

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)361/06-07
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/PL/PLW/1

Panel on Planning, Lands and Works

Minutes of meeting
held on Tuesday, 24 October 2006 at 2:30 pm
in Conference Room A of the Legislative Council Building

Members present : Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBM, GBS, JP (Chairman)
Hon Patrick LAU Sau-shing, SBS, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai, SBS, S.B.St.J., JP
Dr Hon LUI Ming-wah, SBS, JP
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon Bernard CHAN, GBS, JP
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP
Hon Mrs Sophie LEUNG LAU Yau-fun, SBS, JP
Hon WONG Yung-kan, JP
Hon Miriam LAU Kin-yea, GBS, JP
Hon CHOY So-yuk, JP
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon LEE Wing-tat
Hon LI Kwok-ying, MH, JP
Hon Daniel LAM Wai-keung, SBS, JP
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming, SBS, JP

Member attending : Hon Mrs Selina CHOW LIANG Shuk-yea, GBS, JP

Members absent : Hon James TIEN Pei-chun, GBS, JP
Hon Albert HO Chun-yan
Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, GBS, JP
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, JP
Hon Vincent FANG Kang, JP

Public officers attending : Agenda item IV

Mr Michael SUEN, GBS, JP
Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands

Mrs Rita LAU, JP
Permanent Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands
(Planning and Lands)

Mr Philip YUNG, JP
Deputy Secretary for the Environment, Transport and
Works (Transport) 1

Ms Maisie CHENG
Deputy Commissioner for Tourism
Economic Development and Labour Bureau

Mr Francis CHENG
Principal Assistant Secretary for Economic Development
and Labour (Economic Development) A2

Miss Janet WONG
Principal Assistant Secretary for Home Affairs
(Recreation and Sport)

Miss Ophelia WONG
Deputy Director of Planning/District

Mr KWAN Pak-lam, JP
Project Manager/Kowloon
Civil Engineering and Development Department

Mr Talis WONG
Chief Engineer/Kowloon
Civil Engineering and Development Department

Agenda item V

Ms Maisie CHENG
Deputy Commissioner for Tourism
Economic Development and Labour Bureau

Miss Ophelia WONG
Deputy Director of Planning/District

Mr KWAN Pak-lam, JP
Project Manager/Kowloon
Civil Engineering and Development Department

Mr Talis WONG
Chief Engineer/Kowloon
Civil Engineering and Development Department

Clerk in attendance : Ms Anita SIT
Chief Council Secretary (1)4

Staff in attendance : Mr WONG Siu-yee
Senior Council Secretary (1)7

Ms Christina SHIU
Legislative Assistant (1)7

Action

Procedural matter

The Chairman informed members that he would need to leave at around 4:00 pm in order to attend and host a ceremony of the Heung Yee Kuk. The Deputy Chairman would take over the chair thereafter.

2. The Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (SHPL) informed members that he would also attend the same ceremony and thus had to leave the meeting before 4:30 pm. As there was a request from Panel members for his attendance at Agenda Item VI - "Planning issues relating to the reprovisioning of the Star Ferry Pier in Central including the proposed preservation of the building structure and clock tower of the existing Star Ferry Pier", which was scheduled for 4:20 pm to 4:55 pm, he suggested that the item be deferred to another meeting. Members agreed to defer the item to another meeting to be held as soon as practicable.

I Confirmation of minutes

(LC Paper No. CB(1)90/06-07

-- Minutes of meeting on
12 October 2006)

3. The minutes of the meeting held on 12 October 2006 were confirmed.

II Information papers issued since the meeting on 25 July 2006

- (LC Paper No. CB(1)2132/05-06(01) -- Information paper on "112CD – Drainage improvement in Northern New Territories – package A" provided by the Administration
- LC Paper No. CB(1)2244/05-06(01) -- Extract of the minutes of the meeting between Legislative Council Members and Tuen Mun District Council members on 11 May 2006 on "Complementary measures of the Mandatory Building Inspection Scheme"
- LC Paper No. CB(1)2246/05-06(01) -- Submission dated 15 September 2006 from蒲崗里物業招標工作小組 on "Proposals to lower the compulsory sale threshold for specified classes of lots under the Land (Compulsory Sale for Redevelopment) Ordinance"
- LC Paper Nos. CB(1)77/06-07(01) & (02) -- Issues raised by Tuen Mun District Council members at the meeting with Legislative Council Members on 11 May 2006 on "General land use planning in Tuen Mun District" and the Administration's response
- LC Paper Nos. CB(1)78/06-07(01), (02) & (03) -- Issues raised by Yau Tsim Mong District Council Members at the meeting with Legislative Council Members on 22 June 2006 on "Efficiency of enforcement action by the Buildings Department on unauthorized building works" and the Administration's response
- LC Paper No. CB(1)81/06-07(01) -- Information paper on "238WF -- Mainlaying between Sham Tseng and So Kwun Tan" provided by the Administration

LC Paper Nos. CB(1)125/06-07(01), -- Issues raised by Sham Shui Po
(02) and (03) District Council members at
the meeting with Legislative
Council Members on
8 June 2006 on "Regulation of
signboards" and the
Administration's response)

4. Members noted the information papers issued since last meeting.

III Items for discussion at the next meeting

(LC Paper No. CB(1)89/06-07(02) -- List of outstanding items for
discussion

LC Paper No. CB(1)89/06-07(03) -- List of follow-up actions)

5. Members agreed that the item on "Wan Chai Development Phase II -
Concept Plan" proposed by the Administration would be discussed at the next
regular meeting scheduled for 28 November 2006.

IV Kai Tak Planning Review – Revised Preliminary Outline Development Plan

(LC Paper No. CB(1)89/06-07(01) -- Information paper provided by
the Administration

LC Paper No. CB(1)89/06-07(04) -- Background brief on "Kai Tak
Planning Review" prepared by
the Legislative Council
Secretariat)

6. SHPL said that a new mode of planning with emphasis on public
participation had been adopted for the Kai Tak Planning Review. After going
through three stages of public participation, the Administration had prepared a
revised Preliminary Outline Development Plan (PODP). He added that the public
longed for early implementation of the developments in Kai Tak, especially the
public rental housing and the Cruise Terminal. He then highlighted the key
amendments to the PODP made in response to the requests of the public, which
were detailed in the Administration's paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)89/06-07(01)).

7. The Deputy Director of Planning/District (DD of Plan) gave a PowerPoint
presentation to brief members on the outcome of the Stage 3 Public Participation
and the detailed proposals in the revised PODP.

*(Post-meeting note: The revised PODP and the presentation notes (LC
Paper Nos. CB(1)163/06-07(01) and (02) respectively) tabled at the
meeting were subsequently issued to members on 25 October 2006.)*

General comments, connectivity with neighbouring districts and transport infrastructure

8. Mr CHAN Kam-lam welcomed the Administration's adoption of a number of suggestions put forward by the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong (DAB). DAB in general supported the proposals in the revised PODP. As regards connection with Kwun Tong, DAB, Kwun Tong District Council and many Kwun Tong residents supported the bridge link connecting Kwun Tong with Kai Tak. For the monorail system, he suggested that the system be extended to Kwun Tong town centre by using the site of the existing fire station as one of its terminals if relocation of the fire station was feasible. He also asked whether the two breakwaters in the Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter could be demolished to compensate for the area of reclamation required for constructing the bridge link.

9. Mr Albert CHAN expressed disappointment at the revised PODP and considered it haphazard town planning resulting from political deals. The current planning failed to meet public aspirations as the best locations were designated for the Cruise Terminal, Heliport and hotels, rather than for facilities to be used by the general public. He indicated that he would support conducting a feasibility study to implement a monorail system for the whole of Hong Kong. However, he had reservation over the construction of a monorail system for Kai Tak alone. He was worried that fares would be high and the system would repeat the failure of the Light Transit Railway.

10. In response, DD of Plan explained that the feasibility of implementing a monorail system would need further study. While it was the planning intention to extend the system to Kwun Tong town centre, the proposal might affect private land and had to be carefully studied. While the Kwun Tong Public Cargo Working Area (KTPCWA) might be decommissioned in the long run, there was a need to retain the Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter and, as such, the two breakwaters could not be demolished.

11. Noting that the proposed bridge link to Kwun Tong would depend on the decommissioning of KTPCWA, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming enquired about the timeframe for decommissioning KTPCWA. In reply, SHPL said that the bridge link to Kwun Tong, which might require reclamation, would depend on the results of further detailed investigation. While there was no definite timeframe at present for decommissioning KTPCWA, suitable arrangement would have to be made to reprovision the PCWA before decommissioning. The bridge link shown on the revised PODP would take the form of a land reserve for the purpose.

12. Dr KWOK Ka-ki commented that any necessary reclamation for the bridge link to Kwun Tong should be considered based on the need to facilitate the public's access to the facilities located in Kai Tak, rather than based on the interests of developers who would develop commercial developments in Kai Tak.

13. In order to provide better linkage to the Hung Hom area, Miss CHOY So-yuk suggested that consideration be given to constructing a bridge link from the middle part of the former runway to Hung Hom by utilizing the breakwater at the To Kwa Wan Typhoon Shelter. In reply, DD of Plan pointed out that unlike the proposed bridge link to Kwun Tong, which would only be some 500 metres long, a bridge to Hung Hom would be some 1 500 to 2 000 metres long and its construction would be impossible without reclamation. As the Central Kowloon Route would also serve Kai Tak, it was unlikely that constructing the suggested bridge by reclamation could meet the "overriding public need test". Furthermore, Hung Hom was a congested built-up area, it would be difficult to find adequate space for the bridge landing without affecting private land.

14. Noting that there would be inadequate landing space for the bridge at Hung Hom, Miss CHOY So-yuk further suggested that consideration be given to constructing a bridge to connect Kai Tak with Tsim Sha Tsui East so as to link up the two tourist districts.

15. Mr Albert CHAN expressed concern on the undesirable effects of constructing highways that would run through Kai Tak. Expressing a similar concern, the Deputy Chairman asked whether Trunk Road T2 would lead to noise pollution in Kai Tak because part of it would be built at-grade.

16. In reply, DD of Plan explained that the majority of the roads in Kai Tak would circumscribe instead of running through Kai Tak. The roads in Kai Tak would be designed in such a way that only vehicles destined for a certain area would enter that area. The commercial developments along Prince Edward Road East could also serve as a barrier screening the traffic noise generated by Prince Edward Road East. As Trunk Road T2 would be connected with the Central Kowloon Route, a very small part of Trunk Road T2 would be at ground level to provide an interchange in Kai Tak for traffic from East Kowloon and Central Kowloon. Except for that small part, most parts of Trunk Road T2 would be built in the form of a tunnel and therefore noise pollution should not be a problem.

17. While commending the revised PODP for its reduced development intensity and increased open space, Mr LEE Wing-tat considered that the development of Kai Tak should create opportunities and benefits for the neighbouring districts. There should be good integration of Kai Tak with the neighbouring districts so as to avoid segregation and there should be enhancement works for those districts. In this regard, he urged the Administration to ensure easy access to Kai Tak from the neighbouring districts. In reply, SHPL said that there would be an underground walkway connecting Kowloon City with Kai Tak. For connection with Kwun Tong, the feasibility of a monorail system would be investigated. There would be sufficient connection with other important transport networks such as the proposed Shatin to Central Link (SCL) and Trunk Road T2 to connect Kai Tak with other areas. Facilities such as the Cruise Terminal, Tourism

Node and Multi-purpose Stadium Complex (Stadium Complex) would be able to attract people to Kai Tak.

18. Mr James TO commended the Administration for having assimilated the views of different sectors of the community into the revised PODP and he considered that it was the most satisfactory development plan that he had seen recently. While considering it appropriate to connect Kowloon City with Kai Tak by an underground walkway, he expressed concern on the adequacy of pedestrian access facilities to connect Kai Tak with other neighbouring districts. Drawing reference from West Kowloon Reclamation, he urged the Administration to further strengthen accessibility to Kai Tak. In response, DD of Plan advised that 21 pedestrian crossings had already been planned to connect Kai Tak with the neighbouring districts. She assured members that there would be easy access to Kai Tak from the various neighbouring districts.

Multi-purpose Stadium Complex and Metro Park

19. Mr CHAN Kam-lam expressed concern that the Stadium Complex might affect the integrity of the Metro Park and there might be difficulties in attaining a good design for the portion of the Metro Park located at the 600-metre deck above the opening of the former runway. He was also concerned about the intensity of the residential developments near the Metro Park and suggested that consideration could be given to relocating those developments so as to enhance the openness of the Metro Park.

20. In response, SHPL explained that the planning intention was that the Stadium Complex would be integrated with the Metro Park. The distributor road lying in-between the main stadium and the secondary stadium and the Central Kowloon Route would be sunken roads so as to avoid segregation of the Metro Park. DD of Plan said that the 600-metre deck above the opening of the former runway would be more suitable for constructing the Metro Park than for other building developments. As regards intensity of the residential developments, she pointed out that the intensity of residential developments near the Metro Park would be lower than that of other districts in Kowloon. She emphasized that apart from the Metro Park, there would be a comprehensive and well-connected open space network in the area.

21. Dr KWOK Ka-ki pointed out that details of the facilities in the Metro Park and other open space were not provided and no provision had been made for a site for organizing water sports activities. In response, DD of Plan explained that the facilities to be provided inside the Metro Park and other open space would be considered at the detailed design stage and the public would be duly consulted on the detailed design.

22. Mr Albert CHAN considered it a planning blunder to provide a mega sports stadium in Kai Tak and queried the appropriateness of locating the Metro Park next to the To Kwa Wan Typhoon Shelter. In response, DD of Plan pointed

out that vessels would use the To Kwa Wan Typhoon Shelter mainly during typhoons and the view from the Metro Park would not be affected for most of the time. Planning the Metro Park at the present location would provide a continuous stretch of open space along the waterfront which was requested by the public as revealed in the public participation exercise.

23. The Deputy Chairman also had reservation on the proposed location of the Metro Park and asked whether it could be relocated nearer to the central part of Kai Tak. Noting that the drawings showed that there would be many water features in the Metro Park, he enquired whether it was Government plan to provide water features. In reply, DD of Plan explained that the location of the Metro Park was constrained by the presence of the Kai Tak Tunnel which would continue to operate. Besides, placing the Stadium Complex at the waterfront would enable it to serve as an icon in the Victoria Harbour, and the arrangement could realize the stadium-in-the-park concept in providing a lot of greening areas around the Stadium Complex. The location would provide a catalyst to rejuvenate the old areas and was supported by the Kowloon City community and the sports sector. As for the water features in the Metro Park, she clarified that the drawings were for illustration purposes only and such ideas would be considered at the detailed design stage after consultation. She however remarked that there had been many suggestions from the public for incorporating more water features in the area.

Kai Tak Approach Channel

24. Mr WONG Yung-kan expressed concern on whether bioremediation could effectively solve the environmental problems at the Kai Tak Approach Channel (KTAC) and asked when the detailed report of the treatment results would be available. He considered that the whole Kai Tak development plan, however good it might be, would be ruined if the environmental problems at KTAC could not be solved satisfactorily.

25. Mrs Selina CHOW welcomed that the revised PODP had adopted many suggestions of the Liberal Party in various aspects such as the monorail system, Cruise Terminal and Heliport. As regards KTAC, she expressed concern that bioremediation could not guarantee that the odour problem would be completely solved. Failing to solve the odour problem at KTAC would affect the image of Kai Tak, especially in relation to developing the Cruise Terminal and Tourism Node in Kai Tak.

26. In response, the Permanent Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands) (PSPL) said that the data collected from the treatment tests carried out during different seasons would be available for analysis by the end of 2006. The Administration planned to create a 600-metre opening at the northern end of the runway to improve water circulation and to reduce sedimentation, thus improving the water quality at KTAC. The existing sediments which caused the odour would also have to be treated. She assured members that the planned developments in Kai Tak would proceed only if it could be confirmed that the

environmental problems relating to the odour and water quality of KTAC could be effectively mitigated to meet the stringent requirements under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (Cap. 499). At this stage, as there were no scientific data to support that there were no alternatives to reclamation, the Administration would continue to collect data to assess the effectiveness of the bioremediation measures.

27. The Deputy Chairman enquired whether any water sports activities could be organized at KTAC in the future. In response, DD of Plan explained that water sports activities were not proposed at KTAC at the present stage because the water quality study indicated that even after implementation of mitigation measures, the water quality was not up to the required standard. However, she would not preclude the possibility of allowing water sports activities at KTAC in the long run when the water quality could meet the required standard.

28. Mr LEE Wing-tat commented that if the bioremediation measures proved to be a success for treating the environmental problems at KTAC, KTAC could be developed into a good and easily accessible in-town water activities centre.

Runway Precinct, Cruise Terminal and Heliport

29. Mr CHAN Kam-lam expressed concern on whether cruise ships berthing at the third berth of the Cruise Terminal would obstruct the view of the hotel developments on the former runway and urged the Administration to take this into account in the future planning.

30. Mr James TO enquired why commercial developments were planned to locate on the harbour-front side of the Runway Precinct while residential developments were planned to locate on the KTAC side. As the commercial developments would be more high-rise than the residential developments, the harbour view would not be maximized under the present arrangement and this in turn would result in a lower total land premium for the Runway Precinct area.

31. In response, DD of Plan said that the revised PODP had built in flexibility (by allowing sufficient infrastructure) for the possible construction of a third berth. Should there be a proven demand for the third berth in the future, the revised PODP would have to be amended to cater for the change in land use. As the Cruise Terminal would generate some noise and smoke, commercial developments were planned to locate on the harbour-front side since they were less sensitive to those environmental impacts. In addition, the commercial buildings would be low-rise, ranging from 45 mPD in the front to 65 mPD at the back. The buildings would also adopt a curved design so as to achieve the best possible view.

32. The Deputy Chairman asked whether the water off the coast at the site for the Cruise Terminal was deep enough for berthing cruise ships and whether dredging would be required.

33. Dr KWOK Ka-ki considered that the tip of the former runway was the best location in Kai Tak and it should be designated for uses frequented by the general public. He enquired whether it would be possible to relocate the Cruise Terminal to the central part of the former runway and designate the present site for the Cruise Terminal as open space.

34. In response, SHPL and DD of Plan explained that the depth of the water at the proposed location was about 8 to 10 metres, and the site was the most suitable location for the Cruise Terminal because the least extent of dredging would be required. Also, the location of the Cruise Terminal was constrained by the presence of a gas main. In relation to the provision of open space, PSPL pointed out that there would be landscaped decks on top of the Cruise Terminal for public use.

35. Mr CHAN Kam-lam pointed out that the provision of the Heliport in Kai Tak was not the best option and many Kwun Tong residents still had reservation on the proposal.

36. Dr KWOK Ka-ki considered that the planning for Kai Tak should strive to attain the greatest benefits for the public and queried why the Heliport should occupy the best location in Kai Tak. He also considered that residential and hotel developments on the former runway were not absolutely necessary. He pointed out there were no public leisure facilities such as water activities centres near the tip of the former runway, the best location in the area.

37. In response, DD of Plan said that the proposed location of the Heliport was the most suitable location that could meet the necessary requirements, including the requirement that there should be a building-free zone beneath the two flight paths of the Heliport which had to be at least 150 degrees apart. She further pointed out that for safety reasons, single-engine helicopters had to land on and take off from the ground. PSPL added that while the Heliport, a very important facility for the economy of Hong Kong, would be located at one part of the tip of the former runway, the other part of the tip would be used for constructing the Runway Park for public enjoyment.

Tourism Node

38. Dr KWOK Ka-ki expressed reservation on the proposed landmark building of 200 metres in height with a public observation gallery and considered that a height of 100 to 150 metres might be more appropriate. He was also worried that the observation gallery would not materialize just like the one that was once proposed at International Finance Centre II. Even if it could materialize, he was

concerned that the public might have to pay a high price for a visit to the observation gallery. In response, SHPL and PSPL explained that the landmark building would only occupy a small site area. There would be mechanisms such as requiring the developer concerned to obtain approval from the Town Planning Board for the development and including relevant conditions in the land lease to ensure that the observation gallery would materialize.

Development intensity and air ventilation

39. Mr CHAN Kam-lam said that DAB welcomed the Administration's proposal of constructing an observation gallery in Kai Tak. As regards the public rental housing development, he suggested that the layout of the public rental housing should be so designed to avoid a congested layout. In response, DD of Plan said that there would be open space and a civic centre in front of the public rental housing to enhance openness of the area.

40. Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming expressed concern on the intensity and location of the commercial developments near Kowloon City. In response, DD of Plan said that an air ventilation assessment had been conducted and the commercial developments at the ex-SCL depot site would not block southeast wind from blowing into Kowloon City because the plot ratio for those developments would only be about 4.5. Commercial developments with a higher plot ratio of 9.5 would only be located at the future town centre.

41. Mrs Selina CHOW urged the Administration to ensure that Kai Tak would be well integrated with Kowloon City and that special attention should be given to ensuring good air ventilation to avoid creating a "wall effect". She further enquired how the Administration would encourage good architectural designs that would be creative and aesthetically appealing for the buildings in the area.

42. In reply, DD of Plan emphasized that there would not be any "wall effect" because the plot ratios would be generally low and there would be site coverage restrictions specified in the relevant Outline Zoning Plans (OZPs) to ensure good air ventilation. Kai Tak was designed to be a podium free environment. She assured members that while important planning parameters would be prescribed in the OZPs, there would be sufficient room for creativity in the architectural designs for the future buildings in the area.

Other planning issues

43. Miss CHOY So-yuk enquired whether the Administration would adopt any environmental protection concepts at the detailed design stage of Kai Tak, such as rooftop greening, renewal energy, waste classification facilities at the household level and designs to promote good air ventilation. In reply, DD of Plan said that important environmental protection concepts such as the monorail system, centralized cooling system, centralized underground conduits and rooftop

greening had already been incorporated into the planning for Kai Tak and the relevant OZPs would contain the necessary planning controls.

44. Dr KWOK Ka-ki noted that although the depot of the SCL would be relocated, the area thus vacated was planned for commercial developments rather than for public use. He was worried that in expediting the project, the Administration might subtly introduce commercial elements that the public was not aware of.

45. In response, PSPL said that some 33% of the area in Kai Tak would be designated as "Open Space", the highest percentage among various kinds of land uses. In relation to commercial developments, DD of Plan clarified that there was no increase in commercial developments in the revised PODP because commercial developments had already been planned above the ex-SCL depot site in the original PODP. As the area of Kai Tak was more than 300 hectares, it was not appropriate to designate the entire area as "Open Space". Neither did the Administration see majority support for the idea to designate the entire area as "Open Space".

46. Mr Albert CHAN commented that the Administration had failed to take the opportunity to facilitate strategic urban renewal of old districts like Hung Hom, Wong Tai Sin and Kwun Tong. He suggested that the Panel should hold a special meeting to further discuss the revised PODP and deputations should be invited to present views. Dr KWOK Ka-ki supported the suggestion.

47. In response, SHPL assured members that the planning for Kai Tak would have to undergo the normal statutory planning process and there would be a lot of opportunities and sufficient time for the community to give views before the relevant OZPs were submitted to the Chief Executive in Council for approval.

(Post-meeting note: The item on "Planning issues relating to the reprovisioning of the Star Ferry Pier in Central including the proposed preservation of the building structure and clock tower of the existing Star Ferry Pier" and the item on "Kai Tak Planning Review – Revised Preliminary Outline Development Plan" would be discussed at the special meeting scheduled for 14 November 2006.)

48. The Chairman left the meeting at this juncture and the Deputy Chairman took over the chair.

V PWP Item No. 719CL – Kai Tak development – engineering review and PWP Item No. 711CL – Kai Tak development – advance infrastructure works for developments at the southern part of the former runway

(LC Paper No. CB(1)89/06-07(05) -- Information paper provided by the Administration)

49. The Project Manager/Kowloon of the Civil Engineering and Development Department (PM/CEDD) briefed members on the details of PWP Item No. 719CL – Kai Tak development – engineering review and PWP Item No. 711CL – Kai Tak development – advance infrastructure works for developments at the southern part of the former runway. He said that the Administration planned to submit the two items to the Public Works Subcommittee (PWSC) for consideration at its meeting on 22 November 2006.

50. Mr CHAN Kam-lam enquired whether the underwater town gas pipe off the former runway would be affected by dredging required for the construction of the third berth and, if so, which party would be responsible for the associated relocation cost of the town gas pipe. He also asked whether there was any need to widen or enhance the existing vehicle bridge over KTAC to accommodate future traffic.

51. In reply, PM/CEDD said that dredging for the third berth would not be included in the present works projects because the need and timing for constructing the third berth had yet to be confirmed. If the underwater town gas pipe was affected, the associated relocation cost would be borne by the Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited. He further explained that the structure and width of the existing vehicle bridge could accommodate future traffic. However, some enhancement works to the bridge might be required to make room to accommodate public utilities such as cables, street lights, sewage drains, gas, etc.

52. Mr Albert CHAN commented that it was too early to submit the funding proposals to PWSC because the revised PODP had just been released for consultation. He considered that to facilitate a meaningful discussion, a breakdown of the estimated costs of each of the two projects should have been given in the paper for this meeting.

53. The Deputy Chairman enquired if a breakdown of the estimated costs for the works under 719CL and 711CL was on hand. In reply, PM/CEDD said that for 719CL, the detailed engineering feasibility study, including associated site investigation and supervision, would cost \$72.0 million, whereas the preliminary preparatory work for the development of the Cruise Terminal would cost \$13.0 million, giving a total of \$85.0 million in September 2006 prices, or \$87.0 million in money-of-the-day prices. For 711CL, detailed design of advance infrastructure works would cost \$25.6 million, and site investigation and supervision would cost \$12.0 million, giving a total of \$37.6 million in money-of-the-day prices.

54. Mrs Sophie LEUNG said that a detailed breakdown of the project costs would be provided in the relevant funding proposals to be submitted to PWSC. She expressed reservation on the need for a detailed breakdown of the project costs when a funding proposal was put to the relevant Panel for consultation. In response, PM/CEDD said that a detailed breakdown of the estimated costs for each of the two projects would be available before PWSC considered the funding proposals at its meeting on 22 November 2006.

55. Summing up, the Deputy Chairman said that the Panel supported the Administration's submission of the funding proposals for 719CL and 711CL to PWSC for consideration.

VI Any other business

56. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 4:45 pm.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
27 November 2006