

**立法會**  
***Legislative Council***

LC Paper No. PWSC128/17-18

(These minutes have been seen  
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/F/2/1(10)B

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

**Minutes of the 9<sup>th</sup> meeting  
held in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex  
on Monday, 22 January 2018, at 8:30 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 Starry LEE Wai-king, SBS, JP

Hon CHAN Hak-kan, BBS, JP

Hon Claudia MO

Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP

Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, SBS, JP

Hon YIU Si-wing, BBS

Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP

Hon CHAN Chi-chuen

Hon CHAN Han-pan, JP

Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, SBS, MH, JP

Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP

Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki

Hon Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung, SBS, JP

Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung

Hon Alvin YEUNG

Hon CHU Hoi-dick  
Hon LAM Cheuk-ting  
Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding  
Hon Wilson OR Chong-shing, MH  
Hon Tanya CHAN  
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, JP  
Hon LUK Chung-hung  
Hon KWONG Chun-yu  
Hon Jeremy TAM Man-ho

**Members absent:**

Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP  
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP  
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH  
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan  
Hon Andrew WAN Siu-kin  
Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP  
Hon HO Kai-ming  
Hon HUI Chi-fung  
Hon LAU Kwok-fan, MH  
Dr Hon CHENG Chung-tai

**Public officers attending:**

Mr Raistlin LAU Chun, JP	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) <sup>3</sup>
Mr Vincent MAK Shing-cheung, JP	Deputy Secretary for Development (Works) <sup>2</sup>
Ms Bernadette LINN, JP	Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)
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 Ivan CHUNG Man-kit	Principal Assistant Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands) <sup>5</sup>
Dr LEUNG Siu-fai, JP	Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation
Dr LIU Kwei-kin, JP	Assistant Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (Agriculture)
Mr Albert CHEUNG Ka-lok	Assistant Director of Lands (Specialist) <sup>3</sup>
Ms Lily CHIU Lee-lee	Chief Estate Surveyor (Acquisition) Lands Department
Mrs Sylvia LAM YU Ka-wai, JP	Director of Architectural Services
Mr HUI Chiu-kin	Assistant Director of Architectural Services (Property Services)
Mr Edwin TONG Ka-hung, JP	Director of Drainage Services
Mr LAM Sai-hung, JP	Director of Civil Engineering and Development
Ms Betty CHEUNG Miu-han	Assistant Director of Environmental Protection (Environmental Infrastructure)
Miss Hinny LAM Shuk-yee	Assistant Director of Environmental Protection (Waste Management Policy)
Mr Albert LIU Ho-hoi	Deputy Director of Highways (Acting)
Mr Sam LAM Sai-wing	Chief Engineer (1) (Major Works) Highways Department
Ms Eugenia CHUNG Nga-chi, JP	Assistant Director of Home Affairs (2)

Mr Martin KWAN Wai-cheong	Chief Engineer (Works) Home Affairs Department
Miss Winnie WONG Ming-wai	Secretary-General (Acting) University Grants Committee Secretariat
Mr LEE Sin-wah	Chief Maintenance Surveyor (School Premises Maintenance) Education Bureau
Mr Samuel FAN Kim-fung	Senior Property Services Manager (School Works Section) Education Bureau
Mr KOK Che-leung	Assistant Director of Social Welfare (Subventions)
Mr Kenneth WOO Chi-man	Chief Executive Officer (Subventions/Planning) Social Welfare Department
Mr Sebastian TSE Shu-to	Chief Social Work Officer (Elderly) <sup>2</sup> Social Welfare Department
Mr WONG Chung-leung, JP	Director of Water Supplies (Acting)
Mr Gavin WAH Kwok-kee	Chief Systems Manager (Governance and Resources) Office of the Government Chief Information Officer
Mr Kenneth LEUNG Tak-yan	Chief Civil Engineer (Public Works Programme) Transport and Housing Bureau

**Clerk in attendance:**

Ms Doris LO	Chief Council Secretary (1) <sup>2</sup>
-------------	--

**Staff in attendance:**

Mr Raymond CHOW	Senior Council Secretary (1) <sup>6</sup>
-----------------	---

Ms Mandy LI  
Ms Christina SHIU  
Ms Christy YAU  
Ms Clara LO

Council Secretary (1)2  
Legislative Assistant (1)2  
Legislative Assistant (1)7  
Legislative Assistant (1)8

---

Action

The Chairman advised that there were six funding proposals on the agenda for the meeting, all of which were items carried over from the previous meeting. 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.

**Capital Works Reserve Fund Block Allocations**

**PWSC(2017-18)25 — Provision for Capital Works Reserve Fund block allocations in 2018-19**

2. The Chairman advised that the proposal, i.e. PWSC(2017-18)25, was to seek the approval of an allocation of \$12,490.1 million for the block allocation subheads under the Capital Works Reserve Fund ("CWRF") for 2018-2019.

3. The Chairman further advised that the Administration had consulted the Panel on Development on the proposal on 28 November 2017. The Office of the Government Chief Information Officer had also consulted the Panel on Information Technology and Broadcasting on the proposed block allocation under Head 710 – Computerisation on 13 November 2017. Moreover, the Transport and Housing Bureau had consulted the Panel on Transport on the implementation of Subhead 6101TX – Universal Accessibility Programme under Head 706 – Highways on 17 November 2017. A report on the gist of the discussion of the three Panels was tabled at the meeting.

4. At the invitation of the Chairman, Principal Assistant Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) (Works) briefed members on the proposed block allocations. She said that the block allocations covered a total of about 10 000 projects under 26 subheads for 2018-2019, including landslip preventive works, refurbishment for government buildings, drainage works, waterworks and repairs of highways, etc. Among these projects, about 9 000 were underway. The block allocations mainly served

two purposes: first, to implement minor works; and second, to carry out pre-construction activities for major projects in Category B status.

Review of the block allocations mechanism under the Capital Works Reserve Fund

5. Mr CHU Hoi-dick said that the Finance Committee ("FC") held a special meeting on 28 November 2017 to discuss his request for a review of the block allocations mechanism under CWRP, including the vetting and approving mechanism of controversial projects under individual subheads. At that meeting, members raised a number of suggestions on improving the mechanism. He enquired how the Administration would respond to members' suggestions and when the review of the mechanism would be completed.

6. Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury)3 ("DSFST(T)3") replied that the Administration was still examining members' views on the existing block allocations mechanism raised at the aforesaid special FC meeting. As block allocations involved a large number of projects and any changes made to the existing mechanism might have far-reaching implications, the Administration needed some more time for internal discussion. The review findings would be reported to FC, together with a response to members' comments, as soon as possible.

7. DSFST(T)3 further said that the Administration must obtain FC's approval for the proposed block allocations before 1 April in order not to affect the 9 000-odd projects underway and new projects in the pipeline. The Administration considered that for the time being, it should adhere to the established block allocations mechanism in submitting the relevant funding proposal to the Public Works Subcommittee ("PWSC") for discussion, so that FC could complete its scrutiny by 1 April.

8. Mr CHU Hoi-dick recalled that in the last session, PWSC and FC spent much time on the discussion of controversial projects under the block allocations, such as those related to the development at Wang Chau, Yuen Long. He was concerned how the Administration would deal with members' requests for taking out controversial projects from the proposed block allocations for separate consideration in the current session. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen commented that members requested for taking out controversial projects for separate consideration so that the lengthy discussion of such projects would not affect the progress of the deliberation on the proposed block allocations. The Administration should not see this as a deliberate move by members to delay the scrutiny progress.

9. In reply, DSFST(T)3 said that instead of making a generalized reply, the Administration would consider members' views in the light of individual projects, having regard to their implications on the relevant projects or policy objectives and with respect for the established block allocations mechanism, before providing an appropriate response.

10. The Chairman advised that under its terms of reference, PWSC examined the funding proposals presented by the Administration and made recommendations to FC. While PWSC had no independent functions or powers, all decisions were made by FC. Moreover, PWSC considered the proposed block allocations in accordance with the established mechanism. PWSC had no power to deal with the questions put forth by members in respect of the mechanism, and the handling of such issues should be left to the decision of FC. Unless otherwise directed by FC, PWSC would adhere to the established mechanism in considering the proposed block allocations. At the special meeting of FC on 28 November 2017, no decision was made to change the existing block allocations mechanism.

#### Head 701 – Land Acquisition

##### *1100CA – Compensation and ex-gratia allowances in respect of projects in the Public Works Programme*

11. Members noted that the proposed block allocations included two projects, namely "Resumption of land for the establishment of an agricultural park in Kwu Tung South (phase 1)" and "The establishment of an agricultural park in Kwu Tung South (phase 1) – road works". Mr CHAN Chi-chuen questioned why the Administration bundled the two projects under the proposed block allocations after merely consulting the relevant District Council ("DC") on the development plan of the agricultural park ("Agri-Park"). He requested the Administration to provide the following information on the Agri-Park project: the area of land required to be resumed for the Agri-Park development and the timetable of the related land resumption exercise; the respective numbers of indigenous and non-indigenous households, licensed structures and business operations that were expected to be affected; whether the land resumption was agreed upon by the affected households; and the number of objections received.

12. Assistant Director of Lands (Specialist)3 ("ADL(S)3") replied that the development of the Agri-Park (Phase 1) was expected to require the resumption of some 8.1 hectares of private agricultural land and affect three households (about 12 persons). The timetable of land resumption was subject to the development progress of the Agri-Park (Phase 1) and had not yet finalized for the time being. Nonetheless, as the land resumption

exercise might possibly commence in 2018-2019 according to preliminary estimations, the two related land resumption compensation proposals were included under the proposed block allocations for 2018-2019.

13. Dr Fernando CHEUNG pointed out that as far as he understood, the aforesaid 8.1 hectares of private agricultural land was active farmland and the three affected households might not directly benefit from the land resumption compensation as they were only tenants. He believed that the original objective of establishing the Agri-Park was to promote agriculture development. However, he was concerned that the Administration's land resumption exercise would instead damage the existing active farmland and force the farmers who had been farming there to move out. He was also concerned that the future Agri-Park might focus only on the development of high-tech farming which was capital intensive and beyond the affordability of farmers in general. Dr CHEUNG enquired whether the Administration had considered other development options for the Agri-Park, and whether it could ensure that the arrangements for the affected tenants to relocate to and re-establish their farms in the Agri-Park in future would facilitate a seamless transition. In this connection, he sought details of the relevant arrangements, including the area of the agricultural land earmarked for re-establishment of farms and the relocation schedule. Dr CHEUNG also urged the Administration to consider taking out these two controversial projects related to Agri-Park development from the proposed block allocations for separate consideration.

14. Mr CHU Hoi-dick concurred that the Administration should ensure that the soil and water quality in the Agri-Park was comparable to the conditions of the original farmland of the farmers, and ask those farmers to move out only after having confirmed that they were satisfied with the re-establishment of their farms in the Agri-Park.

15. Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation ("DAFC") said that for the farmers affected by the land resumption related to the Agri-Park project, the Administration had undertaken that arrangements would be made to give them priority for leasing farmland in the Agri-Park (Phase 1), and it would help them re-establish their farms in the Agri-Park, including assisting them in enhancing their farming techniques so that they needed not make heavy investments. He said that phase 1 of the Agri-Park covered an area of about 11 hectares, most of which would be used for agricultural purpose. It would also be further demarcated into different areas for conventional, organic and modern technological farming. In implementing the Agri-Park project, the Administration would draw up specific plans on the re-establishment of individual farms according to the actual circumstances of the affected farmers prior to their relocation. In addition, officials of the



Civil Engineering and Development Department and representatives of the engineering consultant would be present when the staff of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department conducted consultations with the affected farmers, so as to ensure that they could understand first-hand the farmers' various concerns and hence properly address those concerns in mapping out the Agri-Park project.

16. Mr LAM Cheuk-ting sought specific details of the Agri-Park project. Apart from the affected farmers mentioned above, he also enquired whether the farmers affected by the land resumption in the North East New Territories New Development Areas would be allowed to lease farmland in the Agri-Park (Phase 1), and whether arrangements would be made in future so that the squatters currently residing within the Agri-Park development site could continue to live in their squatter huts after the completion of the Agri-Park.

17. Ms Claudia MO opined that the responses given by government officials on the Agri-Park were hollow and failed to allay members' concerns. She was also concerned that the Administration only sought to obtain funding related to the Agri-Park development without sincerely addressing the demands of the affected farmers.

18. ADL(S)3 explained again that the Lands Department ("LandsD") would be responsible for arranging compensation for land acquisition, damaged crops, etc., and rehousing of those who were affected (such as processing the registration of the eligible persons and verifying their eligibility). As for the specific arrangements of farm re-establishment, the Administration would finalize the relevant arrangements upon confirmation of the development timetable of the Agri-Park (Phase 1). DAFC reiterated that the Administration would do its best to minimize the impact of the Agri-Park project on the farmers concerned.

19. Dr KWOK Ka-ki commented that since the last-term Government had announced the implementation of the New Agriculture Policy ("NAP"), the Panel on Food Safety and Environmental Hygiene ("FSEH Panel") had yet to hold in-depth discussion of the subject. He commented that the Administration should not submit the funding proposal related to the Agri-Park development before the various initiatives under NAP (including the Agri-Park) had been discussed by the relevant Panels.

20. Mr CHU Hoi-dick concurred with Dr KWOK. He was dissatisfied that the Administration only provided the FSEH Panel with an information paper on "Progress of the Major Initiatives under the New Agriculture Policy" but did not give a briefing on the subject at a Panel meeting to allow

members to express their views. In this connection, Mr CHU and Dr KWOK requested the Administration to advise on the time when it would meet with members of the FSEH Panel to discuss the Agri-Park project.

21. DAFC replied that following the announcement of NAP, the Administration had reported to the FSEH Panel the implementation progress of the policy on a number of occasions. The Administration had also consulted the relevant DC and stakeholders on the Agri-Park project, and would maintain liaison with the local stakeholders on the project. As the Agri-Park project was still at the detailed study stage, the Administration would timely report its progress to the Panel. Assistant Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (Agriculture) also undertook that once a detailed development plan for the Agri-Park was available, the Administration would consult the FSEH Panel on the plan and submit the funding proposal for consideration by PWSC and FC. Members would have ample opportunities to express their views on the Agri-Park development.

22. DSFST(T)3 explained that the funding request was to provide the expected required funding in 2018-2019 for the projects underway and new projects to be commenced according to the current forecast of the Administration. However, the Administration might revise the project list to cater for changing circumstances and evolving needs. The two new projects related to the Agri-Park project (i.e. "Resumption of land for the establishment of an agricultural park in Kwu Tung South (phase 1)" and "The establishment of an agricultural park in Kwu Tung South (phase 1) – road works") which had aroused members' concerns were enabling items to dovetail with the implementation of associated works, so as to cover the payment of land resumption compensation and ex-gratia allowances arising from the associated works. According to the rough project time frame at present, the earmarked provision might not be used until the latter part of 2018-2019. Although the Administration would consult the FSEH Panel on the Agri-Park project in due course, the two new projects had to be included in the block allocations for 2018-2019, so as not to miss the timing to earmark funding. Nonetheless, as to whether and when the provision would be actually used, it would depend on the actual progress of project implementation and other factors.

23. ADL(S)3 echoed that LandsD would use the funding provided under the two projects only after the implementation of Agri-Park (Phase 1) had been confirmed in order to commence the land resumption work.

24. The Chairman remarked that under the current mechanism, the amount of funding involved in each item covered by the proposed block allocations mostly did not exceed \$30 million, except for those under certain

subheads such as compensation on land resumption. For any projects that incurred a cost exceeding the financial ceiling, the Administration should consult the relevant Panel(s) separately before submitting the funding proposal to PWSC and FC for consideration. The Chairman commented that as the estimated funding for land resumption compensation required flexibility, items related to land resumption compensation were not subject to any financial ceilings under the current block allocations mechanism. To facilitate project implementation, it was necessary to make provision for the required funding in the financial year concerned.

25. Mr Alvin YEUNG enquired whether, apart from the two projects related to the Agri-Park project, other project items involving major policies but not yet discussed by the relevant Panels were included in the proposed block allocations.

26. DSFST(T)3 reiterated that the Administration had all along adhered to the established mechanism by consulting the relevant Panels on the main works (including the development project of the Agri-Park). However, as the proposal of block allocations should be submitted well before the beginning of the coming financial year in order to obtain approval by 1 April, and that of the main works could be submitted later, there would be a time gap in between. If the estimated expenditures of the items related to land resumption compensation were not included in the proposed block allocations, the Administration would miss the opportunity to earmark the funding concerned. He reiterated that the relevant government departments had made it clear that the land resumption work would commence only after FC had approved the funding for the Agri-Park (Phase 1).

27. Regarding the road works for the establishment of Agri-Park (Phase 1), Dr Fernando CHEUNG pointed out that the Agri-Park would only be used for general farming purpose. He therefore questioned the need to build a new and wide carriageway in the Agri-Park. He requested the Administration to provide justifications for building the carriageway.

28. DAFC pointed out that apart from agricultural land, the Agri-Park would also comprise a visitor centre. It was therefore necessary to build a new carriageway, which would occupy about one hectare of land, for use by farmers and visitors. Director of Civil Engineering and Development ("DCED") supplemented that based on the findings of the engineering feasibility study for the Agri-Park, a single two-lane carriageway would be built in the Agri-Park (Phase 1).

29. Dr Fernando CHEUNG further said that information such as the traffic volume of the new carriageway during peak hours was redacted from

the report of the engineering feasibility study for the Agri-Park provided by the Administration for members' reference ([LC Paper No. PWSC84/17-18\(02\)](#)) (Chinese version). In this connection, he requested the Administration to provide supplementary information setting out the designed traffic volume of the carriageway and the number of visitors to be attracted. Mr CHU Hoi-dick was also dissatisfied that many parts of the feasibility study report were redacted. He requested the Administration to provide a unredacted version of the report so that members could fully grasp the contents therein.

30. The Administration agreed to provide the supplementary information requested by Dr Fernando CHEUNG. However, DAFC pointed out that given the sensitive information contained in the feasibility study report, it was not appropriate to disclose the full report at this stage in order not to affect the Agri-Park project.

*(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC95/17-18\(01\)](#) (Chinese version) on 29 January 2018.)*

31. As the contents of some questions put forward by members involved the Government's policy on Agri-Park development, the Chairman reminded members that they should follow up on such policy issues at the relevant Panel(s).

### Head 703 – Buildings

#### *3004GX – Refurbishment of government buildings for items in Category D of the Public Works Programme*

32. Mr YIU Si-wing said that as the proposed block allocations involved a large number of livelihood-related projects, he hoped that the proposal could be endorsed as soon as possible. In view of the aging facilities in the Hong Kong Zoological and Botanical Gardens ("HKZBG"), Mr YIU enquired whether the Administration had plans to enhance the attractiveness of HKZBG by improving its overall planning, increasing the number of animal species being shown, stepping up publicity, etc. apart from the proposed refurbishment of the aviary cages no. 16, 18 and 19. He also enquired about the number of local residents and visitors to Hong Kong who had visited HKZBG in each of the past three years.

33. In response, Director of Architectural Services ("DArchS") said that the aviary cages no. 16, 18 and 19 in HKZBG which were built in 1975 required refurbishment. The Architectural Services Department would relay

the concerns of Mr YIU to the Leisure and Cultural Services Department, which was responsible for the operation of HKZBG. The Administration would also provide the supplementary information requested by Mr YIU after the meeting.

*(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC95/17-18\(01\)](#) (Chinese version) on 29 January 2018.)*

*3100GX – Project feasibility studies, minor investigations and consultants' fees for items in Category D of the Public Works Programme*

34. Regarding the project on "Community health centre and social welfare facilities building in Siu Sai Wan – minor investigations and consultants' fees", Ms Alice MAK was concerned about the completion time of the building. Given that the project had already been discussed at length, she urged the Administration to commence the works as soon as possible.

35. DArchS replied that the Administration had to ascertain the feasibility of constructing the community health centre and social welfare facilities building in Siu Sai Wan based on the site investigation findings. Once the project feasibility was confirmed, the local DC would be consulted accordingly and the funding proposal of the project was expected to be submitted to LegCo in 2019.

Head 707 – New Towns and Urban Area Development

36. Ms Alice MAK noticed that under Head 707 – New Towns and Urban Area Development, the provision for 2018-2019 was 5.3% less than the allocation in 2017-2018. Similarly, the provision under Head 711 – Housing for 2018-2019 was also 20.9% less than the allocation in 2017-2018. She questioned why the Administration cut back on the expenses under the two heads of expenditure related to housing supply amidst the huge demand for housing in Hong Kong.

37. Chief Civil Engineer (Public Works Programme), Transport and Housing Bureau, explained that Head 711 covered minor works and studies related to housing projects, which normally involved the advance works of those projects. The number of projects under Head 711 for 2018-2019 were similar to that of 2017-2018. The percentage change in the amount of allocation was a reflection of the different cashflow requirements of the projects funded in these two years.

*7016CX – District Minor Works Programme*

38. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen said that he had been urging the Administration to build pet gardens. Citing the project on "Construction of a pet garden in Sheung Shing Street Park" as an example, Mr CHAN sought details of the pet garden concerned, including its size and the time of completion. Mr CHAN also enquired whether there were other pet garden projects under the proposed block allocations.

39. In response, Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department, said that the project on "Construction of a pet garden in Sheung Shing Street Park" mainly involved works such as the provision of fences, dog excreta collection bins and taps, and was expected to complete in March 2018. Assistant Director of Home Affairs (2) ("ADHA(2)") supplemented that the projects under 7016CX – District Minor Works Programme included various minor works initiated by DCs. There were other pet garden projects which were being implemented under the subhead (e.g. the project underneath Ferry Street Flyover). The inclusion of new pet garden projects in the proposed block allocations would depend on the decisions of DCs in the coming year.

40. Ms Claudia MO opined that from the perspective of protecting animal rights, the Administration should consider renaming "pet gardens" as "animal gardens".

*7017CX – Signature Project Scheme*

41. Expressing opposition to the construction of music fountains at Kwun Tong Promenade, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen enquired about the use of the project estimate of the project on "Pre-construction works, consultancy fee and study for construction of music fountains at Kwun Tong Promenade (Kwun Tong District)", and whether the Administration would make use of the project estimate only after FC had approved the funding for the main works of the music fountains.

42. Mr Jeremy TAM noted that the Administration had included "Pre-construction works, consultancy fee and study for construction of music fountains at Kwun Tong Promenade (Kwun Tong District)" under the proposed block allocations despite the opposition of quite a number of members to the construction of the music fountains at Kwun Tong Promenade. He requested the Administration to clarify whether the construction works of the music fountains would be taken forward.

43. ADHA(2) replied that the scope of 7017CX comprised the cost of preparatory and pre-construction works, consultants' fees for contract procurement, etc. of the works-related components of projects under the Signature Project Scheme ("SPS"). The Administration would prepare tender documents and pay the relevant consultants' fees either before or after FC had approved the funding for the main works as appropriate. The funding proposals for the main works of SPS projects would be submitted for consideration by PWSC in accordance with the progress of various project items. As regards the music fountain project at Kwun Tong Promenade, the Panel on Home Affairs was consulted in December 2017 and Panel members supported the main works. The Administration would submit the funding proposal of the main works for consideration by PWSC and FC in due course. The project estimate provided for "Pre-construction works, consultancy fee and study for construction of music fountains at Kwun Tong Promenade (Kwun Tong District)" would be used to cover expenses such as consultants' fees for tender preparation and contract procurement. At this stage, the Government did not intend to invite tenders for the main works of the music fountain project before obtaining FC's funding approval for the main works.

*7100CX – New towns and urban area works, studies and investigations for items in Category D of the Public Works Programme*

44. Mr Holden CHOW said that the planning and engineering study for re-planning of Tseung Kwan O Area 137 was expected to complete in 2019 as advised by the Administration earlier. He enquired whether the Administration could complete the study ahead of schedule and consult the public on the study findings.

45. In response, DCED said that the Administration would complete the planning and engineering study for re-planning of Tseung Kwan O Area 137 in 2019 and consult the public on the study findings.

46. Mr Holden CHOW referred to the preliminary feasibility study on traffic and transport for Lantau, the coastal road between Tung Chung and Tai O and connection between North Lantau and Mui Wo. He opined that the construction of a coastal road between Tung Chung and Tai O could help improve the traffic conditions in the area, and enquired when the Administration could complete the feasibility study and consult the public on the study findings (including the proposed coastal road).

47. DCED said that the coastal road between Tung Chung and Tai O was one of the topics of the Administration's studies on the overall traffic and transport for Lantau. The main part of the study was expected to complete within this year and the public would be consulted on the study findings.

48. Dr KWOK Ka-ki was concerned that the construction of the coastal road between Tung Chung and Tai O would only benefit the owners of small houses and developers holding large plots of land in the area, but would cause irreversible damage to the environment of South Lantau. He requested the Administration to explain how it would make use of the project estimate of the feasibility study, and whether it would commence the feasibility study only after consulting the public on the coastal road proposal and reaching a consensus in the community.

49. DCED explained that the project estimate would be used to cover the expenses of engaging consultants to conduct the preliminary study on the traffic and transport for Lantau, the coastal road between Tung Chung and Tai O and the connection between North Lantau and Mui Wo, examining the environmental implications of the projects, and conducting public consultation on the study findings.

#### Head 708 – Capital Subventions

##### *8100QX – Alterations, additions, repairs and improvements to education subvented buildings*

50. Mr Alvin YEUNG enquired about the impact of the conversion works of Hong Chi Morninghill School, Tsui Lam, on the students of the special school in aspects such as their access to the school campus. Mr YEUNG also noticed that a number of special schools under Hong Chi Association were located close to the project site of the public housing developments at Area 9, Tai Po, and Chung Nga Road, where site formation and infrastructure works were in progress. He was concerned about the impact of such works on the students of those special schools in aspects such as their access to the school campuses.

51. In response, Chief Maintenance Surveyor (School Premises Maintenance), Education Bureau, said that the conversion works of Hong Chi Morninghill School, Tsui Lam, involved building a new wing, for which construction works were underway. The building contractor maintained close liaison with the school management and had introduced measures to provide separate accesses for works vehicles and students. The impact of the conversion works on the students concerned would not be significant.

52. The Chairman added that when PWSC deliberated on the site formation and infrastructure works for the public housing developments at Area 9, Tai Po, and Chung Nga Road, the Administration had indicated that



corresponding arrangements would be made to minimize the impact of the works on the special schools in the vicinity.

*8001SX – Provisioning of welfare facilities*

53. Mr Jeremy TAM enquired about the details of the projects on "Provisioning of a hostel for severely physically handicapped persons at Anderson Road public housing development" and "Provisioning of a care and attention home for severely disabled persons at Anderson Road public housing development", including the locations of the two facilities, whether they would share any common space and the respective numbers of service places.

54. Assistant Director of Social Welfare (Subventions) ("ADSW(S)") replied that the hostel for severely physically handicapped persons and the care and attention home for severely disabled persons would be provided on different floors of an ancillary facilities block near On Tai Estate. The two facilities would each provide 50 service places.

55. Mr Holden CHOW noticed that according to the papers provided earlier by the Administration for Tai Po DC, the Administration planned to provide five social welfare facilities, namely a child care centre, a day care centre for the elderly, an early education and training centre, a residential care home for the elderly and a centre of integrated support service for persons with severe physical disabilities, in the public housing development at Chung Nga Road East, Tai Po. However, the proposed block allocations only covered the works of two facilities, i.e. the child care centre and the day care centre for the elderly. Mr CHOW urged the Administration to commence the works of the remaining three facilities as soon as possible, and enquired whether the Administration would include the works of the three facilities under the proposed block allocations; if so, the time when the works would be included.

56. ADSW(S) said that the five social welfare facilities mentioned above would be provided in the social welfare facilities block in the public housing development at Chung Nga Road East, Tai Po. The Panel on Welfare Services had been consulted and supported the proposed social welfare facilities in the social welfare facilities block. The project cost of the residential care home for the elderly would be funded by the Lotteries Fund, while that of the four other facilities was subsumed under the block allocations. The relevant works had already commenced and the progress would continue to be monitored by the Social Welfare Department.

Head 709 – Waterworks

*9100WX – Waterworks, studies and investigations for items in Category D of the Public Works Programme*

57. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen enquired about the details of the project on "Condition survey on Dongjiang water mains", including the scope of the survey, whether a survey had been conducted previously on the water mains concerned, and whether the surveying work would be on-going in future.

58. Director of Water Supplies (Acting) explained that as the length of the Dongjiang water mains spanned dozens of kilometres, and had been in use for more than 30 years in general, the Administration had already surveyed the condition of the water mains in phases. The provision being sought in the funding request would be used to carry out a condition survey on the water mains which had not been surveyed. It was not necessary to conduct an on-going condition survey on every section of the water mains. Normally, condition surveys on water mains were conducted at regular intervals.

*[During the meeting, some observers spoke loudly in the public gallery and an applause was heard. The Chairman repeatedly reminded observers that they must behave themselves, and must not shout or applaud.]*

*[At 8:44 am, the Chairman announced that the meeting be suspended for two minutes. The meeting resumed at 8:46 am.]*

59. The Chairman said that PWSC would continue to discuss this item at the next meeting. The meeting ended at 10:30 am.