicles that would be provided in the proposed public housing development. He urged that a sufficient number of parking spaces be provided, so as to alleviate the problem of illegal parking in the area. CCE(PWP)/THB replied that pursuant to the standards set out under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines ("HKPSG"), the Hong Kong Housing Authority ("HKHA") would provide 220 private car parking spaces in the proposed public housing development.

9. Mr CHAN Han-pan pointed out that currently in Tung Chung Town Centre, traffic was very busy on Tat Tung Road and near the MTR station. He urged the Administration to also give consideration to improving the traffic conditions in the town centre when it set out to develop housing projects in the surrounding area, so as not to increase the traffic load there. In response, CCE(PWP)/THB said that upon inspection, TD found that the congestions on Tat Tung Road were attributed to the blocking of traffic by vehicles picking up and dropping off passengers there. TD would continue to follow up on the traffic conditions in Tung Chung Town Centre.

10. Mr YIU Si-wing enquired about the number of parking spaces for bicycles that would be provided in the cycle parking area built under the proposed project. CCE(PWP)/THB replied that the proposed cycle parking area to the north of Ying Hei Road would provide 60 parking spaces for bicycles. The proposed public housing development at Area 54, Tung

Chung, would also provide an appropriate number of parking spaces for bicycles in future.

11. Mr WU Chi-wai said that the Democratic Party supported the development of public housing and the provision of associated infrastructure at Area 54, Tung Chung. He suggested that the proposed cycle parking area should have a more flexible design with no individual bicycle parking spaces so that more bicycles could be accommodated. He asked whether there were cycle parking areas near the MTR station in Tung Chung Town Centre for the convenience of residents who accessed the MTR station by bicycle. CCE(PWP)/THB took note of Mr WU's suggestion on the design of the cycle parking area. He said that there was a cycle parking area each in Citygate Phase 1 and Hing Tung Street in Tung Chung Town Centre, which together provided about 1 000 parking spaces for bicycles.

12. Mr CHU Hoi-dick pointed out that the cycle parking area on Hing Tung Street, Tung Chung, was not covered and not managed by designated personnel. Many bicycles parked there had their parts stolen and were long abandoned. He suggested that the Administration consider improving the design and management of cycle parking areas. The Chairman advised that the circumstances mentioned by Mr CHU Hoi-dick occurred in various districts. The management of cycle parking areas was a territory-wide issue which should be followed up by the Panel on Transport.

13. Mr WU Chi-wai requested supplementary information on the measures to be taken to enable cyclists to use the proposed cycle track under the project to commute from Area 54, Tung Chung, to Tung Chung Town Centre and the MTR station smoothly.

(Post meeting note: The written response provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC121/16-17\(01\)](#) on 31 March 2017.)

Proposed public housing development at Area 54, Tung Chung

14. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen enquired whether the flats to be provided in the proposed public housing development at Area 54, Tung Chung, were public rental housing flats or subsidized sale flats. Given the proximity of Tung Chung to the airport and Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge, Mr CHAN was concerned whether the Administration had conducted any study to assess if the noise and air quality problems in the area would have any impact on the future residents of the proposed public housing development.

15. Chief Architect (5), Housing Department ("CA(5)/HD"), replied that the proposed public housing development at Area 54, Tung Chung, was a subsidized sale flats project. According to the conceptual layout presented by HKHA during its consultation with Islands DC on the proposed public housing development last year, about 3 300 flats would be provided in eight housing blocks under the project, which could accommodate about 10 000 people. Some DC members suggested then that the number of blocks proposed to be built be reduced. The proposed public housing development was currently at the stage of schematic design. The Administration would strive to achieve an appropriate balance in its design, taking into account various town planning perimeters (such as site ventilation, height restrictions, etc.) and the views of DC members.

16. CCE(PWP)/THB advised that the Housing Department ("HD") had examined the environment of Area 54, Tung Chung. Located at about 1 000 metres from the airport, the area would basically not be exposed to aircraft noises. HD had also confirmed that the air quality of the area met the relevant standards.

17. Mr CHU Hoi-dick considered that public rental housing flats should be provided in the proposed public housing development at Area 54, Tung Chung, so as to make available more rental flats and shorten the waiting time for public housing. The Chairman pointed out that matters relating to public housing development strategy should be followed up at the Panel on Housing. CCE(PWP)/THB advised that the Administration had explained to members of the Panel on Housing its proposal to provide subsidized sale flats under the proposed public housing development at Area 54, Tung Chung, when the Panel was consulted on the proposed infrastructure works on 5 December 2016.

18. Referring to the planning errors made by the Administration in developing the new town in Tin Shui Wai North in early years, Mr KWONG Chun-yu urged the Administration to ensure the provision of adequate supporting facilities to meet residents' needs in every aspect of their lives, including clothing, food, accommodation and transport, while implementing the public housing development project at Area 54, Tung Chung. Mr KWONG and Mr CHU Hoi-dick asked whether a market would be provided in the proposed public housing development at Area 54, Tung Chung.

19. CA(5)/HD replied that there would not be a market in the proposed public housing development at Area 54, Tung Chung. However, a wet market with more than 40 stalls would be available in the soon-to-be-completed Ying Tung Estate in the adjacent Area 56, Tung Chung.

Voting on PWSC(2016-17)39

20. Members raised no further questions on the item. The Chairman put the item to vote and ordered a division. The division bell was rung for five minutes. Twenty-five members voted for the proposal, and no member voted against it or abstained from voting. The votes of individual members were as follows:

For:

Mr Jeffrey LAM
Ms Starry LEE
Mr Paul TSE
Mr YIU Si-wing
Mr CHAN Han-pan
Ms Alice MAK
Dr Junius HO
Mr LAM Cheuk-ting
Mr Wilson OR
Ms Tanya CHAN
Mr HUI Chi-fung
Mr KWONG Chun-yu
Dr LAU Siu-lai
(25 members)

Mr WONG Ting-kwong
Dr Priscilla LEUNG
Mr WU Chi-wai
Mr MA Fung-kwok
Mr LEUNG Che-cheung
Mr CHU Hoi-dick
Mr HO Kai-ming
Mr Holden CHOW
Mr CHAN Chun-ying
Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan
Mr LAU Kwok-fan
Dr YIU Chung-yim

Against:

(0 member)

Abstain:

(0 member)

21. The Chairman declared that the item was endorsed by the Subcommittee. Dr YIU Chung-yim requested that this item (i.e. PWSC(2016-17)39) be voted on separately at the relevant FC meeting.

(Post meeting note: Dr YIU Chung-yim wrote to the Chairman of FC on 31 March 2017 indicating his withdrawal of the above request.)

Head 711 - Housing**PWSC(2016-17)40 186GK Ancillary facilities block at Tseung Kwan O Area 65C2**

22. The Chairman advised that the proposal, i.e. PWSC(2016-17)40, was to upgrade 186GK to Category A at an estimated cost of \$235.2 million in MOD prices for the construction of an ancillary facilities block ("the proposed AFB") at Tseung Kwan O ("TKO") Area 65C2. The Administration had consulted the Panel on Housing on the proposal on 5 December 2016. Panel members supported the submission of the funding proposal to the Subcommittee for consideration. A summary of the Panel's discussion had been tabled at the meeting.

Use of land resources for the proposed ancillary facilities block

23. Mr CHU Hoi-dick enquired: (a) whether the site of the proposed AFB was a Government, Institution or Community ("G/IC") site; (b) about the maximum plot ratio permitted for the site; and (c) whether the proposed project had fully utilized the plot ratio of the site. In his view, if the plot ratio of the site was under-utilized, the Administration should make best use of the site by putting in more welfare facilities to cater for the needs of residents in the area.

24. CA(5)/HD responded that the site identified for the proposed AFB was not a standalone G/IC site, but was part of the site for the public housing development at TKO Area 65C2. Both the domestic and non-domestic plot ratios of the site were close to the respective maximum ratios permitted under the draft outline zoning plan.

25. Mr CHU Hoi-dick requested the Administration to explain whether the floor areas of the welfare facilities and other related facilities in the proposed AFB were determined in accordance with the guidelines set out in HKPSG. Mr CHU considered that a uniform set of planning standards should be formulated to ensure that residents of various districts would have equal opportunities to access welfare facilities.

26. Assistant Director of Social Welfare (Subventions) ("ADSW(S)") explained that in general, integrated children and youth services centres and integrated family service centres were provided according to the population standards under HKPSG. As to other welfare facilities, the Social Welfare Department ("SWD") would decide on the type and size of the facilities that should be provided in a development based on a number of factors such as availability of the facilities and demand for the services offered, number of people waiting for the service in various districts, the environment nearby,

and the usable area of the development. The Administration took the view that such practice would allow greater flexibility in planning.

Services provided by social welfare organizations in the proposed ancillary facilities block

27. Mr CHU Hoi-dick said that some overseas residential care homes for the elderly shared common space with child care centres, with an aim to promote inter-generational interaction. Given that services for people of different age brackets (such as young children, youngsters and elderly people) would be provided in the welfare facilities located in the proposed AFB, Mr CHU urged the Administration to take the opportunity of this proposed development to, by drawing on overseas experience, allow shared use of some common space by the social welfare organizations operating in the AFB, so as to promote mutual understanding among people of different age brackets.

28. ADSW(S) advised that SWD had all along encouraged social welfare organizations to pursue comprehensive or integrated service development. However, since the welfare facilities to be accommodated in the proposed AFB were run by different social welfare organizations, they would operate as separate service units.

29. The Chairman suggested that social welfare organizations might make use of the multi-purpose hall in the proposed AFB to organize activities for the promotion of inter-generational harmony. Mr CHU Hoi-dick expressed dissatisfaction that while the Administration sought to encourage shared use of common space by social welfare organizations, it had failed to put the concept into practice in the proposed project.

30. ADSW(S) replied that the Administration would look into ways to implement the concept of service integration when considering the service operation of the proposed AFB.

31. Mr KWONG Chun-yu requested the Administration to provide the number of welfare facilities currently available in TKO, and enquired whether these facilities were sufficient to meet the needs of local residents.

32. Regarding the welfare facilities to be accommodated in the proposed AFB, ADSW(S) replied that there were three integrated family service centres in Wong Tai Sin/Sai Kung Districts as a whole. In addition, there were five neighbourhood elderly centres, three special child care centres, two early education and training centres, two daytime youth outreaching social work teams and one overnight outreaching team for young night drifters in

Sai Kung District (which included TKO). Moreover, there were about 94 children in the district who were on the waiting list for special child care centre service.

Accessibility of the proposed ancillary facilities block

33. Ms Tanya CHAN was concerned about the ways by which service users might travel to the proposed AFB. She enquired (a) whether the people who took MTR to the proposed AFB could directly reach the AFB via the pedestrian footbridge after alighting from TKO Station, and (b) about the arrangements for vehicular access to the proposed AFB.

34. CA(5)/HD replied that the pedestrian entrance/exit of the proposed AFB was on the street level on Chi Shin Street. Users of the activity centre might enter the proposed AFB directly from Chi Shin Street. Users of social welfare facilities could access different levels of the AFB by lift or stairs from the entrance lobby on the ground floor. The vehicular ingress/egress was also located on Chi Shin Street, though separated from the pedestrian entrance/exit. Vehicles servicing the facilities in the AFB could stop at the loading/unloading area for passengers to enter the AFB directly.

Cost of works and quality of building materials

35. Dr Junius HO noted that 12.5% of the construction cost of the proposed works would be charged by HKHA for the design, administration and supervision of the project. He enquired how the proportion was determined and whether there was room for downward adjustment, and whether the relevant tasks could be taken over by a government department in order to save the cost to be paid to HKHA.

36. CCE(PWP)/THB explained that since the proposed AFB was located within the site of HKHA's public housing development at TKO Area 65C2, the construction of the AFB must interface with the works programme of the public housing development. Therefore, the Administration would entrust the design of the AFB and works supervision, etc., to HKHA. If the Architectural Services Department ("ArchSD") were to take up the work, it would incur a similar construction cost for the proposed works.

37. Referring to paragraph 9 of the discussion paper, Dr Junius HO pointed out that among the estimated construction cost of \$235.2 million, about \$83.1 million was the construction cost of the four welfare facilities located in the proposed AFB. He requested the Administration to provide a cost breakdown (e.g. building works and building services) for that \$83.1 million.

38. Project Director (3), Architectural Services Department, replied that since the four welfare facilities would be co-located with other facilities in the proposed AFB, the Lotteries Fund, which was responsible for reimbursing the construction cost of the relevant welfare facilities, would have to contribute part of the construction cost of the communal facilities in the AFB. The Administration would work out the construction cost of communal facilities to be apportioned to each of the four welfare facilities on the basis of the floor area they each occupied in the proposed AFB.

39. Citing media reports, Mr KWONG Chun-yu said that recently a contractor of a subsidized sale flats development at TKO Area 65C2 was found to have used concrete spacer blocks of poorer quality. He was concerned whether similar problems would occur in the proposed works.

40. CCE(PWP)/THB stressed that the building materials used for the proposed works had to comply with the relevant standards of ArchSD and HKHA.

Greening and energy efficient features

41. Mr LEUNG Che-cheung queried whether the provision of vertical greening for the proposed AFB was aimed more at beautifying the exterior than reducing the indoor temperature of the building. In this connection, Mr LEUNG enquired about the future maintenance cost of the vertical greening facility in the proposed AFB, and whether it was an established policy to provide vertical greening facilities for new government buildings.

42. In response, CCE(PWP)/THB said that in working out a vertical greening design, the Administration would take into account the future maintenance cost of the facility, so as to achieve sustainability objectives. The Administration undertook to provide the information requested by Mr LEUNG after the meeting.

(Post meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC120/16-17\(01\)](#) on 31 March 2017.)

43. Dr YIU Chung-yim requested the Administration to explain: (a) how it came up with the projection that the energy efficient features mentioned in the discussion paper could achieve the target of 3% energy savings in the annual energy consumption with a payback period of 8.3 years; and (b) the details of the energy efficient technologies concerned. The Administration undertook to provide the information requested by Dr YIU after the meeting.

(Post meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC120/16-17\(01\)](#) on 31 March 2017.)

44. Given that the Administration expected to achieve significant energy savings through the energy efficient features concerned, Dr YIU Chung-yim enquired whether HKHA would strive to achieve a higher rating for the proposed AFB under Building Environmental Assessment Method ("BEAM") Plus.

45. CA(5)/HD replied that HKHA would submit an application to the relevant institution for the whole public housing development at TKO Area 65C2, instead of the proposed AFB alone, to undergo BEAM Plus Assessment.

Consultation

46. Mr CHU Hoi-dick enquired whether the Administration had gauged the views of local residents on the land use of the site of the proposed AFB apart from consulting the relevant DCs.

47. CA(5)/HD advised that HKHA had consulted Sai Kung DC on the development at TKO Area 65C2 in November 2014 and July 2015. However, it did not participate in the consultation activities with residents, such as residents' meetings. At the DC meetings, HKHA received and responded to DC members' views and requests on the uses of the proposed AFB. It also believed that those members had relayed the views of TKO residents.

48. Members raised no further questions on the item. The Chairman put the item to vote.

(At 10:25 am, due to the absence of a quorum, the Chairman directed the Clerk to summon members to the meeting. At 10:26 am, a quorum was present and the meeting was resumed.)

49. The item was put to vote and endorsed. Dr YIU Chung-yim requested that this item (i.e. PWSC(2016-17)40) be voted on separately at the relevant FC meeting.

(Post meeting note: Dr YIU Chung-yim wrote to the Chairman of FC on 31 March 2017 indicating that he would withdraw the above request.)

Head 703 - Buildings

PWSC(2016-17)41 111ET A special school for students with mild, moderate and severe intellectual disabilities in Area 108, Tung Chung

50. The Chairman advised that the proposal, i.e. PWSC(2016-17)41, was to upgrade 111ET to Category A at an estimated cost of \$334.7 million in MOD prices for the construction of a new special school with boarding facilities for students with mild, moderate and severe intellectual disabilities in Area 108, Tung Chung. The Administration had consulted the Panel on Education on the proposal on 12 December 2016. Panel members supported the submission of the funding proposal to the Subcommittee for consideration. A summary of the discussion of the Panel on Education had been tabled at the meeting.

Education and boarding services provided by the proposed special school

51. Ms Alice MAK supported the proposed project. She enquired about the number of students of the proposed special school who would be admitted to the boarding section of the school, and the transportation arrangements for non-boarding students.

52. Under Secretary for Education ("USED") replied that the proposed special school could provide about 200 school places. Among the students enrolled, about 60 would be admitted to the boarding section of the school, while the remaining 140 non-boarders would go home after school. Currently, all special schools provided school bus service for students with moderate and severe intellectual disabilities. The proposed special school was even contemplating providing school bus service for students with mild intellectual disabilities, subject to their parents sharing part of the cost. As there were bus stops near the school, parents might transport their children to and from school themselves.

53. Mr KWONG Chun-yu was concerned about the walking distance that parents and their children would have to travel between the proposed special school and the nearest bus stop if parents wished to transport their children to and from school themselves.

54. Citing Enclosure 5 to the discussion paper, USED advised that there were bus stops near the proposed special school. Mr KWONG Chun-yu suggested that the Administration should discuss with bus operators to have

the bus stops located closer to the proposed special school, so as to provide convenience to parents to transport their children to and from the school.

55. Ms Alice MAK sought explanation from the Government on whether students of ethnic minorities would be admitted to the proposed special school, and whether special schools admitting such students would receive additional support.

56. USED said that the proposed special school would admit both Chinese-speaking and non-Chinese-speaking ("NCS") students with intellectual disabilities. The Education Bureau would provide additional funding for special schools depending on the number of NCS students they admitted.

Staff establishment of the proposed special school

57. Mr Holden CHOW welcomed the commencement of the proposed works by the Administration. He enquired about the number of teachers to be employed by the proposed special school, and whether there would be staff living on site in the boarding facilities to take care of the needs of boarding students.

58. USED said that special schools would determine their staff establishment based on the number and conditions of their students and the established teacher-student ratios. As far as the proposed special school was concerned, there would be about 40 teaching staff, about 13 non-teaching staff (e.g. social workers) and about 30 supporting staff (e.g. teaching assistants). For the boarding section of the proposed special school, about 40 staff (e.g. wardens and nurses) would be employed to provide service for boarding students.

59. Mr KWONG Chun-yu was concerned whether the social worker-student ratio for the proposed special school was too low. He hoped that the relevant ratio for the school would be higher than that adopted currently, so as to provide adequate support for students with intellectual disabilities.

60. USED said that the proposed special school, which would provide about 200 school places, would have about 2.5 social workers, meaning that each social worker would take care of about 80 students.

Energy efficient features

61. Mr CHU Hoi-dick enquired whether all new buildings such as the proposed special school built under public works projects would adopt the energy efficient features and renewable energy technologies (such as photovoltaic system) set out in paragraph 21 of the discussion paper. He noted that the cost for the adoption of energy efficient features in the proposed special school was \$3.9 million, while the construction cost of the entire school building project was \$334.7 million; for the previous item discussed (i.e. construction of an AFB at TKO Area 65C2), the construction cost of the entire project was \$235.2 million, while the cost for the adoption of energy efficient features amounted to \$1.7 million only. Mr CHU enquired about the reasons for the significant difference between the two projects in terms of the proportion of the cost of energy efficient features in the total project estimate.

62. Director of Architectural Services said that the Development Bureau and the Environment Bureau had established internal technical guidelines on the energy efficient features to be adopted in government buildings, which had to be followed in all public works projects. Various types of energy efficient features would be introduced to public works projects as and where appropriate, depending on the objective environment in which these projects were undertaken. However, the relevant cost should not be higher than 2% of the total project estimate.

63. Members raised no further questions on the item. The Chairman put the item to vote.

64. The item was put to vote and endorsed. Dr YIU Chung-yim requested that this item (i.e. PWSC(2016-17)41) be voted on separately at the relevant FC meeting.

(Post meeting note: Dr YIU Chung-yim wrote to the Chairman of FC on 24 March 2017 indicating that he would withdraw the above request.)

HEAD 703 – BUILDINGS

**PWSC(2016-17)42 70JA Redevelopment of Junior Police Officers
Married Quarters at Fan Garden,
Fanling**

65. The Chairman advised that the proposal, i.e. PWSC(2016-17)42, was to upgrade 70JA to Category A at an estimated cost of \$2,827.9 million in

money-of-the-day prices for the redevelopment of Junior Police Officers Married Quarters at Fan Garden, Fanling. The Panel on Security had been consulted on the proposal on 3 January 2017 and members did not object to the Administration's submission of the funding proposal to the Subcommittee for consideration. A report on the gist of the discussion of the Panel on Security was tabled at the meeting.

Supply of departmental quarters for disciplined services staff

66. Mr Wilson OR said that members belonging to the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong supported the funding proposal. He considered the proposed project conducive to alleviating the shortfall of departmental quarters ("DQs") for police officers.

67. Mr Nathan LAW was concerned that junior police officers ("JPOs") would not benefit as the DQs to be constructed under the project only provided F-grade and G-grade units but not H-grade units.

68. Mr Jeremy TAM expressed support for the proposed project. Noting that the shortfall rate of DQs units for JPOs was 20.6%, Ms Tanya CHAN enquired about the shortfall rates of DQs units for other disciplined services staff.

69. Under Secretary for Security ("US for S") said that given the limited land resources, all disciplined services staff were facing shortage of DQs. Depending on the increase in the establishment of the disciplined services concerned and the proportion of married staff in the respective disciplined services in recent years, the shortfall rates ranged from a dozen percentage points to some 40%. US for S further said that in a recent judicial review case, the court ruled that DQs were discretionary benefit. DQs would be provided for disciplined services staff, subject to availability of resources. The Administration was also making efforts to identify suitable sites for the construction of DQs for disciplined services staff, including redevelopment of the JPOs Married Quarters at Fan Garden, Fanling under the proposed project to increase the supply of DQs units.

70. Mr Nathan LAW recalled that at the meeting of the Panel on Security in January 2017, he asked whether the redevelopment of the DQs for police officers at Fan Garden would be relocated to Kwu Tung North in future. The Administration replied that another site at Kwu Tung North had been earmarked for the construction of new police facilities and DQs for police officers. Mr LAW asked the Administration to explain again the future use of the site of the JPOs Married Quarters at Fan Garden and the aforesaid site in Kwu Tung North.

71. US for S replied that the Administration had planned for an in-situ redevelopment of the JPOs Married Quarters at Fan Garden. There were no plans to relocate the DQs for police officers to Kwu Tung North for redevelopment in future. As mentioned before, the Administration was making efforts to identify more suitable sites for the construction of DQs for disciplined services staff. As such, the Administration planned to earmark another site at Kwu Tung North for the construction of new DQs for police officers in future.

72. Mr LAM Cheuk-ting said that as the proposed project was conducive to maintaining the morale of the disciplined services, members belonging to the Democratic Party supported the funding proposal. He enquired whether the allocation exercise of DQs units for police officers took place four times a year; if so, whether it could be increased to six times a year to enable police officers to move into vacated DQs units as early as possible.

73. Assistant Commissioner of Police (Personnel) responded that the allocation exercise of DQs units for JPOs and police officers at the Inspector Grade took place five and four times a year, respectively. In addition, vacated DQs units would be allocated to waitlisted officers expeditiously. US for S undertook that the Administration would examine whether the allocation procedures could be further enhanced.

74. Quoting the Director of Audit's Report No. 62, Mr Nathan LAW pointed out that the arrangements for disposal of surplus non-departmental quarters ("NDQs") by the Administration were undesirable and the Director of Audit recommended expediting the disposal of those DQs. Mr LAW enquired whether the Administration would consider converting rental NDQs currently available in the market to DQs for disciplined services staff so as to address the shortfall; if not, the reasons for that. Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury)³ undertook to provide the information requested by Mr LAW after the meeting.

(Post meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC119/16-17\(01\)](#) on 31 March 2017.)

Use of land resources regarding the site of the proposed redevelopment

75. Mr LAU Kwok-fun noted that under the proposed project, the site at Fan Garden would attain a maximum plot ratio of 6. However, Mr LAU urged the Administration to consider relaxing the plot ratio of the Fan Garden site in order to address the shortage of DQs for police officers.

76. US for S responded that the Administration had fully utilized the development potential of the Fan Garden site. When planning a development project, the Administration must take into consideration its implications on the surrounding environment, landscape and traffic. District Planning Officer (Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East), Planning Department ("DPO(FS&YLE)/PD"), added that the maximum domestic plot ratio of housing sites in Fanling New Town was 6 in general. Moreover, land to the north of Fan Garden was zoned "Village Type Development" and the plot ratio of the housing developments on the east (e.g. Wing Fok Centre) was also around 5.6. The Administration therefore considered it appropriate to apply a plot ratio of 6 to the Fan Garden site.

77. Mr WU Chi-wai enquired whether the Administration would consider incorporating the site to the south of the Fan Garden site which was adjacent to the Police Driving and Traffic Training Centre ("PDTTC") into the project site in order to provide more DQs units. Mr LAU Kwok-fan suggested converting the site concerned to DQs for police officers upon the implementation of the PDTTC relocation plan.

78. Chief Superintendent of Police (Planning and Development)(Acting) said that the site was being used by PDTTC for training purpose. US for S took note of Mr LAU's suggestion and said that upon the implementation of the PDTTC relocation plan, the Administration would consider the site's future use from the perspective of the overall land planning in Hong Kong.

79. Referring to paragraph 7 of the discussion paper, Dr YIU Chung-yim pointed out that the adjacent site which was not part of the existing JPOs Married Quarters at Fan Garden would be incorporated into the project site to make available sufficient land for redevelopment,. He enquired about the details of the site concerned, including its location, area and value.

80. US for S drew members' attention to the site plan in enclosure 1 of the discussion paper. He said that two sites between the Fan Garden site and Fan Leng Lau Road with a combined area of 840 square metres would be incorporated into the proposed project site for DQs development. Given that the two sites were currently unallocated government land, the Administration considered it conducive to optimizing the use of land resources by incorporating these sites into the project site.

81. The Chairman and Mr WU-Chi-wai supported the conversion of the idle land to green belt. Mr WU further suggested that the site should be open for public use in future. While noting members' suggestion to open the public space of the project for the enjoyment by the people in future,

US for S pointed out that the design of DQs should also address security concerns and the need to protect the privacy of the tenants.

Parking spaces for cars and motorcycles

82. Members noted that the proposed redevelopment project would provide 149 car parking spaces and 12 motorcycle parking spaces. Mr Wilson OR, Ms Tanya CHAN, Mr HO Kai-ming, Mr Jeremy TAM and Mr WU Chi-wai were concerned whether the parking spaces for cars and motorcycles in the redeveloped DQs were sufficient to meet the parking needs of the 1 184 DQs tenants. They considered that as police officers should to be on duty around the clock and their place of work might not be accessible by public transport, they had a greater need for private cars and motorcycles.

83. US for S explained that they had made the best effort to provide more parking spaces for private cars and motorcycles. The Transport and Housing Bureau ("THB") was responsible for formulating the overall transport policy while HKPSG set out the standards for parking provision for different development projects. The parking spaces for private cars and motorcycles under the proposed project met the maximum requirements stipulated in HKPSG.

84. DPO(FS&YLE)/PD supplemented that the parking standards for housing developments were laid down in HKPSG and any further increase in the number of parking spaces would deviate from the relevant standards. Nevertheless, the Transport Department ("TD") would review from time to time the standards of parking provision stipulated in HKPSG. US for S stressed that members' views on parking provision under HKPSG would be proactively relayed to THB and TD.

85. Mr WU Chi-wai asked the Administration to elaborate on the standards for parking provision for cars and motorcycles for residential developments/DQs for disciplined services staff, and the criteria for determining the provision of 149 car parking spaces and 12 motorcycle parking spaces under the redevelopment project.

86. DPO(FS&YLE)/PD replied that under HKPSG which were revised in 2014, there should be one car space per six to nine flats for housing development. In addition, the number of parking spaces should be adjusted in the light of the proximity of the developments to railway stations, development intensity and flat sizes. As for the number of motorcycle parking spaces, the revised HKPSG stipulated that there should be one motorcycle parking space per 100-150 flats. In the design of the

redevelopment project, the Administration had already adopted the maximum provision stipulated in HKPSG (i.e. one car space per six flats and one motorcycle parking space per 100 flats) in calculating the number of parking spaces in the DQs. The Administration undertook to provide the relevant information in writing after the meeting.

(Post meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC119/16-17\(01\)](#) on 31 March 2017.)

87. Mr LAU Kwok-fan suggested that the Administration could incorporate the land surrounding the Fan Garden site (e.g. idle government land) into the project site in order to provide adequate motorcycle parking spaces for DQs tenants. Mr Jeremy TAM enquired whether a mechanism was in place to allow the Administration to increase the number of motorcycle parking spaces of individual housing developments beyond the standards stipulated in HKPSG according to the needs of the tenants concerned.

88. US for S reiterated that in determining the standards of parking provision in HKPSG, the relevant department would take into account traffic and environmental considerations, rather than simply examining whether there would be enough space in a particular site for parking provision. DPO(FS&YLE)/PD added that the number of parking spaces for cars and motorcycles that could be provided under redevelopment projects should be approved by TD and the Government Property Agency.

89. The Chairman suggested that members should follow up on the issues relating to the criteria for determining the standards of parking provision in HKPSG at the relevant Panel.

Project costs

90. Referring to paragraph 10 of the discussion paper, Ms Tanya CHAN pointed out that the estimated construction cost of the redevelopment project was \$18,568 per square metre of construction floor area in September 2016 prices which the Administration considered comparable to those of similar projects built by the Government. Ms CHAN asked the Administration to explain the type of projects under "similar projects built by the Government" and the principle for putting different projects under the same category.

91. Director for Architectural Services ("DArchS") replied that after making comparison with similar DQs projects (e.g. redevelopment of Kwun Tong staff quarters at Tseung Kwan O and construction of staff quarters for

Correctional Services Department at Tin Wan, Aberdeen) which had been implemented recently, the Administration considered that the construction unit cost of the redevelopment of the DQs at Fan Garden was comparable to those of other similar DQs projects.

92. Mr Wilson OR enquired whether the construction cost of the project would increase if the proposed project could not commence as scheduled due to failure to secure funding. DArchS responded that the redevelopment project was planned to commence in the second quarter of 2017. If the project could not commence as scheduled, the increase in provision for price adjustments would drive up the construction cost.

Traffic and environmental impacts of the proposed redevelopment project

93. Given that the number of DQs units would increase from the existing 99 to 1 184 under the proposed redevelopment project, Ms Tanya CHAN enquired whether the Administration had conducted a traffic impact assessment ("TIA") of the redevelopment project. US for S pointed out that the relevant TIA had been conducted and the findings indicated that the redevelopment project would not have any significant impacts on the traffic in the vicinity.

94. Ms Tanya CHAN was concerned that during the implementation of the proposed redevelopment project, the two important trees which were not registered Old and Valuable Trees would be felled in view of their low survival rate after transplanting. She enquired how the Administration assessed the survival rate of the trees.

95. DArchS responded that in determining whether the trees were suitable for transplanting, the Administration would take into account tree conditions and whether the trees would be compatible with the proposed development. After assessing the conditions of those two trees, professional landscape architects concluded that their survival rate after transplanting would be low.

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

97. The item was voted on and endorsed. Dr YIU Chung-yim requested that this item, i.e. PWSC(2016-17)42, be voted on separately at the relevant FC meeting.

Head 706 - Highways**PWSC(2016-17)43 63TR Shatin to Central Link - construction of railway works – advance works**

98. The Chairman advised that the proposal, i.e. PWSC(2016-17)43, was to increase the approved project estimate of 63TR by \$847.7 million from \$6,254.9 million to \$7,102.6 million in MOD prices in order to cover the cost of the works under the project. The Administration had consulted the Subcommittee on Matters Relating to Railways of the Panel on Transport on the proposal at its meeting on 9 December 2016. The majority of members attending the meeting supported the submission of the proposal to the Subcommittee for consideration. A report on the gist of the discussion of the Subcommittee on Matters Relating to Railways had been tabled at the meeting.

Cost of works

99. Ms Claudia MO and Mr LAU Kwok-fan enquired whether the Administration would make further applications for additional funding for the Shatin to Central Link ("SCL") project in future. Ms MO also enquired about the cost of works for the entire SCL project.

100. In response, Under Secretary for Transport and Housing ("USTH") said that 63TR was the advance works for the construction of railway works for SCL, which included the expansion of Admiralty Station to accommodate SCL railway facilities and construction of ventilation facilities for the station, as well as the construction of the portion of Ho Man Tin Station for SCL. The relevant works had been substantially completed. MTR Corporation Limited ("MTRCL") had come up with a more accurate amount of the additional cost incurred. The Administration was seeking additional funding from FC after detailed scrutiny. No additional funding would be required for 63TR in future.

101. USTH further said that 61TR was to construct the main railway works for SCL. Due to the complexity of works and the fact that the main works were still in progress, MTRCL would not be able to come up with a more realistic assessment on the cost of the main works of SCL until the second half of 2017. After scrutinizing MTRCL's assessment, the Administration would seek additional funding from FC in the 2017-2018 legislative session with a view to continuing the main works.

102. Dr YIU Chung-yim enquired about the amount claimed by contractors in connection with 63TR and the relevant details. The Administration undertook to provide the information requested by Dr YIU after the meeting.

(*Post meeting note:* The supplementary information provided by the Administration (Chinese version) was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC114/16-17\(01\)](#) on 22 March 2017.)

103. Mr Nathan LAW, Dr KWOK Ka-ki and Mr KWONG Chun-yu enquired about the reasons for and details of lowering the project management cost payable to MTRCL. Dr KWOK queried whether the Administration had connived at MTRCL's overcharging of project management cost.

104. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Dr KWOK Ka-ki and Mr KWONG Chun-yu criticized that cost overruns had occurred in a number of railway construction projects in recent years. They opined that the relevant government departments and MTRCL should be held accountable.

105. USTH and Director of Highways ("DHy") replied that in the Administration's funding application for the advance works of SCL in 2011, \$710.5 million was temporarily reserved under 63TR for paying the project management cost to MTRCL for its undertaking of technical studies, design, construction supervision and contract management during the design and construction stages. The amount was tentatively set based on the established rule, i.e. at 16.5% of the project estimate. Subsequently, the Highways Department had appointed an independent consultant to examine the project estimate of SCL. After further negotiation with MTRCL, the Administration lowered the project management cost payable under 63TR to \$498.5 million, resulting in a corresponding decrease in the percentage. USTH said that Dr KWOK Ka-ki's statement about the Administration having connived at MTRCL's overcharging of project management cost was unfounded.

106. Mr Nathan LAW enquired whether the proposed comprehensive development of Wan Chai Sports Ground would have any impact on the construction works and cost of SCL. Projects Director, MTR Corporation Limited ("PD/MTRCL"), replied that part of SCL's alignment would be built underneath Wan Chai Sports Ground. This section of the tunnel had been completed. Any building development on the site of Wan Chai Sports Ground in future must be designed appropriately taking into account the location of this tunnel section of SCL.

Unfavourable ground conditions

107. Mr Nathan LAW, Ms Claudia MO, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Ms Tanya CHAN and Mr Jeremy TAM expressed grave concern about the unfavourable ground conditions encountered in the expansion works of Admiralty Station and the construction works of Ho Man Tin Station, which led to substantial increase in the construction cost. They queried whether MTRCL had carried out appropriate and sufficient ground investigation during the design stage for an accurate grasp of the ground conditions of the works sites.

108. In response, PD/MTRCL said that due to the dense building development and heavy road traffic in the urban area of Hong Kong, there were restrictions on the locations where drill hole investigations could be carried out. Moreover, since the ground conditions in Hong Kong were relatively prone to changes, it was impossible for a ground investigation to completely and accurately reveal the ground conditions within the site area in their entirety. During the design stage, MTRCL had conducted ground investigations with reference to the Geoguide compiled by the Geotechnical Engineering Office ("GEO"), and had followed the recommendations in the Geoguide in terms of the location and number of drill holes.

109. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen enquired whether the Geoguide compiled by GEO would be updated to provide more detailed and accurate guidelines for ground investigation, so as to increase the accuracy of ground investigation results. DHy replied that according to GEO, the Geoguide was used as a reference for engineering personnel in conducting ground investigations. To his knowledge, GEO would not consider revising the Geoguide at the present stage.

110. Ms Tanya CHAN enquired about the time when MTRCL discovered that unfavourable ground conditions were encountered in the construction works of Ho Man Tin Station and the expansion works of Admiralty Station. PD/MTRCL replied that the construction works of Ho Man Tin Station commenced sometime around 2011-2012. When carrying out extensive excavation works sometime around 2012, the construction team discovered that the weathering of the rocky hills in Ho Man Tin was relatively profound. General Manager (Projects), MTRCL, advised that unfavourable ground conditions were encountered in the excavation work for the expanded Admiralty Station sometime around 2012, which impaired the efficiency of the excavation works to a large extent.

111. Ms Tanya CHAN enquired about the membership of the Project Supervision Committee which was set up to monitor the SCL project, and the

time when the said committee was given to know that unfavourable ground conditions were encountered in the construction works of Ho Man Tin Station and the expansion works of Admiralty Station. Mr Jeremy TAM requested the Administration to provide supplementary information on the name of the company which carried out the ground investigations for the excavation works for the expansion of Admiralty Station, and explain why the actual properties of the rocks were different from the geological information obtained by the ground investigations. The Administration undertook to provide the information requested by Ms CHAN and Mr TAM after the meeting.

(Post meeting note: After the meeting on 16 March 2017, Mr Jeremy TAM wrote to the Chairman, elaborating on the supplementary information he sought from the Administration, which included the ground investigations conducted in relation to the excavation works for the expanded Admiralty Station and the excavation works for the shaft of the ventilation building ([LC Paper No. PWSC111/16-17\(01\)](#)) (Chinese version only). The letter was referred to the Administration for follow-up. The supplementary information provided by the Administration (Chinese version) in response to the enquiries from Ms Tanya CHAN and the enquiries and letter from Mr Jeremy TAM was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC114/16-17\(01\)](#) on 22 March 2017.)

Modification of the construction schemes to suit the actual site conditions

112. Mr CHU Hoi-dick and Dr YIU Chung-yim were concerned whether the need to revise the construction schemes of the expanded Admiralty Station and Ho Man Tin Station, which resulted in cost increases, arose from irregularities in the pre-tender preparation work, project design and construction schemes, and how the Administration and MTRCL would prevent recurrence of similar problems.

113. PD/MTRCL reiterated that since the ground conditions in Hong Kong were relatively prone to changes, it was impossible for a ground investigation to completely and accurately reveal the ground conditions within the site area in their entirety. During the design stage, MTRCL had conducted ground investigations with reference to the Geoguide compiled by GEO, and had followed the recommendations in the Geoguide in terms of the location and number of drill holes. During the design and tender preparation stage, MTRCL had assessed the potential risks arising from the ground conditions and estimated the geological conditions of the site based on the geological data and information available at the time, and used them as the referenced geotechnical baseline for both parties in the tendering process. If all the

risks of adverse ground condition were allocated to the tenderer (who would be the contractor), the tender price would likely be increased in order to cover the high risks and hence a higher cost would be incurred.

114. PD/MTRCL added that to suit the actual site conditions, MTRCL had modified the construction schemes of the expanded Admiralty Station and Ho Man Tin Station respectively during construction, with a view to further reducing the risks posed to the railway operation and passengers during the works period of the expansion of Admiralty Station and ensuring the safety of the blasting works of Ho Man Tin Station. To improve the ground investigation work in future, MTRCL had saved in its database the ground investigation information obtained from the two projects and learned from the experience gained from the ground investigation work for the present project.

115. The Chairman advised that the Subcommittee would continue discussion of this item (PWSC(2016-17)43) at the next meeting. The meeting ended at 12:58 pm.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
26 April 2017