For information **PWSCI(1999-2000)24**

NOTE FOR PUBLIC WORKS SUBCOMMITTEE OF FINANCE COMMITTEE

Supplementary information on
260EP - Primary school in Yau Tong Estate redevelopment, phase 2, Yau Tong

INTRODUCTION

When Members considered paper PWSC(98-99)51 on **260EP** – Primary school in Yau Tong Estate redevelopment, phase 2, Yau Tong at the Public Works Sub-committee meeting on 16 December 1998, the Administration undertook to review with the Housing Authority (HA) the appropriateness of the existing arrangements to apportion drainage and external works costs between the HA and Education Department for new schools which are constructed within public housing developments. The Administration also undertook to consider alternative methodologies for calculating such costs based on factors such as population and the provision of drainage/sanitary installations.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S RESPONSE

Existing methodology

2. Under the existing arrangements, the drainage and external works costs for a new school in a public housing development is apportioned as follows –

(a) the cost of external works within the school boundary is borne by the school itself. Such external works include hard and soft landscaping, boundary wall/fences for the school;

(b) the cost of the entire underground drainage system (including those parts in the school grounds and under the housing development) and the total external works for the housing development (excluding those for the school grounds already mentioned in (a) above) is

/apportioned …..

apportioned on a gross floor area[1] (GFA) basis between the school and the public housing development;

(c) the cost of the automatic refuse collection system which serves only the housing estates, and is not shared by the school, is deducted from the cost in (b) above prior to making the apportionment; and

(d) the apportionment of the cost for a school is determined by calculating the GFA of the school as a proportion of the GFA of the relevant development phase of the estate in which the school is to be built.

Revised methodology

3. In response to Members' concerns, the Administration and the HA have considered whether any changes to the existing arrangements were warranted. The following was agreed –

(a) The cost of external works within the school boundary should continue to be borne by the school itself (i.e. no change to paragraph 2(a) above);

(b) the methodology for calculating the cost apportionment as described in paragraphs 2(b) to (d) should continue to be adopted, but the basis for cost apportionment should be changed from GFA to Construction Floor Area[2] (CFA). HA proposes to use CFA as the basis of cost apportionment for all entrusted construction works undertaken by HA, including schools since CFA is commonly used as a basis for cost apportionment in the

/private …..

---

[1] Gross floor area (GFA) of a building is the area contained within the external walls of the building measured at each floor level (including any floor below the level of the ground), together with the area of each balcony in the building, which is calculated from the overall dimensions of the balcony (including the thickness of the sides thereof), and the thickness of the external walls of the building. Floor space that is constructed or intended to be solely used for parking, loading or unloading motor vehicles or occupied solely by machinery or equipment for any lift, air-conditioning or heating system or any similar services may be disregarded.

[2] Construction floor area (CFA) is the total covered area of a building measured on plan to the external face of the external walls after the deduction of light wells and other floorless voids but including lift shafts, vertical ducts, stairs and balconies. This area may exclude canopies, bay windows etc. projecting beyond the external face of building, covered walkway on roof, etc. unless such areas fulfill the functional requirements of the building.

private sector and throughout the profession. In addition, CFA covers the entire construction footprint of a building and includes plant rooms, lift wells and other areas which are not taken into account in the calculation of GFA, but form an integral part of the facilities. The Director of Architectural Services has advised that the difference in cost apportionment arising from such a change is minimal and considers this approach to be acceptable; and

(c) the apportionment of cost should be determined by calculating the CFA of the school as a proportion of the whole estate rather than the particular phase in which the school is built (i.e. paragraph 2(d) would be further amended). This is considered a more equitable arrangement, particularly when some phases may contain a significant proportion of facilities other than housing blocks, e.g. car parks and commercial complexes.

Alternative approaches

4. We have also considered the use of other methodologies for calculating cost apportionment such as population and the provision of drainage/sanitary facilities. However, none of these alternative methods is as consistent or as fair as the CFA approach. For example, it is difficult to apportion population figures to commercial complexes or multi-storey car-parks, both of which are commonly provided in public housing estates. In addition, the provision of drainage/sanitary facilities varies considerably with the design of the housing estate and the facilities available in the development; they therefore do not provide a uniform basis for apportioning the cost of drainage and external works between the school and the estate at large. By comparison, the CFA approach provides a clear cut and practical basis upon which to determine such costs and is therefore considered preferable.

Education and Manpower Bureau and Finance Bureau
October 1999

(W0045/WIN2)