

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. PWSC121/13-14
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/F/2/1(17)B

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

**Minutes of the 16th meeting
held in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex
on Tuesday, 10 June 2014, at 9:00 am**

Members present:

Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, BBS, MH, JP (Chairman)
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, BBS, MH, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP
Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP
Hon WONG Kwok-hing, BBS, MH
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, JP
Hon CHAN Kin-por, BBS, JP
Hon IP Kwok-him, GBS, JP
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH
Hon Gary FAN Kwok-wai
Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP
Hon Charles Peter MOK
Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN Ka-lok
Hon CHAN Yuen-han, SBS, JP
Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, JP

Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan
Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, JP
Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, JP
Hon Christopher CHUNG Shu-kun, BBS, MH, JP
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen

Members absent:

Dr Hon LEUNG Ka-lau
Hon James TIEN Pei-chun, GBS, JP
Hon CHAN Han-pan

Public officers attending:

Mr YEUNG Tak-keung	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) ³
Mr WAI Chi-sing, JP	Permanent Secretary for Development (Works)
Mr Thomas CHOW Tat-ming, JP	Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)
Ms Anissa WONG, JP	Permanent Secretary for the Environment
Ms Jasmine CHOI Suet-yung	Principal Assistant Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) (Works)
Mr HON Chi-keung, JP	Director of Civil Engineering and Development
Mr MAK Chi-biu	Chief Engineer (Hong Kong (1)) Civil Engineering and Development Department
Ms Amy CHEUNG Yi-mei	Assistant Director (Territorial) (Acting) Planning Department

Clerk in attendance:

Ms Sharon CHUNG	Chief Council Secretary (1)6
-----------------	------------------------------

Staff in attendance:

Mr Andy LAU	Assistant Secretary General 1
Ms Connie FUNG	Senior Assistant Legal Adviser 1
Mr Bonny LOO	Assistant Legal Adviser 3
Mr Fred PANG	Senior Council Secretary (1)8

Mr Frankie WOO
Ms Christy YAU

Senior Legislative Assistant (1)3
Legislative Assistant (1)7

Action

The Chairman reported that 20 Capital Works Reserve Fund items of \$58,795.0 million had been endorsed by the Public Works Subcommittee ("PWSC") in the 2013-2014 session so far, of which \$55,044.1 million was related to capital works projects. He advised that together with the seven unfinished agenda items carried over from the meetings on 27 May and 4 June 2014, there were eight funding proposals on the agenda of the meeting, which, if endorsed, would involve a total funding allocation of \$12,560.8 million. Of these proposals, seven were for upgrading seven capital works projects to Category A respectively and one was to increase the approved project estimate of a Category A item. If these proposals were approved, the cumulative number of items approved by PWSC in the 2013-2014 session would be 28 while the total amount of funding approved would be \$71,355.8 million, of which \$67,604.9 million was related to capital works projects.

2. The Chairman advised that, according to the Administration, excluding the eight items on the agenda for the meeting, it was anticipated that 16 more items, involving a proposed funding allocation of about \$11,520.0 million, would be submitted to PWSC for consideration in the current session.

3. The Chairman 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 item. He also drew members' attention to Rule 84 of RoP on voting or withdrawal in case of direct pecuniary interest.

Head 707 – New Towns and Urban Area Development

PWSC(2014-15)10 770CL Planning, engineering and architectural study for topside development at Hong Kong boundary crossing facilities island of Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge

4. The Chairman advised that the proposal was to upgrade 770CL to Category A at an estimated cost of \$61.9 million in money-of-the-day prices for carrying out a planning, engineering and architectural study and the associated site investigation works for the proposed commercial development on the Hong Kong boundary crossing facilities ("HKBCF") island of the

Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge ("HZMB"). The Subcommittee had commenced the discussion on the item at the previous meeting on 4 June 2014 and would continue to consider the proposal at the meeting.

Development of bridgehead economy

5. The Subcommittee noted that according to paragraph 6 of the Administration's paper, the HKBCF island had the potential for development of "bridgehead economy" and utilization of the land on the island for commercial development could create synergy among the Hong Kong International Airport ("HKIA"), AsiaWorld-Expo, the North Commercial District on the airport island, the HKIA's Third Runaway Project under planning and other tourist and business destinations in Lantau. Dr Fernando CHEUNG enquired about the economic benefits to be generated from such synergy. Mr Gary FAN queried whether the development of bridgehead economy on the HKBCF island proposed by the Administration was in substance tourism development. Noting that according to Enclosure 3 to the Administration's paper, the proposed study included an assessment on the market demand for commercial development from the western Pearl River Delta ("PRD"), he enquired whether the focus of this part of assessment would in fact be the market demand generated by tourists travelling from the western PRD to Hong Kong.

6. Director of Civil Engineering and Development ("DCED") replied that to provide commercial development on the HKBCF island could capitalize on the opportunities arising from the locational advantage of the island and create synergy among the various developments in Lantau. Shopping, dining, entertainment and hotel facilities were some examples of commercial development. While it was not practicable at the current stage to derive the quantifiable economic benefits of the synergy, in the first six to eight months of the proposed study, the Administration would assess the demand for different types of commercial development on the island as well as the financial viability of the proposed commercial development. DCED advised that upon the commissioning of HZMB, the travelling time between HKBCF and the main cities of western PRD would be within three hours. The patronage of HKBCF would be examined in the proposed study. In response to Mr Gary FAN's enquiry about successful examples of airports in Europe and the North America near which commercial developments were provided, DCED advised that Amsterdam Airport Schiphol, the Netherlands, could serve as a good reference. He advised that the volume of passengers handled by the airport was about 50 million, which was comparable with that of HKIA.

Proposed commercial development on the Hong Kong boundary crossing facilities island

7. Mr Alan LEONG was concerned whether the Administration had a pre-determined stance on the type of development to be considered in the proposed study, i.e. commercial development. He enquired whether the Administration had engaged the public in the formulation of the proposal to provide commercial facilities on the HKBCF island.

8. Dr Fernando CHEUNG said that according to the Administration's website on "Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macau Bridge Related Hong Kong Projects", HKBCF did not include any shopping, dining, entertainment and hotel facilities as mentioned in paragraph 6 of the Administration's paper. He queried whether the purpose of the funding proposal was to enable the Administration to scrap the original design and plan for the site and re-plan it for providing commercial development. Dr CHEUNG said that in its press release issued on 19 May 2010, the Administration had advised that, to minimize the size of the reclamation and to comply with the Airport Height Restriction, it did not recommend large-scale commercial developments on the HKBCF island. He questioned when the Administration had changed its stance on the matter and the officials responsible for the change.

9. In response, DCED advised that while the land being developed on the HKBCF island was only large enough to accommodate boundary crossing and associated facilities, the Civil Engineering and Development Department ("CEDD") and the Planning Department ("PlanD") considered it appropriate to examine the feasibility of exploring the use of the topside and, if cost-effective, underground space of HKBCF to capitalize on the benefits brought by the favourable geographical location of the island and the commissioning of the HZMB as well as the Tuen Mun-Chek Lap Kok Link. He advised that community engagement activities in relation to the formulation of the development proposals to be recommended by the proposed study would be carried out.

10. Mr Alan LEONG remained of the view that the Administration would reserve the space available on the HKBCF island for commercial use only even if it received views through the community engagement exercise suggesting the provision of non-commercial developments, such as hospitals, parks, etc. at the site. He opined that, as providing commercial development on the island would constitute a fundamental change to the previous proposals submitted to the Finance Committee ("FC") in 2009 and 2011 with respect to the design and construction of HKBCF, the Administration must follow the established procedures to seek approval for the changes.

Other development options

11. Miss Alice MAK opined that as the HKBCF island would not be commissioned until 2016, the Administration should carefully assess the long-term change of the market demand for commercial facilities at the site. She said that residents of Tung Chung were concerned that development of large shopping malls and hotels in the vicinity would continue to push up the prices of consumer products in the district. She urged that the Administration should provide space on the island for developing industries to generate more employment opportunities.

12. DCED replied that, as the construction of hardware facilities would take time, the Administration considered it appropriate to commence the proposed study as early as possible to assess the demand for different types of development on the HKBCF island and to examine the feasibility of the proposed developments in parallel. While providing shopping facilities to cater for the demand of tourists was one of the possible development options, the proposed study would take into account the long-term development needs of Hong Kong.

13. Dr CHIANG Lai-wan considered it appropriate for the Administration to explore possible development options on the HKBCF island in order to provide more employment opportunities for residents in Tung Chung. Mr LEUNG Che-cheung said that as new transport infrastructures connecting the HKBCF island with the North Lantau Highway via the Tuen Mun-Chek Lap Kok Link would be commissioned shortly, the Administration should carry out the proposed study to examine how the development on the HKBCF island could tie in with the planned commercial developments on the airport island and generate more employment opportunities for residents in Lantau.

14. In response, DCED assured members that the proposed study would examine how to increase employment opportunities through new developments on the HKBCF island. He advised that the remaining development in Tung Chung would accommodate an additional population of about 100 000. The Administration would hope that, with the new developments in North Lantau together with new infrastructure like the Tuen Mun-Chek Lap Kok Link, job opportunities in easily accessible locations would be made available for up to half of the additional population.

15. Miss CHAN Yuen-han said that she supported the funding proposal. She echoed the view of Miss Alice MAK that the Administration should not focus merely on providing land for commercial development. She opined that, in the light of shortage of land in the urban areas for the creative industries to operate, compared with the Lok Ma Chau Loop, the HKBCF

island was a more suitable location to provide space for developing local creative industries. The Administration should consider reserving space in the future topside development for this purpose.

16. Mr Frankie YICK noted that HKBCF would provide facilities for cross-boundary cargo processing and passenger clearance. As HKBCF was located close to HKIA and Hong Kong had a competitive advantage to develop high value-added logistics services, he enquired whether the proposed study would look into the feasibility of developing logistics-related facilities on the island.

17. DCED replied that the Administration would consider the views of Miss CHAN Yuen-han and Mr Frankie YICK when conducting the proposed study.

18. Dr Fernando CHEUNG enquired whether the Administration had formulated any conceptual plans for providing a logistics park on the HKBCF island during the design stage of the HKBCF project. DCED advised in the negative. Mr Albert CHAN remarked that studies had been carried out by the Administration to provide land in Siu Ho Wan and Sunny Bay for logistic uses.

19. Dr Helena WONG said that while the Administration might explore as part of the proposed study the types of commercial development to be provided on the HKBCF island, it should also consider the feasibility of providing land resources to cater for other uses such as production of hydroponic leafy vegetables, provision of columbarium facilities, etc. DCED replied that the Administration would listen to the suggestions on the types of development that could be provided on the HKBCF island when conducting the proposed study and would take into account development compatibility issues.

20. Miss CHAN Yuen-han requested that members' views with respect to the types of development that could be provided on the HKBCF island be put in record, so that members could in future make a comparison between the record and the results of the study to find out whether the Administration had considered their views.

Amendment to the Outline Zoning Plan

21. Mr Alan LEONG and Dr Fernando CHEUNG enquired whether commercial uses were permitted under the existing outline zoning plan ("OZP") for the HKBCF island. Assistant Director (Territorial)(Acting), Planning Department ("AD(T)/PlanD"), replied that as town planning was an

ongoing process, the Administration might make changes to the land use proposal for a site in light of changing community needs and planning circumstances. The undertaking of a study was one of the first steps in the established procedures to examine whether such changes were appropriate. The HKBCF island fell within the "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Boundary Crossing Facilities" ("OU(BCF)") zone, and its planning intention was primarily for the development of boundary crossing facilities and related activities for HZMB. Although shop and eating place uses were permitted under the "OU(BCF)" zone, if the development proposals to be recommended under the proposed study constituted a contravention to the planning intention for the "OU(BCF)" zone, the Administration would need to seek the agreement of the Town Planning Board ("TPB") to amend the OZP in accordance with the relevant town planning procedures.

22. Mr Albert CHAN said that as the proposed site on the HKBCF island was zoned as "Other Specified Uses" under the existing relevant OZP, and such uses included commercial use, he was concerned that the Administration could proceed with its proposals to provide large-scale commercial development without going through the statutory town planning procedures.

23. In response, Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands) ("PS/DEV(P&L)") advised that as far as planning for an area was concerned, a planning and engineering study might be required for determining the types of development that could be provided on it. If the development proposal arising from the study could not be taken forward under the restrictions in the existing OZP, amendments to the OZP would need to be made in accordance with the statutory procedures under the Town Planning Ordinance. At the request of Mr Albert CHAN, the Administration would provide detailed information about the land uses on the HKBCF island as permitted on the current OZP.

(Post-meeting note: The Administration's supplementary information was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. PWSC118/13-14(01) on 9 July 2014.)

24. Mr Michael TIEN opined that the Administration should carry out preparatory work, such as undertaking a study, before formulating any development proposals for the HKBCF island and proceeding to make amendments to the relevant OZP. Mr Albert CHAN recalled that there were past public works projects in which the Administration had not conducted engineering studies for the project site but proceeded to obtain TPB's approval for the relevant planning applications. PS/DEV(P&L) responded that the Administration needed to first secure the funding to carry out the proposed study to work out the topside development options for the

HKBCF island. Before such options were formulated, the Administration could not ascertain whether it would need to seek approval for amending the existing OZP.

25. Mr Alan LEONG queried about the financial consequence in the event that the Administration had secured the funding approval for carrying out the proposed study but the amendment to the relevant OZP was disapproved by TPB. He held the view that the Administration should revise the proposal submitted to the Subcommittee to reflect PS/DEV(P&L)'s response made at the meeting. At the request of Mr LEONG, the Administration would provide information to make clear the statutory town planning process to go through in the circumstance that, after conducting the proposed study, the Administration would propose to proceed with commercial development on the island through topside and underground space developments. Mr LEONG said that LegCo Members belonging to the Civic Party would object to the funding proposal if the Administration did not withdraw the proposal and provide the supplementary information. He held the view that as such information was not yet available, the Subcommittee should not put PWSC(2014-15)10 to vote.

(Post-meeting note: The Administration's supplementary information was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. PWSC118/13-14(01) on 9 July 2014.)

26. Permanent Secretary for Development (Works) ("PS/DEV(Works)") responded that under the existing plan, HKBCF would provide some 5 000 square metres of commercial gross floor area ("GFA"). The Administration had briefed members of the Panel on Development that according to its preliminary internal assessment, a commercial GFA of 300 000 square metres could be provided by means of topside development on the island. The proposed study would look into the validity of the assessment. If the study ascertained that a commercial GFA of such a scale could be provided on the island for commercial development and the Administration accepted the proposal, the Administration would need to go through the statutory town planning procedures to take forward the proposal. The procedures included, among others, the exhibition of the draft OZP for public inspections for two months, hearing of representations and comments, etc. PS/DEV(Works) continued that in light of members' views made at the meeting that the development of logistics-related facilities, creative industries, etc., should be considered in the study, the Administration would expand the scope of the proposed study as detailed in paragraph 3(a) of the Administration's paper to study the development of other economic activities in addition to commercial development as originally proposed.

27. Considering that the statutory town planning procedures would take time and TPB would likely receive a lot of objections against the amendment to the relevant OZP to enable the provision of shopping malls on the HKBCF island, Mr Albert CHAN cast doubt on whether the development proposal recommended by the proposed study could dovetail with the commissioning of HZMB and HKBCF in 2016. Dr Fernando CHEUNG expressed similar views and enquired about the fallback option in the event that TPB disapproved the proposed amendment.

28. PS/DEV(P&L) responded that in planning a development of considerable scale, the Administration needed to carry out a planning and engineering study. Without first undertaking such a study to formulate the development proposals, the Administration could not proceed to propose amendments to the relevant OZP and seek TPB's approval. DCED advised that the Administration planned to commence the proposed study in August 2014 for completion in September 2016. There should be sufficient time within the study period to carry out all the assessments included in the study, such as the environmental impact assessment ("EIA") and to undertake the statutory town planning procedures, if required. In response to the Chairman's enquiry on whether the topside development proposals recommended by the study would be implemented after the commissioning of HZMB and HKBCF, DCED reiterated that the overriding principle was that the operation of HZMB and HKBCF should not be affected by the implementation of any proposed development.

Motion on adjournment of discussion on PWSC(2014-15)10

29. Mr Albert CHAN proposed a motion to adjourn the discussion on PWSC(2014-15)10 pursuant to Paragraph 33 of the PWSC Procedure.

30. Mr WONG Kwok-hing said that, if Mr Albert CHAN's motion was negatived, the Chairman should put the item to vote immediately. The Chairman noted Mr WONG's view.

31. The Chairman said that the Subcommittee would proceed to deal with Mr Albert CHAN's motion. Each member could speak once on the motion, and the speaking time should not be more than three minutes.

32. Mr Albert CHAN said that FC had approved the Administration's previous funding proposals on the construction and reclamation of the HKBCF island having regard to the need of providing cross-boundary cargo processing and passenger clearance for the passengers and vehicles arriving in Hong Kong via HZMB. He opined that, to take forward an initiative to develop bridgehead economy on the island was not in line with the original

planning intention. If the proposal to be recommended by the study was to be implemented, it would be done so within a short period of time and under a lot of development constraints, incurring substantial amount of public expenditure. He held the view that the Administration should have consulted members of the public on the proposed changes of the planning intention before the funding proposal on the study was submitted to the Subcommittee. However, the Administration had not done so. As such, he moved the motion to adjourn the discussion on the item.

33. Dr Fernando CHEUNG said that he supported the motion. He commented that the proposal to conduct a planning, engineering and architectural study on developing large-scale commercial facilities on the HKBCF island had been worked out in a top-down approach and such development might not be beneficial to most Hong Kong people. He said that the island was originally constructed to provide boundary crossing facilities. The Administration had not made clear to the public why it needed to provide more facilities on it to develop bridgehead economy while similar types of facilities with sufficient capacities to cope with visitors' demand had already been provided or planned in neighbouring areas such as the airport island.

34. Mr Gary FAN said that he was opposed to the funding proposal as pursuing topside development on the HKBCF island was a violation of procedural justice and the Administration already had a pre-determined stance on the types of development to be provided. He was concerned that development of hardware facilities on the island would not be cost-effective and could not help address the adverse impact caused by the endless increase in visitor arrivals under the Individual Visit Scheme ("IVS") on the local communities. He said that he would support the motion.

35. Mr WONG Kwok-hing said that he supported the funding proposal and did not subscribe to the view that the proposal on topside development on the HKBCF island had been put forward in a top-down approach. He said that residents of New Territories West had expressed years ago their strong aspirations for development of bridgehead economy. He considered it appropriate to provide commercial development on the island to help divert tourists from major shopping spots in the urban areas. He said that he objected to the motion.

36. Mr Tony TSE said that he did not support the motion. He considered it appropriate for the Administration to review on an ongoing basis its planning initiatives in light of changing needs and circumstances. He opined that, although the Administration had not incorporated in its design and planning for the HKBCF island at an early stage developments other than

the boundary crossing facilities, the funding proposal should be supported as it would finance a study to recommend options to optimize the development potentials of the island for the benefit of Hong Kong's economic development, hence the well-being of Hong Kong people. Mr Frankie YICK echoed the views of Mr TSE and said that he did not support Mr CHAN's motion.

37. Mr Alan LEONG held the view that the Subcommittee should consider the funding proposal only after the Administration had provided supplementary information on whether and how it would go through the statutory town planning process in the circumstance that the Administration would proceed with commercial development on the HKBCF island. He stressed that the Administration should only make changes to the land use plan for the site according to the statutory town planning procedures.

38. Mr TAM Yiu-chung recalled that in considering the Administration's proposal to construct the HKBCF island to provide a landing point for HZMB, there were views suggesting the development of bridgehead economy and commercial facilities on the island. In response to the suggestion, the Administration had then advised that the first important task was to ensure the timely construction of HKBCF as a boundary control point. He said that stakeholders including the relevant District Council and members of the Lantau Development Advisory Committee supported the initiative to make good use of the land on the island to cater for the long-term development needs of Hong Kong. Moreover, residents in Tung Chung expected that the development on the island would help generate more employment opportunities.

39. Mr CHAN Kam-lam said that provision of infrastructure facilities was important to support the economic development of Hong Kong. He said that the development of bridgehead economy had been a subject of discussion in the society for years before the establishment of the current-term Government. The proposal to make use of the land resources on the HKBCF island to provide commercial development would help alleviate the over-crowdedness in the urban shopping areas.

40. Mr LEUNG Che-cheung said that he did not agree to the motion. He recalled that the Panel on Development had been consulted on the funding proposal in March 2014 and majority of members of the Panel supported the submission of the proposal to the Subcommittee. Given that the Administration had met a lot of resistance when taking forward its land development projects in other parts of the territory, it should optimize the use of the land on the island to meet the development needs of Hong Kong.

41. Mr WU Chi-wai said that the results of the proposed study would facilitate members to further consider the best way to make use of the land resources on the HKBCF island. It was not necessary for the Subcommittee to adjourn the discussion on the item because the funding proposal was subject to the approval of FC. He urged the Administration to provide supplementary information on the proposed study as requested by members before the funding proposal was considered by FC.

42. The Chairman asked if the Administration had any response to the proposed motion. DCED advised in the negative.

43. The Chairman put to vote the question that the discussion on PWSC(2014-15)10 be adjourned. At the request of members, the Chairman ordered a division. Of the 25 members present, 24 members voted. Six voted for, 18 voted against the motion and no one abstained. The voting result was as follows:

For:

Ms Cyd HO

Mr Albert CHAN

Dr Kenneth CHAN

(6 members)

Mr Alan LEONG

Mr Gary FAN

Dr Fernando CHEUNG

Against:

Mr CHAN Kam-lam

Mr TAM Yiu-chung

Mr WONG Kwok-hing

Mr CHAN Kin-por

Mr Michael TIEN

Mr WU Chi-wai

Miss CHAN Yuen-han

Miss Alice MAK

Dr CHIANG Lai-wan

(18 members)

Ms Emily LAU

Mr Abraham SHEK

Mr CHAN Hak-kan

Mr IP Kwok-him

Mr Frankie YICK

Mr Charles MOK

Mr LEUNG Che-cheung

Dr Elizabeth QUAT

Mr Tony TSE

Abstain:

(0 member)

Duration of the meeting

44. Mr Alan LEONG pointed out that the agenda for the meeting uploaded to LegCo's website had not specified the ending time of the meeting. He said that according to the practice of LegCo's Panels, the ending time of a meeting should be put on the agenda.

45. At the invitation of the Chairman, the Clerk explained that as a usual practice, the starting and ending time of the meeting had been given in the notice of meeting issued on 3 June 2014 vide LC Paper No. PWSC91/13-14.

46. Mr Gary FAN echoed Mr Alan LEONG's view and said that the agenda for a previous meeting to consider the funding proposal on the Southeast New Territories landfill extension had also not shown the ending time of the meeting. He said that to be fair to members, the ending time of a meeting should be specified in the agenda.

47. Miss Alice MAK said that she was all along well aware of the starting time and ending time of the Subcommittee's meetings. She suggested that in light of members' concerns about specifying the ending time of a meeting, the Subcommittee should follow the practice of LegCo's Panels to include in the agenda the discussion time limit for each agenda item, so that in future meetings, it would be clear to members whether the time taken on the discussion on an item had exceeded the specified time limit.

48. The Chairman instructed the Clerk to consider members' views and make appropriate changes to the information given in the agendas.

(Post meeting note: Starting from the meeting on 18 June 2014, the starting time and ending time of the Subcommittee's meetings are given in the respective agendas.)

Motion on adjournment of further proceedings of the Subcommittee

49. The Chairman advised that a motion to adjourn further proceedings of the Subcommittee proposed under Paragraph 33 of the PWSC Procedure had been received from Mr Gary FAN.

50. Mr WONG Kwok-hing enquired whether the Chairman should deal with Mr FAN's motion, given that the Subcommittee had considered and voted on Mr Albert CHAN's motion to adjourn the discussion on PWSC(2014-15)10. The Chairman said that under Paragraph 33 of the PWSC Procedure, apart from moving a motion to adjourn the discussion of an item, members might move that further proceedings of the Subcommittee be adjourned.

51. The Chairman said that each member could speak once on Mr FAN's motion, and the speaking time should not be more than three minutes. He then invited members to speak on the motion.

52. Mr Gary FAN said that he had proposed the motion because some members who did not know the ending time of the meeting might not be able to stay until 12:45 pm, so the meeting should be adjourned. Moreover, he considered that there were lots of controversies over the initiative to provide topside development at the HKBCF island. No consensus in the society on the development of bridgehead economy and the overall direction of tourism development had been reached. The Administration had not explained clearly to members a number of issues arising from the funding proposal, such as the statutory town planning process for the topside development and how the HKBCF island, of a size of 130 hectares, which was originally designed to accommodate boundary crossing facilities only, could accommodate other developments. He opined that as the proposed study involved the use of precious land resources in Hong Kong, members should exercise prudence when considering the proposal.

53. Dr Fernando CHEUNG said that he supported the adjournment motion. Referring to the Administration's reply to a question raised at the Council meeting of 19 May 2010 that the Administration did not recommend large-scale commercial development on the HKBCF island, he said the funding proposal revealed that the Administration had changed its previous stance on the matter. The Administration had not consulted the public on the change and had not explained clearly the reason for and the officials involved in making such a change. Moreover, it had not been made clear at the meeting how the change would be proceeded through the statutory town planning process and its impact on the construction works of HKBCF which were underway. Together with the fact that the cross-boundary arrangements for passengers and vehicles using HZMB had yet to be finalized, Dr CHEUNG considered that it was not a responsible act for members to endorse the item at the meeting.

54. Mr WU Chi-wai said that he objected to the motion. The Administration needed to carry out the proposed study in order to ascertain the financial viability and technical feasibility of commercial development on the island. The results of the study, including a projection on HKBCF's patronage, EIA, etc., would facilitate public discussions on whether topside development on the island should be pursued. He urged the Administration to provide written responses to the questions raised by members at the meeting before the item was considered by FC.

55. Miss CHAN Yuen-han expressed support for conducting the proposed study to examine how to make good use of the land resources on the HKBCF island. As the Administration had advised it would consider facilitating industries developments on the island, it should undertake the study to ascertain whether and how these developments could be included in the

development plan for the site. She expressed disagreement to the motion proposed by Mr Gary FAN.

56. Mr Alan LEONG said although the Administration had advised that it might expand the scope of the proposed study as detailed in paragraph 3(a) of the Administration's paper to study the development of other economic activities in addition to commercial development as originally proposed, it should provide written information to address members' concerns on how the Administration would take forward the development in compliance with the statutory town planning procedures. He considered it reasonable for members to vote on the item only after such information was available.

57. Mr CHAN Kam-lam said that it was not necessary for the Subcommittee to adjourn the proceedings of the Subcommittee. He opined that those members who considered that the supplementary information to be provided by the Administration could not address their concerns might vote against the proposal when it was considered at the relevant meeting of FC. He stressed the importance for Hong Kong to continue developing its economy and the economic ties with the Mainland. He requested that the Subcommittee should vote on the item as early as possible so that it could proceed to consider other agenda items for the meeting.

58. Mr Albert CHAN said that the development of bridgehead economy on the HKBCF island was not compatible with the original planning intention for the land reclaimed as proposed in the Administration's funding proposals submitted to FC in 2009 and 2011, and might be against the aspiration of the public. He supported the motion since the adjournment of the meeting would allow more time for members to consider the proposal.

59. The Chairman put to vote the question that further proceedings of the Subcommittee be now adjourned. At the request of Mr Gary FAN, the Chairman ordered a division. Of the 24 members present, 23 members voted. Six voted for, 17 voted against the motion and no one abstained. The voting result was as follows:

For:

Ms Cyd HO

Mr Albert CHAN

Dr Kenneth CHAN

(6 members)

Mr Alan LEONG

Mr Gary FAN

Dr Fernando CHEUNG

Against:

Mr CHAN Kam-lam

Mr TAM Yiu-chung

Ms Emily LAU

Mr WONG Kwok-hing

Mr CHAN Hak-kan
Mr IP Kwok-him
Mr Frankie YICK
Mr Charles MOK
Mr LEUNG Che-cheung
Dr Elizabeth QUAT
Mr Tony TSE
(17 members)

Mr CHAN Kin-por
Mr Michael TIEN
Mr WU Chi-wai
Miss CHAN Yuen-han
Miss Alice MAK
Dr CHIANG Lai-wan

Abstain:
(0 member)

60. The Chairman declared that the motion was negatived. The Subcommittee resumed the discussion on PWSC (2014-15)10.

Construction works for the Hong Kong boundary crossing facilities

61. Dr Fernando CHEUNG and Mr Albert CHAN expressed concerns about the possible impact of the implementation of the proposed commercial development on the progress of the construction works of HKBCF. In reply, DCED advised that the Administration would adhere to the principle that implementation of any proposed commercial development should not affect the construction and operations of HZMB and HKBCF. CEDD would liaise closely with relevant Government departments, including the Highways Department and the Transport Department, to ensure the smooth interfaces between the works projects. The coordination issue would be a subject to be considered in the proposed study.

62. Dr Fernando CHEUNG said that according to a media report, the Administration had extended the deadlines for submission of tenders for some works contracts associated with the construction of the HKBCF island and the tendering period for one of them had been extended for five weeks until July 2014. He was concerned whether the extension was caused by changes to the project requirements. DCED replied that the project was under the purview of the Highways Department. At the request of Dr CHEUNG, the Administration would provide information, including the reasons, such as whether there were changes to works/contract requirements, resulting in the extension of the deadlines.

(Post-meeting note: The Administration's supplementary information was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. PWSC118/13-14(01) on 9 July 2014.)

63. Mr Gary FAN pointed out that according to paragraph 7 of the Administration's paper, the proposed commercial development would have substantial interfaces with HKBCF during the construction and operation stage and would involve reprovisioning of the affected facilities on a temporary or permanent basis. He enquired about the details of these affected facilities. Chief Engineer (Hong Kong (1)), CEDD ("CE/HK(1)/CEDD"), replied that during the construction period for the proposed commercial development, the Administration might need to adopt temporary arrangements for some facilities such as passenger pick-up/drop-off facilities, landscaping areas, etc.

Projection of passenger and vehicular patronage of the Hong Kong boundary crossing facilities

64. The Subcommittee noted the Administration had projected that HKBCF would have a daily patronage of 9 200 to 14 000 vehicles and 55 850 to 69 200 passengers in 2016. Mr Gary FAN enquired how the Administration had come up with this projection. Mr WU Chi-wai cited the patronage of the Shenzhen Bay boundary control point as an example and considered that HKBCF's patronage might not reach the projected level within a short period of time.

65. Dr Fernando CHEUNG and Mr Gary FAN were concerned about the required level of HKBCF's patronage to justify the cost-effectiveness of large-scale commercial development on the island. Considering that the projected patronage was not more than 69 200 passengers, Dr CHEUNG cautioned the Administration that the utilization of commercial development on the island with a commercial GFA of 300 000 square metres might turn out to be low. He estimated that a daily patronage of at least 200 000 passengers was required to justify the commercial development of such a large scale.

66. In response to Dr Fernando CHEUNG's enquiry about the respective numbers of visitor arrivals from HZMB who (i) would not travel across the boundary; (ii) would travel across the boundary and enter Hong Kong; (iii) drive to Hong Kong under the Self-drive Tour Scheme; and (iv) would travel by coaches, etc., DCED advised that the proposed study would include a detailed analysis on HKBCF's patronage taking into account the development proposals to be recommended by the proposed study. He explained that HKBCF's daily patronage provided in paragraph 5 of the Administration's paper was a conservative and tentative forecast made under the four-stage modelling approach and had been referred to for projecting the traffic volume and assessing the financial viability of HZMB.

67. Mr Gary FAN considered that whether or not the Administration should provide large-scale commercial development on the HKBCF island should be subject to the outcome of the patronage analysis in the proposed study. The Chairman considered it appropriate for the Administration to conduct all the assessments included in the proposed study such as EIA before finalizing the development proposals for the site.

68. Dr Fernando CHEUNG said the Administration had advised in its paper that the proposed study would recommend an overall concept for the proposed development and appropriate development parameters. He asked the Administration to elaborate on this part of the study. AD(T)/PlanD replied that the Administration would request the consultant undertaking the proposed study to review the existing development parameters including the projected patronage figures in paragraph 5 of the Administration's paper in light of the topside development options to be recommended. The updated figures would be used as a basis for considering the types and scale of infrastructural facilities to support the proposed development.

69. Mr WU Chi-wai said if it was confirmed that there was a shortage of commercial floorspace in Tung Chung and the airport area, including the floorspace for hotels and offices, it might still be worthwhile to pursue the proposed study even if the patronage of HKBCF in future would not be as high as that projected. He considered that the study should cover how to address the shortage, if any, of commercial floorspace in Tung Chung and the airport area. AD(T)/PlanD responded that the overall demand for office space in Hong Kong was high due to population growth and economic development in the past decade. The occupancy rate of hotel rooms in Hong Kong was also high at about 87%. She said that Tung Chung, in close proximity to HKIA, would become a land transportation node following the commissioning of HZMB and the Tuen Mun-Chek Lap Kok Link. The area currently provided about 3 000 hotel rooms and their occupancy rate was high. At the request of Mr WU, the Administration would provide information about hotel room supply and the occupancy rate in Tung Chung and the airport area.

(Post-meeting note: The Administration's supplementary information was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. PWSC118/13-14(01) on 9 July 2014.)

Impact of surge of visitors

70. Dr Helena WONG said that if more land resources in Hong Kong were to be used for providing large shopping malls, which would attract more visitors to come from the Mainland, members of the public would have grave

concern on the impact of the surge of such visitors on the daily life of the local residents. She enquired whether the number of visitor arrivals in 2017, i.e. over 70 million per year, as projected in the latest Assessment Report on Hong Kong's Capacity to Receive Tourists, had included the projected HKBCF patronage, i.e. 55 850 passengers daily or around 20 million per year. She stressed that such information was important for assessing the overall number of visitor arrivals under IVS in future and whether Hong Kong had the capacity to receive them. In response, DCED advised that the Administration would provide information after the meeting to address Dr WONG's enquiry. The Chairman said that the patronage figures would be subject to the types of development to be provided on the HKBCF island in future.

(Post-meeting note: The Administration's supplementary information was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. PWSC118/13-14(01) on 9 July 2014.)

71. Noting that the proposed study would include an assessment of the financial viability of the proposed commercial development, Mr Gary FAN enquired whether the assessment would take into account the recent discussion in the society on the issues of visitors' demand management and an adjustment in the number of Mainland residents visiting Hong Kong under IVS. DCED replied that the financial viability assessment would be conducted within the first six to eight months of the proposed study. The assessment would take into account all relevant available information including the projection on the number of visitors to Hong Kong.

72. Dr CHIANG Lai-wan enquired whether the Administration would consider providing suitable facilities on the HKBCF island to help divert tourists from major shopping spots in the urban areas.

73. Mr Gary FAN said that more than half of the respondents to a survey conducted by a local concern group in Tung Chung were opposed to further tourism development in the area and its vicinity, taking into consideration the adverse impact of such development on the residents' daily life. He enquired about the Administration's stance on the concern. Stressing the importance to divert tourists from the shopping spots in the neighbouring areas of the HKBCF island, such as Tung Chung, to ease the over-crowdedness, Mr FAN questioned whether, when carrying out the proposed study, the Administration would work out effective plans to ensure that the tourists from HZMB who came for shopping only would make use of the commercial facilities on the island and would not go shopping in the urban areas.

74. In reply, DCED referred to some overseas airports, including the Incheon International Airport in the Republic of Korea and the Amsterdam Airport Schiphol in the Netherlands and explained that these airports provided not only retail floorspace but also shopping and leisure areas, hotels and office space. The proposed study would recommend the most appropriate development option taking into account all relevant considerations and public views.

75. Mr Michael TIEN said there were grave public concerns about the reduction of employment opportunities among the workforce with low educational attainment in the event that the number of visitors on IVS would drop in future. He considered that the provision of shopping malls on the HKBCF island would help increase the overall supply of retail floor area to alleviate the pressure on shop rentals in core business districts. He urged the Administration to take forward the proposed study without further delay, given that HZMB and HKBCF would be commissioned shortly.

76. In response to the Chairman's enquiry on whether the study would take into account members' views expressed at the meeting on the types of topside development to be provided on the HKBCF island, such as provision of logistics-related facilities, facilities to cater for the needs of visitors coming from HZMB as well as the needs of the communities in the neighbouring areas, AD(T)/PlanD advised in the affirmative.

Environmental implications

77. Mr Gary FAN enquired whether the Administration would conduct an EIA with respect to the development proposals to be recommended by the proposed study to ensure that the topside development would not cause adverse impact on the surrounding environment in terms of air quality, visual impact, etc. DCED replied that as the area involved in the proposed topside development might exceed 20 hectares, the study would include an EIA on the proposed developments and the associated supporting infrastructures. In line with the usual arrangements for works projects, the EIA would be conducted in parallel with other parts of the study and would be finalized taking into account the recommendations on land use.

78. Dr Fernando CHEUNG said that according to media reports, barges and marine mechanical plant for construction works had been deployed outside the prescribed works area of the construction of the HKBCF island. He was concerned about the impact caused by such deployment on the marine environment. DCED replied that the construction of the HKBCF island was under the purview of the Highways Department. According to the

information provided by the Highways Department, the contractor undertaking the reclamation works needed to temporarily occupy some of the marine area permitted under Marine Department Notice for maneuvering of a steel cellular seawall construction plant and the associated environmental and safety facilities. As the deployment was near completion, the contractor would remove the plant and other facilities shortly. At the request of Dr CHEUNG, the Administration would provide information on whether an assessment on the impact caused by the deployment of such a construction plant on the marine environment had been conducted.

(*Post-meeting note:* The Administration's supplementary information was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. PWSC118/13-14(01) on 9 July 2014.)

79. Mr LEUNG Che-cheung was concerned about the impact of the construction works of the road access for connecting the HKBCF island with the North Lantau Highway on the watercourse section located at Tai Ho Wan where *Plecoglossus altivelis*, a rare species, were found. DCED replied that before the commencement of the construction project, the Administration had undertaken an assessment on the impact of the project works on the species. At the request of Mr LEUNG, the Administration would provide information about the impact of the works on the ecological environment of *Plecoglossus altivelis* at Tai Ho Wan.

(*Post-meeting note:* The Administration's supplementary information was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. PWSC118/13-14(01) on 9 July 2014.)

80. Dr Fernando CHEUNG said it had been pointed out in a brief issued by the Highways Department in March 2008 that the construction of HKBCF and its associated reclamation works could lead to changes of flow regimes, hence affecting the nearby fishing operation. He asked the Administration to give an updated account of the impact of the works on the fishing and spawning grounds near North Lantau. DCED replied that he did not have the information regarding the construction works of HZMB. He advised that the proposed study would not include any reclamation proposals. The Chairman remarked that according to the Administration, an EIA had been conducted for the construction of the HKBCF island. With respect to the development proposals arising from the proposed study, the Administration would conduct an EIA.

81. Mr Albert CHAN held the view that the Administration should scale down the extent of reclamation as far as practicable to minimize the impact of the reclamation works on the marine ecology including the living

environment for dolphins. Considering that the Administration had not planned to provide large-scale shopping facilities at the initial planning stage of the construction of the HKBCF island, he queried whether the original size of the reclaimed land under construction was larger than necessary to accommodate the boundary crossing facilities. Mr Gary FAN enquired whether the Administration could reduce the extent of reclamation if both the topside and underground space on the island would be developed.

82. DCED replied that the proposed size of the reclaimed site was just right for accommodating HKBCF. Consideration would be given to providing the commercial development by means of topside and underground space developments. He advised that in a relevant paper submitted to LegCo, the Administration had advised that certain commercial facilities would be provided on the HKBCF island, such as retail shops and eating places to cater for the needs of passengers coming via HZMB. Considering that to optimize the utilization of the land on the island for commercial development could capitalize on the locational advantage of the island, the Administration had proposed to carry out the study.

Underground space development

83. Mr Gary FAN enquired about the circumstances under which the Administration would use the underground space for accommodating new developments. On his question on whether the Administration would develop underground space if there was not enough space above ground to provide the developments recommended by the proposed study, DCED advised that while the Administration would not rule out the possibility of developing the underground space, cost-effectiveness and financial viability were some of the factors to be considered.

84. Taking into consideration that about 70% to 80% of the land resources of the HKBCF island would be reserved for providing the boundary crossing facilities and other supporting infrastructures, Dr Fernando CHEUNG was of the view that large-scale commercial development, such as a shopping mall with a commercial GFA of 300 000 square metres, would need to be wholly or partly accommodated underground. DCED responded that the proposed study would mainly explore the feasibility of topside development on the island. He explained that with a size of 130 hectares, the island should be able to accommodate a commercial GFA of 300 000 square metres. In response to Dr CHEUNG's enquiry about the maximum number of storeys that could be provided in the topside development, DCED advised that, subject to the Airport Height Restriction of 35mPD to 50mPD, the maximum number of storeys of the topside development should be around seven to eight.

Transport facilities

85. Mr Gary FAN asked whether the proposed study would look into the transport connection between the HKBCF island and other parts of the territory. He opined that if a large-scale shopping complex was to be provided on the island and there was a direct transport connection between the island and Tung Chung, many passengers from HZMB would visit Tung Chung, hence affecting the community life of Tung Chung residents. Dr Fernando CHEUNG enquired whether the Administration would examine the suggestion of providing a rail link to the island. He said that the Administration should enhance the transport connection to and from the HKBCF island, as the proposed commercial development was of a very large scale.

86. DCED replied that the Administration would not rule out any transport options, including a possible rail link, and would recommend the best option based on the results of the various planning and technical assessments to be conducted under the proposed study.

87. Mr Gary FAN enquired about the number of parking spaces planned to be provided on the HKBCF island. He was concerned whether there would be sufficient parking spaces to cater for the demand generated from the development of large-scale shopping facilities in future. DCED replied that according to the Administration's original plan, HKBCF would provide about 800 parking spaces. The proposed study would review whether there was a need to expand parking and other supporting facilities if commercial development would be provided at the site. He advised that consideration could be given to providing car parking spaces underground.

Cross-boundary transport arrangements

88. Dr Helena WONG enquired whether the proposed study would include an assessment on the number of vehicles from HZMB to HKBCF. She was concerned whether such vehicles would be allowed to access the urban areas via the local road networks. DCED responded that the three Governments, i.e. of Hong Kong, Zhuhai and Macao, were discussing the cross-boundary arrangements for the vehicles using HZMB. He advised that the Transport and Housing Bureau ("THB") had been taking part in the discussions and would brief LegCo Members on the arrangements in due course.

89. Dr Fernando CHEUNG considered it undesirable that issues such as cross-boundary transport arrangements had yet to be finalized while HZMB

would be commissioned shortly in 2016. He enquired how the separate-location model for immigration and customs facilities for HZMB passengers would operate. Dr CHEUNG said that according to media reports, the Administration had reserved certain car parking spaces on the HKBCF island for cross-boundary vehicles and visitors eligible for visa-free entry. He was concerned whether the local transport arrangements for cross-boundary vehicles from HZMB, yet to be finalized, would make it necessary for the Administration to change the existing design of the HKBCF passenger terminal building.

90. Dr Helena WONG opined that when carrying out the proposed study, it was essential for the Administration to take into account the cross-boundary transport arrangements. She urged for a close communication between the Government departments undertaking the study and THB on the matter. She said that members of the public were concerned whether the local road networks would be under great pressure if a large number of vehicles from HZMB were allowed to access the urban areas. Dr WONG enquired how the Administration would allay such concerns.

91. In response, DCED advised that the relevant Government departments undertaking the proposed study would closely liaise with THB on the outcome of the discussions on the cross-boundary transport arrangements.

Public Consultation

92. Mr Albert CHAN stressed that the proposed design and construction of HKBCF set out in the Administration's funding proposals submitted to FC in 2009 and 2011 had not included the provision of shopping malls. While it was reasonable for boundary crossing facilities to include some shopping facilities, members of the public all along had not had an impression that the site would provide large shopping malls. As it was not the original planning intention for the HKBCF island to provide large-scale shopping facilities, the Administration should consult the public on the matter before submitting the funding proposal to FC for approval.

93. DCED replied that it had been mentioned in the Administration's papers submitted to PWSC in 2009 and 2011 that there would be commercial facilities to meet the needs of the visitors. In view of the commissioning of HZMB and the peripheral developments, the Administration considered it appropriate to carry out a study to explore the feasibility of providing commercial development on the HKBCF island to capitalize on the new development opportunities. The proposed commercial facilities would only be developed at the topside of the HKBCF island, although the feasibility of developing the underground space would also be explored. The area of the

HKBCF island, which was just enough to accommodate the boundary crossing facilities, would remain unchanged. He reiterated that the Administration would, as part of the proposed study, carry out a community engagement exercise in relation to the formulation of development proposals.

94. Mr Gary FAN said there were views suggesting that the Administration had not conducted adequate public consultation on the proposal on topside development on the HKBCF island. He recalled that there had been divergent views among members on the proposal when it was discussed at the meeting of the Panel on Development in March 2014. Noting that the Administration had advised in paragraph 13 of its paper that members of the Islands District Council ("IDC") had supported the proposal, he asked the Administration to provide details.

95. CE/HK(1)/CEDD replied that the Administration had consulted IDC on 24 February 2014 on the proposal and had submitted a paper to brief IDC members on it. In response to Mr FAN's enquiry on whether IDC had put the proposal to vote, CE/HK(1)/CEDD advised in the negative. He said that after a discussion on the proposal at the meeting, the IDC Chairman had concluded that IDC was in support of the proposal. The Chairman remarked that the gist of the discussion at the meeting of the Panel on Development on 25 March 2014 had been tabled at the meeting.

96. The Subcommittee noted that the proposed funding included a provision of \$3 million to finance the expenses on a community engagement exercise and other miscellaneous items. Dr Fernando CHEUNG and Mr Gary FAN enquired about the community engagement activities planned to be conducted.

97. DCED replied that the Administration had not yet finalized the details about the community engagement exercise. He assured members that, apart from the relevant District Council, members of the public would be engaged. CE/HK(1)/CEDD advised that the community engagement exercise would include, among others, briefings, exhibitions, display of models, panels, information digests and leaflets, etc. Moreover, relevant information about the proposed study would be mailed to local residents. As part of the exercise, the Administration would publicize the outcome of the proposed study, including the preliminary development proposals, and would seek public views on the proposals.

[The Chairman directed that the meeting be extended until 1:00 pm.]

Project cost and control

98. Mr Tony TSE said that he supported the funding proposal. He opined that as more than one Government departments would take part in the proposed study and the study scope comprised various parts, namely, planning and architectural study, engineering study and EIA, the Administration should consider commissioning more than one consultant to carry out these studies to ensure the independence of the results and cost-effectiveness. Dr Fernando CHEUNG opined that, for better project control, it was more desirable for the Administration to commission different consultants to undertake separate parts of the proposed study.

99. In response, DCED said the Administration's initial thinking was that it was effective to commission one single consultant to oversee different parts of the study. As the proposed study was multi-disciplinary and complex in nature, it needed to be undertaken by a group of professionals with different backgrounds. He advised that the main consultant would have to coordinate inputs from the professionals in the course of the study. In light of Mr TSE's view, he said the Administration would put in place suitable arrangements for specifying the duties to be undertaken by these professionals.

100. Miss CHAN Yuen-han enquired about the constraints that had to be taken into account by the consultant when undertaking the proposed study. DCED advised that although the HKBCF island had an area of about 130 hectares, given its proximity to HKIA, the developments permitted on it would be subject to various development constraints such as building height restrictions, requirements to avoid causing adverse environmental impact such as air and noise pollution, provision of supporting infrastructure facilities etc. Given these constraints, commercial developments would be more suitable than other noise-sensitive uses such as residential developments.

101. Dr Fernando CHEUNG recalled that with the approval of FC, a Chief Engineer post had been created in April 2009 to plan and implement the HKBCF project. Considering that the post had been created for five years, he queried why the Administration had yet to determine the appropriate topside development to be provided on the HKBCF island. DCED replied that the Chief Engineer post referred to by Dr CHEUNG had been created under the Highways Department to provide support for the planning and implementation of HKBCF. The post was not responsible for the subject matters covered by the proposed study.

102. Dr Fernando CHEUNG enquired about the Administration's estimation on the project cost for providing commercial facilities with a

commercial GFA of 300 000 square metres on the HKBCF island. DCED replied that as the Administration had yet to obtain the funding approval for the proposed study, the estimate on the cost of the development project was not available.

Motions proposed under Paragraph 32A of the Public Works Subcommittee Procedure

103. The Chairman advised that he had received two motions proposed under Paragraph 32A of the PWSC Procedure from Mr Albert CHAN. He considered that the motions were directly related to the agenda item. There being no further questions from members, the Chairman said that the meeting would proceed to consider the two motions.

104. The Chairman took turn to put to vote the questions that proposed motions numbered 0001 - 0002 be proceeded forthwith. As requested by members, the division bell was rung for five minutes before members' voting on individual questions. Both questions were voted down by a majority of members.

(Post-meeting note: A soft copy of the wording of the two motions was circulated to members by email on 10 June 2014.)

105. The Chairman sought members' views on whether the meeting should be further extended to deal with the voting on PWSC(2014-15)10. Mr Gary FAN said that he disagreed to further extending the meeting.

106. In response to Mr IP Kwok-him's enquiry on whether the Subcommittee would proceed to deal with the voting on the item (PWSC(2014-15)10) at the next meeting, the Chairman advised that if no more motions on the agenda item were received from members at the next meeting, he would put the item to vote.

Any other business

107. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 1:00 pm.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
11 July 2014