

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)2016/13-14
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/PL/DEV/1

Panel on Development

Minutes of meeting
held on Tuesday, 27 May 2014, at 2:30 pm
in Conference Room 3 of the Legislative Council Complex

Members present : Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen (Deputy Chairman)
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP
Hon Frederick FUNG Kin-kee, SBS, JP
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan
Dr Hon LAM Tai-fai, SBS, JP
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, JP
Hon CHAN Kin-por, BBS, JP
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP
Hon IP Kwok-him, GBS, JP
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-ye, GBS, JP
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP
Hon James TIEN Pei-chun, GBS, JP
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH
Hon YIU Si-wing
Hon Gary FAN Kwok-wai
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen
Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN Ka-lok

Hon CHAN Yuen-han, SBS, JP
Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, JP
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung
Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, JP
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, BBS, MH, JP

Member attending : Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP

Members absent : Dr Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBM, GBS, JP (Chairman)
Hon CHAN Han-pan
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, BBS, MH, JP

Public officers attending : **Agenda item IV**

Mr WONG Chung-leung
Principal Assistant Secretary (Works)³
Development Bureau

Mr LEUNG Wing-lim
Assistant Director/New Works
Water Supplies Department

Mr YEUNG Sek-kui
Chief Engineer/Design
Water Supplies Department

Ms Christine TSE Kin-ching
Assistant Director/Special Duties
Planning Department

Agenda item V

Mr LIU Chun-san
Principal Assistant Secretary (Works)²
Development Bureau

Mr WONG Hok-ning, JP
Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office
Civil Engineering and Development Department

Dr Samuel NG Kwok-choi
Chief Geotechnical Engineer/Planning
Civil Engineering and Development Department

Ms Amy CHEUNG Yi-mei
Assistant Director/Territorial
Planning Department

Agenda item VI

Mr LIU Chun-san
Principal Assistant Secretary (Works)2
Development Bureau

Mr Norman HEUNG Yuk-sai, JP
Project Manager (Kowloon)
Civil Engineering and Development Department

Mrs Sorais LEE KWAN Siu-kuen, JP
Head (Kai Tak Office)
Civil Engineering and Development Department

Clerk in attendance : Ms Sharon CHUNG
Chief Council Secretary (1)6

Staff in attendance : Mr Anthony CHU
Senior Council Secretary (1)6

Mr Fred PANG
Senior Council Secretary (1)8

Ms Christina SHIU
Legislative Assistant (1)6

I Confirmation of minutes

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1457/13-14 -- Minutes of meeting on 25 February 2014)

The minutes of the regular meeting on 25 February 2014 were confirmed.

II Information papers issued since the last meeting

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1325/13-14(01) -- Issue raised at the meeting between Legislative Council Members and Yau Tsim Mong District Council members on 9 January 2014 relating to problems arising from building works associated with sub-division of flats

LC Paper No. CB(1)1341/13-14(01) -- Letter dated 29 April 2014 from Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN Ka-lok and Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki on the planning issues related to the property development project at West Rail Yuen Long Station

LC Paper No. CB(1)1459/13-14(01) -- Administration's paper on revision of non-livelihood related fees and charges under the purview of the Water Supplies Department

LC Paper No. CB(1)1459/13-14(02) -- Administration's paper on revision of fees and charges under Mines (Safety) Regulations, Cap 285B, Dangerous Goods (General) Regulations, Cap. 295B, and Dangerous Goods (Government Explosives Depots) Regulations, Cap. 295D under the purview of the Civil Engineering and Development Department

LC Paper No. CB(1)1479/13-14(01) -- Letter dated 20 May 2014 from Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki on discovery of historical remains at the works site of Shatin to Central Link)

2. Members noted that the above information papers had been issued since the last meeting.

3. Dr KWOK Ka-ki referred to the Administration's response to his letter dated 20 May 2014 and Mr Gary FAN's letter dated 10 April 2014 on the discovery of historical remains at the works site of the Shatin to Central Link ("SCL"), which was tabled at the meeting. He suggested that a special Panel meeting be held to discuss the issue as the Administration's response could not address members' concerns on how the historical remains were handled. Ms Emily LAU and Dr Fernando CHEUNG supported Dr KWOK's proposal. Ms LAU said that the Administration and the MTR Corporation Limited ("MTRCL") should be invited to brief members on the details about how the historical remains were handled and the impact of the discovery, if any, on the construction works for SCL. Dr LAM Tai-fai suggested that members of the Panel on Home Affairs should be invited to join the discussion, which was about conservation of heritage. The Deputy Chairman suggested that consideration should be given to holding a joint meeting with the Subcommittee on Matters Relating to Railways as SCL fell under the Subcommittee's purview. He would convey members' suggestions to the Panel Chairman for further discussion with the Chairman of the Subcommittee. He informed members that the Panel on Transport would conduct a site visit to To Kwa Wan Station of SCL in early June. Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Chairman of the Panel on Transport, said that all Members of the Legislative Council would be invited to join the visit.

(Post-meeting note: The Administration's response tabled at the meeting was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1518/13-14(01) on 28 May 2014.)

III Items for discussion at the next meeting

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1456/13-14(01) -- List of outstanding items for discussion

LC Paper No. CB(1)1456/13-14(02) -- List of follow-up actions)

4. Members agreed that the next regular meeting scheduled for Tuesday, 24 June 2014, at 2:30 pm would be extended to end at 6:30 pm to discuss the following items proposed by the Administration --

- (a) Progress report on heritage conservation initiatives;
- (b) PWP Item No. 13GB -- Liantang/Heung Yuen Wai Boundary Control Point and associated works -- Progress update for buildings and associated facilities;
- (c) Work of the Urban Renewal Authority; and
- (d) Preliminary Feasibility Study on Developing the New Territories North -- Stage 1 Public Engagement.

5. The Deputy Chairman further advised that requests had been received from members of the Panel for a discussion on the following two information papers provided by the Administration --

- (a) Revision of non-livelihood related fees and charges under the purview of the Water Supplies Department; and
- (b) Revision of fees and charges under Mines (Safety) Regulations, Cap 285B, Dangerous Goods (General) Regulations, Cap. 295B, and Dangerous Goods (Government Explosives Depots) Regulations, Cap. 295D under the purview of the Civil Engineering and Development Department.

He sought members' views on whether to include the above two items in the agenda for the regular meeting on 24 June 2014. Members raised no objection. Dr KWOK Ka-ki pointed out that the agenda for the meeting on 24 June was already heavy and expressed concern that there might not be sufficient time for discussing the above two items. He suggested that a special meeting be arranged.

(Post-meeting note: With the concurrence of the Chairman, the item "Preliminary Feasibility Study on Developing the New Territories North -- Stage 1 Public Engagement" originally scheduled for discussion at the meeting on 24 June 2014 was deferred to a future meeting to allow sufficient time for discussion. The two information papers mentioned in paragraph 5 above had been scheduled for discussion at a special meeting to be held on 7 July 2014. For the

meeting on 24 June 2014, "Policy relating to Preservation of Historical Remains discovered at Works Sites" had been added to the agenda for combined discussion with the item "Progress Report on Heritage Conservation Initiatives". Members were informed of the above meeting arrangements vide LC Paper Nos. CB(1)1553/13-14 and CB(1)1565/13-14 issued on 4 and 6 June 2014 respectively.)

IV PWP Item No. 347WF -- Re provisioning of Harcourt Road fresh water pumping station

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1456/13-14(03) -- Administration's paper on 347WF -- Re provisioning of Harcourt Road fresh water pumping station)

Relevant papers

(LC Paper No. CB(1) 1491/13-14(01) -- Submission from Ms Melanie MOORE dated 21 May 2014

LC Paper No. CB(1)1491/13-14(02) -- Submission from Mr Norman HO dated 22 May 2014)

6. Members noted the following submissions tabled at the meeting --

- (a) Submission from Ms Kit YEUNG;
- (b) Submission from Ms Joanne CHOI;
- (c) Submission from Mr Douglas BLACK;
- (d) Submission from Ms Kylie THAPTHONG;
- (e) Submission from Green Sense;
- (f) Submission from Ms Michel CHAU;
- (g) Submission from Ms HO Loy;
- (h) Submission from Ms Melanie MOORE;
- (i) Submission from Mr Ken BORTHWICK;

- (j) Submission from Designing Hong Kong; and
- (k) Submission from Mr HUI Chi-fung, Central & Western District Council member.

(Post-meeting note: The above submissions were circulated to members vide LC Paper Nos. CB(1)1525/13-14(01)-(11) on 28 May 2014.)

7. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Assistant Director/New Works, Water Supplies Department ("AD/WSD(NW)") highlighted the salient points of the Administration's proposal to upgrade 347WF, "Reprovisioning of Harcourt Road Fresh Water Pumping Station" to Category A at an estimated cost of \$742.5 million in money-of-the-day ("MOD") prices for the reprovisioning of the Harcourt Road fresh water pumping station ("the Pumping Station") to a site near the Central Fire Station on Cotton Tree Drive at the periphery of the Hong Kong Park ("the Proposed Site"). The details of the proposal were set out in the Administration's paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)1456/13-14(03)). The Administration intended to submit the funding proposal for the endorsement of the Public Works Subcommittee ("PWSC") in June 2014 with a view to seeking the approval of the Finance Committee ("FC") in July 2014. Subject to FC's approval, the Administration planned to commence the works in December 2014 for completion in September 2019. AD/WSD(NW) drew members' attention to the proposed measures to conserve the old stone wall lying within the Proposed Site. The stone wall would be removed during the construction period but would be restored at the original location on the roof of the reprovisioned Pumping Station.

(Post-meeting note: A soft copy of the powerpoint presentation materials was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1524/13-14(01) by email on 28 May 2014.)

[During AD/WSD(NW)'s presentation, some people shouted in the public gallery. The Deputy Chairman asked them to keep quiet.]

8. The Deputy 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 subjects under discussion at the meeting before they spoke on the subjects. Under Rule 84 of RoP, a member should

not vote upon any question in which he had a direct pecuniary interest except under certain circumstances as provided for in Rule 84.

Land use planning for the existing site of the Harcourt Road fresh water pumping station

9. Noting that the Pumping Station would be relocated to allow office development at the site currently occupied by the Hong Kong Red Cross Headquarters and the Pumping Station ("the Site"), Dr KWOK Ka-ki asked about the assessment and consultation conducted before the Administration made the reprovisioning decision. He was dissatisfied that the Administration had not consulted LegCo Members on the land use of the sites to be made available under Central Reclamation Phase III.

10. Assistant Director/Special Duties, Planning Department ("AD/PlanD(SD")), advised that the Pumping Station lay within the area covered by the Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront ("UDS"), which was completed in 2011. Two large-scale public engagement exercises had been organized in 2009 and 2010 as part of UDS on the planning and urban design proposals of the key sites in the New Central Harbourfront. It was subsequently agreed that the development intensity of the sites near the new Central Piers be reduced and the Site be used for office development to further increase the supply of Grade A office space, subject to the relocation of the existing facilities there. The relevant details of the office development at the Site had been set out in the information digest for UDS. As regards the reprovisioning of the Pumping Station, it was not until WSD had found a potential relocation site that the Administration could provide any information.

11. Dr Fernando CHEUNG considered that the development of the Site would only benefit the Administration and developers. However, the heritage value of the stone wall, which would be removed during the construction period, would be affected by the relocation exercise. He queried the justifications for relocating the Pumping Station and asked about UDS's final recommendations on the development of the Site.

12. AD/PlanD(SD) replied that the recommendation of UDS, which was spelt out in the information digest for UDS, was to explore a possible additional office development at the Site to provide about 21 000 square metres of office space. Moreover, the 2013 and 2014 Policy Addresses had pointed out the need to convert suitable Government/institution/community

sites in the Central Business District to commercial uses to help address the land supply problem.

13. Dr CHIANG Lai-wan said that the Administration had not addressed members' queries on the relocation proposal, which would affect the Flagstaff House (Museum of Tea Ware), part of the old stone wall and 118 trees. As Hong Kong had amassed a huge fiscal reserve, she did not see the urgency in vacating the Site for commercial and office developments. She called on the Administration to reconsider the development of the Site. In response, Principal Assistant Secretary (Works)3, Development Bureau ("PAS/DEV(W)3"), explained that the development of the Site was to address the shortage of land for office development in the Central Business District. Responding to Dr CHIANG's enquiry on the traffic impact of the proposed developments at the Site, AD/PlanD(SD) advised that the traffic impact assessment concluded that there would not be any insurmountable traffic problems associated with the office developments at the Site.

14. Mr Alan LEONG sought detailed information about the decision to relocate the Pumping Station to the Proposed Site after the UDS Report had been published. He also queried why the design of the Central Harbourfront had not catered for the reprovisioning of the Pumping Station and criticized that the Administration's paper did not provide sufficient information about the impact of the relocation of the Pumping Station. PAS/DEV(W)3 advised that based on the recommendation of UDS regarding the proposed office development at the Site, WSD was responsible for taking forward the proposal for the reprovisioning of the Pumping Station.

15. Mr YIU Si-wing asked about the estimated value of the land premium to be received from the sale of the land at the Site. He held the view that a balance had to be struck on conservation and development in the planning of an area. If the concerns on the preservation of the old stone wall and the handling of the trees affected by the construction works could be addressed, members should support the proposal. In reply, PAS/DEV(W)3 said that the Administration could not provide any information on the amount of the land premium for the Site as it would vary over time.

Impact of the reprovisioning works on the environment and heritage

Conservation of the old stone wall

16. Referring to the removal of the old stone wall, which had a history of more than 150 years, under the proposal, Dr KWOK Ka-ki said he was worried that even if the wall would be restored in-situ after the relocation of the Pumping Station, the heritage value of the wall would be significantly reduced. Mr Albert CHAN shared similar concerns.

17. Dr Fernando CHEUNG expressed concern about the impact of the reprovisioning works on Hong Kong Park, the old stone wall and the Flagstaff House. Dr Kenneth CHAN said that the craftsmanship of the stone wall was in excellent conditions and the wall blended in well with the Flagstaff House and the environment. He considered it unacceptable to remove part of the stone wall and restore it at a later stage, as it was likely that damages to the heritage value of the wall would be made in the removal process. Mr James TIEN was also concerned about the removal and restoration of the stone wall.

[Some members of the public in the public gallery made noise. The Deputy Chairman reminded them to keep quiet. He said that he might have to ask them to leave if they made noise again.]

18. AD/WSD(NW) advised that the Administration had engaged a consultant to conduct a heritage impact assessment on the Flagstaff House and the stone wall for the proposed works. The report had been forwarded to the Antiquities Advisory Board ("AAB") for comments. The Administration had accepted AAB's suggestion to relocate the affected 35-metre stone wall in seven sections in order to better preserve the stone wall for future in-situ restoration. The proposal was subsequently supported by most members of AAB. The Administration would carry out a detailed cartographic and photographic survey for the affected part of the stone wall prior to temporary removal of the wall and commencement of the construction works. A specialist contractor would be engaged to carry out the removal works. Details of the removal plan would be submitted to the Antiquities and Monuments Office ("AMO") for comments and approval. The same conservation method for old stone walls had been adopted overseas. He assured members that the whole affected part of the stone wall would be restored in-situ.

19. Dr Kenneth CHAN said that according to media reports, there were dissenting views among AAB members on the conservation method for the stone walls. He opined that Panel members should be informed of AAB members' views before considering the present proposal. As the Administration had not addressed public concerns about the conservation of the stone wall, he considered that the Panel should not endorse the proposal.

20. Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok pointed out that if the stone wall was not removed during the construction of the Pumping Station, it might pose hazards to the construction workers. The stone wall needed regular inspection and maintenance to ensure its structural safety. He opined that it was more appropriate to temporarily relocate the stone wall before the construction works for the Pumping Station started and restore the wall later. Citing the relocation of Murray House as an example, Mr IP Kwok-him supported the temporary removal of the affected part of the stone wall as a conservation measure. Sharing similar views, Mr YIU Si-wing considered the proposed conservation method for the stone wall acceptable in the overall interest of Hong Kong.

21. Mr Frederick FUNG asked if the reprovisioning works would affect the Flagstaff House, which was a Declared Monument. AD/WSD(NW) advised that stringent mitigation and monitoring measures for the Flagstaff House would be put in place. A retaining wall would be constructed to protect the monument and no blasting works would be carried out. No large machines which would produce strong vibration would be used for the works. Monitoring devices would be installed around the Flagstaff House to ensure that the impact of works would be within an acceptable level.

Consultation with District Councils

22. While agreeing to the need of reprovisioning the Pumping Station, Mr CHAN Kam-lam enquired about the public consultation carried out on the measures to mitigate the heritage impact arising from the proposed works. In reply, AD/WSD(NW) said that the Administration had consulted both Central and Western District Council ("C&W DC") and Wan Chai DC in 2013 and both DCs supported the proposal.

23. Mr WU Chi-wai referred to the submission from Mr HUI Chi-fung, C&W DC member, that consultation with C&W DC on the present proposal was inadequate. He asked if the Administration's claim that C&W DC supported the proposal was based on the consultation with the Food, Environment, Hygiene & Works Committee ("FEHWC") of C&W DC on

17 October 2013 or the circulation of information papers on 28 November 2013 on the revised design of the relocated pumping station.

24. AD/WSD(NW) advised that the Administration had briefed FEHWC of C&W DC on the proposal at its meeting on 17 October 2013. He cited the minutes of the FEHWC meeting on 17 October 2013 that, in concluding the discussion, the Chairman said that FEHWC "did not object to re-provisioning the pumping station on Harcourt Road to the existing slope near Central Fire Station on Cotton Tree Drive, but had reservations about the landscaping design of the new pumping station". WSD had subsequently provided the requested information to the Committee. Upon receiving the information, FEHWC members had raised no objection to the proposal.

25. Mr WU Chi-wai said that normally large-scale public works projects should be discussed at DC meetings. At the FEHWC meeting on 17 October 2013, the Administration undertook to provide further information for DC members' consideration. He considered that the Administration should formally seek DC's endorsement of the proposal at a meeting before submitting the proposal for the Panel's consideration, instead of only providing supplementary written information to FEHWC. He requested that the Administration should consult C&W DC on the proposal.

26. Noting the objecting views of the public, some C&W DC members and Panel members on the proposed project, Ms Emily LAU expressed concern about the inadequacy of public consultation on the proposal and asked the Administration to revise the proposal to address public concerns.

27. PAS/DEV(W)3 advised that the Administration had considered alternative sites but each of those sites had its own disadvantages. As regards the conservation of the old stone wall, the method proposed by the Administration, though not agreeable to some members of the public and the Panel, had been used overseas. AD/WSD(NW) said that there was always room for better preparation for the implementation of the proposal, such as obtaining the endorsement of DC for the proposal at a meeting if necessary.

[As some members of the public shouted in the public gallery, the Deputy Chairman gave a final warning that if they continued to disrupt the meeting, they would be ordered to leave the conference room.]

28. Mr IP Kwok-him said that at the meeting of FEHWC on 17 October 2013, the Committee had raised no objection to the proposal but requested more information on the design of the new pumping station, the greening works, the conservation of the Flagstaff House and the old stone wall, etc. The issues had been discussed thoroughly at the meeting. Furthermore, WSD had provided supplementary information after the meeting.

29. Mr Albert CHAN sought clarification on whether C&W DC had agreed to the present proposal. He requested that the confirmation from C&W DC be sought.

Impact of the relocation of the Pumping Station on trees and air quality

30. Mr Gary FAN said that members of the public objected to the present proposal on the consideration that the works would adversely affect the trees and the environment of Hong Kong Park. The air pollution index in Central had been high and the trees in Hong Kong Park could relieve the hot island effect and alleviate air pollution. Given that the construction works under the present proposal would involve the removal of 118 old trees, he asked if the Administration had assessed the impact of the construction works on Hong Kong Park's function as city lungs and the compensatory greening measures. Referring to the proposed transplantation of 31 trees, he said that many trees transplanted in other public works projects had been damaged during the process or could not adapt to the new environment. He asked WSD to provide information about tree transplantation works carried out in the past, including the successful rates, so that the public would be convinced that transplanting was a viable method.

31. Mr YIU Si-wing also asked about the compensatory measures for the trees felled under the present proposal.

32. AD/WSD(NW) said that 87 trees would need to be felled mainly because of poor health or low survival rates after transplanting. 87 new trees and 3 310 shrubs would be planted upon the completion of construction of the proposed Pumping Station. This coupled with the provision of vertical greening and 270 square metres of grassed area would enhance the greening effect of the site. He agreed that the Administration had to be cautious in selecting trees for transplantation. After considering factors such as the size, the age and the species of the trees and their adaptability to a new environment, the Administration, with the assistance of tree specialists, considered that 31 trees were suitable for transplanting. 17 trees would be

transplanted inside Hong Kong Park, while the remaining 14 would be transplanted to Pok Fu Lam Reservoir and other WSD facilities. The Administration would ensure the quality of the new trees to be planted and that the number of trees at the Proposed Site would not be reduced by the implementation of the relocation project.

33. On the impact of the works on the air quality in the vicinity of Hong Kong Park, PAS/DEV(W)3 advised that there would be some short-term impact during the construction period but it would not be significant, as the number of trees to be affected only represented a small proportion of the trees in the Park.

34. Mr CHAN Hak-kan was concerned about the impact of the proposal on the trees in Hong Kong Park, especially the existing teak tree (*Tectona grandis*), which was an Old and Valuable tree. He opined that the construction works might cause damages to the tree root despite that a fence would be erected around the tree to ensure that no works would be carried out within the tree protection zone. He queried if WSD had the relevant experience and knowledge in tree transplantation. Sharing similar concerns, Mr YIU Si-wing enquired about the protection measures for the teak tree.

35. AD/WSD(NW) said that tree experts would be engaged to undertake the tree transplantation works and other tree protection works under the project to the satisfaction of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department. As to the protection of the teak tree, which was outside the works site boundary, a tree protection zone would be set up according to the relevant technical circular issued by the Development Bureau. He explained that the protection zone for a tree corresponded to the dripline, i.e. the imaginary vertical plumb line that extends downward from the tips of the outermost tree branches and intersects the ground. The tree root would be within the tree protection zone.

36. In response to a further enquiry by Mr CHAN Hak-kan, PAS/DEV(W)3 said that as stated in paragraph 19 of the Administration's paper, landscape consultants, including tree experts, had been engaged for the proposed works.

37. Dr CHIANG Lai-wan asked about the ages of the 118 trees. PAS/DEV(W)3 responded that most of the affected trees had probably been planted during the construction of Hong Kong Park and they were exotic species.

38. Mr Frederick FUNG expressed concern that a lot of public works projects involved the felling and transplantation of trees and this was in conflict with the objective of building a green environment in Hong Kong. AD/WSD(NW) advised it was the Administration's policy that public works projects should not affect the trees at the works sites as far as possible. The Administration had been implementing greening works in various areas continuously and the number of new trees planted each year was greater than that of the trees affected by public works projects.

39. Responding to Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok's enquiry, Chief Engineer/Design, Water Supplies Department ("CE/WSD(D)") advised that trees would be planted on the roof as well as at different levels of the relocated pumping station. Sufficient soil would be provided for the growth of the trees.

Alternative sites for the reprovisioning of the Harcourt Road fresh water pumping station

The proposed site on Cotton Tree Drive

40. Noting that the new pumping station at the Proposed Site would encroach on the open space of Hong Kong Park, Dr Kenneth CHAN enquired if the Administration had sought the approval of the Town Planning Board ("TPB") for changing the zoning of the Proposed Site from "Open Space" to a site for pumping station.

41. AD/WSD(NW) clarified that the Administration had made an application to TPB for planning permission for constructing a pumping station at the Proposed Site and the application had been approved. Changing the "Open Space" zoning for the Proposed Site would not be required for construction of the pumping station. Given that the slope was inconspicuous and inaccessible to the public, the Administration considered that leveling the slope to accommodate the pumping station was an efficient way to make use of limited land resources

42. Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok said that housing the pumping station on a leveled slope was a measure to optimize land use, similar to developing caverns to accommodate existing facilities. He expressed concern about the visual impact of the new pumping station on the environment.

Alternative sites

43. Dr KWOK Ka-ki asked about the justifications for choosing the Proposed Site and whether the Administration had considered other possible sites. AD/WSD(NW) advised that in 2009, WSD and PlanD had worked together to identify a site for the reprovisioning of the Pumping Station. Due to the constraints that the level of the new pumping station could not be too high, as it had to receive water transferred from the network on the Kowloon side, and it had to be close to the existing trunk mains for connecting to them, the choices of site for the relocation of the Pumping Station were limited. Alternative sites, such as those at Supreme Court Road and at the café within Hong Kong Park, had been considered. However, the construction of a pumping station at these sites would adversely affect the operation and maintenance of the Park. Under the present proposal, the relocated pumping station would only be at the periphery of Hong Kong Park currently inaccessible to the public. The Proposed Site was considered the most suitable location.

44. In view of the impact of the reprovisioning works on 118 trees in Hong Kong Park, Ms Cyd HO disagreed to the Administration's proposal to release the Site at Harcourt Road for office development. She opined that the alternative site at the café in Hong Kong Park should be considered, as the impact of the construction works at that site on the Park would only be temporary, while reprovisioning the Pumping Station at the Proposed Site would reduce the heritage value of the stone wall.

45. AD/WSD(NW) advised that if the site of the café in Hong Kong Park was used for the reprovisioning of the Pumping Station, the site would have to be permanently occupied for the operation of the Pumping Station. He reiterated that a heritage consultant had been engaged to undertake a heritage impact assessment for the project, which concluded that the historic value of the stone wall was moderate. Having said that, the consultant had recommended to conserve the wall by temporarily removing it and then restoring it in-situ. The recommendation was supported by AAB.

In-situ reprovisioning

46. Mr James TIEN said that the Liberal Party had reservation on the Administration's proposal. Taking into account the possible impacts of the reprovisioning works on Hong Kong Park, the trees and the old stone wall, he suggested that the Administration should consider reprovisioning the Pumping Station near the new Central Harbourfront. He opined that the

Administration could require the future developer of the Site at Harcourt Road to reconstruct a new pumping station to co-locate with the office development.

47. Dr Kenneth CHAN said that the Civic Party could not accept the Administration's proposal. He queried why the Pumping Station could not be reprovisioned in-situ.

48. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung suggested that consideration should be given to reprovisioning both the Pumping Station and the Hong Kong Red Cross Headquarters in-situ. Suitable provisions should be stipulated in the relevant land lease to require the future developer to carry out the reprovisioning works. As regards the possible technical difficulties for such works, he believed that they could be overcome by the present-day engineering technology.

49. CE/WSD(D) advised that there were actual technical difficulties with in-situ reprovisioning of the Pumping Station. The tunnels of SCL would pass beneath the Site and this had posed constraints to the development of the Site. The design of the pilings represented technical challenges for the future development at the Site. The presence of the Pumping Station would pose further constraints and the development potential of the site would be significantly undermined. In-situ reprovisioning of the Pumping Station was therefore not considered. PAS/DEV(W)3 added that the tunnels of SCL were at some 20 metres below the ground and it was necessary to protect the tunnels by locating the pilings at least three metres from the tunnels. He further advised that the construction of the new Hong Kong Red Cross Headquarters at West Kowloon was already in progress.

50. Mr Albert CHAN suggested that the Administration should consider making use of the land zoned as the Central Military Dock for reprovisioning the Pumping Station.

Submission of the proposal to the Public Works Subcommittee

51. In view of the wide range of supplementary information about the project requested by members, the Deputy Chairman sought members' views on deferring the Panel's decision to a future meeting on whether to endorse the Administration's submission of the proposal to PWSC. Dr Kenneth CHAN supported deferring further discussion on the proposal to a future meeting, pending further information to be provided by the Administration. Mr Gary FAN suggested that a visit to the Proposed Site be

organized for members. After deliberation, members agreed that further discussion on the proposal be deferred to a future meeting and, in the meantime, the Administration should provide the Panel with the information requested by members.

52. In summary, the Administration was asked to provide the following information --

Justifications for relocating the pumping station

- (a) An extract of the UDS report recommending that office development could be proposed for the Site and the relevant justifications;
- (b) A chronology of events after the publication of the UDS report in 2011 leading to the proposal on the reprovisioning of the Pumping Station at the Proposed Site, including the major decisions made and the works/studies undertaken by the relevant departments;
- (c) The estimated value of the land premium for the Site;

Alternative sites

- (d) Alternative sites that had been considered by the Administration for the reprovisioning of the Pumping Station and the pros and cons of each site;
- (e) Whether the Administration had considered reprovisioning the Pumping Station in-situ or at a site near the new Central harbourfront, such as the site for the Central Military Dock; if not, the reasons;

Trees affected by the reprovisioning works

- (f) Of the trees transplanted under previous public works projects, (i) the number of these trees which had survived; (ii) the number of these trees which had died subsequently; and (iii) the successful rate of transplantation;

- (g) Criteria for considering whether trees affected by construction works should be felled or transplanted;
- (h) Breakdown on the 118 trees which had to be removed, by age and size; and

Public consultation

- (i) Written records or confirmation from C&W DC indicating its support for the proposed works.

The Secretariat was asked to circulate the list of requested information to members for their comments.

(Post-meeting note: The list was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1532/13-14 on 29 May 2014 for comments. Comments had been received from members on item (c) above. The item was revised to "(c) the respective estimated land premiums of the Site at the 2014 price level under the following two circumstances: (i) relocating the Pumping Station to another place; (ii) in-situ reprovisioning of the Pumping Station". The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1842/13-14(01) on 22 July 2014.)

V PWP Item No. 769CL -- Pilot study on underground space development in selected strategic urban areas

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1321/13-14(01) -- Administration's paper on 769CL -- Pilot study on underground space development in selected strategic urban areas

LC Paper No. CB(1)1321/13-14(02) Paper on the pilot study on the use of underground space prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat (Background brief))

53. Members noted the following submission tabled at the meeting --

Submission from Tsim Sha Tsui Residents Concern Group.

(Post-meeting note: The above submission was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1525/13-14(12) on 28 May 2014.)

54. Principal Assistant Secretary (Works)2, Development Bureau ("PAS/DEV(W)2") briefed members on the background to the Administration's proposal to upgrade 769CL to Category A at an estimated cost of \$68.4 million in MOD prices to carry out a pilot study ("the Study") on underground space development in four selected strategic urban areas, namely Tsim Sha Tsui West, Causeway Bay, Happy Valley and Admiralty/Wan Chai ("the four selected areas"). With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department ("H(GEO)/CEDD"), highlighted the salient points of the proposal. The Administration planned to submit the funding proposal for the endorsement of PWSC in June 2014 with a view to seeking the approval of FC in July 2014. Subject to FC's approval, the Administration planned to commence the Study in September 2014 for completion in early 2017.

(Post-meeting note: A soft copy of the powerpoint presentation materials was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1524/13-14(02) by email on 28 May 2014.)

55. The Deputy Chairman reminded members that in accordance with Rule 83A of RoP of LegCo, they should disclose the nature of any direct or indirect pecuniary interests relating to the subjects under discussion at the meeting before they spoke on the subjects. Under Rule 84 of RoP, a member should not vote upon any question in which he had a direct pecuniary interest except under certain circumstances as provided for in the rule.

Consultation with District Councils

56. While supporting the concept of exploring the use of underground space to improve the congested environment in developed areas, Miss CHAN Yuen-han was concerned about the reservation expressed by some DC members on the proposal. She sought details of these concerns and how the Administration would address them. She was worried that the present-term Government would not listen to public views when pursuing its policy initiatives.

57. Considering that the use of underground space was worth exploring, Dr KWOK Ka-ki asked about the opposing views and concerns expressed

by the relevant DCs and local communities. Ms Emily LAU asked the Administration to thoroughly consult the relevant DCs to ensure that the proposal was supported by the local communities.

58. PAS/DEV(W)2 said that the three DCs (i.e. Wan Chai DC, Eastern DC and Yau Tsim Mong DC) consulted were in general supportive of the Study. Individual DC members had expressed various concerns, which would be examined in detail under the Study with a view to working out the necessary mitigation measures. Public consultation exercises would be organized as part of the Study to discuss the proposal with stakeholders. It was expected that with the findings of the Study and the input from stakeholders, development options could be formulated for the use of underground space to improve the environment and the connectivity of the selected areas.

59. H(GEO)/CEDD supplemented that the Administration attached great importance to the views of DCs and stakeholders. The main concern expressed by DCs and local communities was the aggravation of the existing pedestrian flow and traffic congestion problems during and after the underground space was constructed. While the concern was understandable, overseas experience showed that the use of underground space offered an opportunity to segregate pedestrians from road traffic. The accessibility and connectivity of the concerned areas could also be enhanced if underground space could be utilized in a planned manner.

Scopes of the Study and the Territory-wide Study

60. Dr Fernando CHEUNG sought clarification on the difference between the territory-wide study on underground space development in the urban areas of Hong Kong commenced in December 2013 (the "Territory-wide Study") and the Study. He queried whether there were duplications between the scopes of the two studies, possibly resulting in a waste of resources. In his view, the Administration should wait for the completion of the Territory-wide Study before taking forward the Study, as there might be a possibility that the findings of the two studies were in conflict. He was concerned that public enjoyment of public space, such as the Victoria Park and the Kowloon Park, would be adversely affected during the construction period. He also queried why the Administration had selected the four areas.

61. PAS/DEV(W)2 stressed that the Administration was dedicated to adopting a multi-pronged approach, including innovative measures such as

the development of underground space, to increasing land supply to meet the various needs of the community. H(GEO)/CEDD supplemented that the two studies would be complementary to each other and were therefore conducted in parallel. The present proposal would focus on the planning and engineering assessments to determine the specific use of underground space in the four selected areas at the district level and to identify any priority projects suitable for early implementation, while the Territory-wide Study was to broadly explore the opportunities and constraints of underground space development in the whole urban areas and new towns of Hong Kong and to identify areas, other than the four selected areas, with high potential for developing underground space. Feeding early information and findings from the Territory-wide Study, such as key constraints encountered and their respective solutions, to the Study will facilitate formulation of suitable measures and implementation strategies for underground space development in the four selected areas.

62. Ir Dr LO Wai-ki said that the two studies were separate studies with different objectives and scopes. Citing the successful experience of Japan, he expressed support for conducting the Study to explore the use of underground space for providing retail facilities and enhancing the connectivity of the concerned areas.

63. The Deputy Chairman opined that it would be confusing to the public that the Study would examine the four selected areas before the completion of the Territory-wide Study.

64. In reply, H(GEO)/CEDD said that the Administration had made reference to overseas examples of developing underground space. He reiterated that the Study was a pilot study for the four areas which were selected with reference to the findings of previous studies related to pedestrian circulation and were considered to have high potential for developing underground space. With respect to the public views that there were other areas in Hong Kong which were suitable for underground space development, the Administration had commissioned the Territory-wide Study to strategically exploring opportunities and constraints in other areas for further studies.

Details of the Study

65. Dr KWOK Ka-ki was concerned that approval of the funding proposal for conducting the Study would be tantamount to giving a green light for the future implementation of underground space development

projects. He stressed that if the Study's findings indicated that any underground space development was not feasible for a particular area, the relevant project should not be pursued further. PAS/DEV(W)2 affirmed that upon completion of the Study, implementation of any priority underground space development projects recommended by the Study would be subject to further consultation with the local communities and funding approval of FC.

66. Referring to Enclosure 1 to the Administration's paper, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen said that the Administration had not indicated a definite boundary for each of the four selected areas. As the three areas on Hong Kong Island were disjointed, he asked if the Study would examine the connectivity among the areas. He further asked whether the Study would prioritize the underground space development projects for implementation, whether it would only focus on Government land but not private land in the four selected areas, and whether these projects would need to go through the Town Planning Board.

67. PAS/DEV(W)2 advised that the locations of the study areas indicated on the plan were indicative and subject to review under the Study. One of the objectives of the Study was to enhance the connectivity within each of the four selected areas. However, there might be constraints on improving the connectivity across these areas due to their distance apart. The Study would examine the interface problems of underground space development with public and private developments/redevelopments. He assured members that the Study would formulate the priority for taking forward the proposed underground space developments.

68. In response to Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's enquiry, Assistant Director/Territorial, Planning Department ("AD/PlanD(T)") said that if development of underground space would involve any changes in land use, it would have to comply with the provisions in the Town Planning Ordinance (Cap. 131). The Study would explore the potential uses of the underground space.

69. Mr CHAN Kin-por asked if the Administration had studied the adoption of the latest technology for developing underground space in overseas cities to minimize the impact of works on the local communities, in particular the densely developed areas, and shorten the duration of works. H(GEO)/CEDD replied that there were challenges in developing underground space in the urban areas. New technologies were available and the Study would review the relevant technical issues and examine how the

new technologies could mitigate the adverse impacts on the residents, taking into account the applicability of the technologies to various factors including the geology in the areas.

70. Mr Michael TIEN said that in the past decade, the retail volume had increased by more than 200%. However, the retail areas had not increased correspondingly and the Administration did not have a comprehensive plan for the provision of retail space. He supported taking forward the present proposal as one of the measures for developing more retail facilities to increase the carrying capacity of Hong Kong for tourists. In his view, the Administration should make more efforts in exploring the potentials of Tsim Sha Tsui West and Admiralty/Wan Chai for underground space development, given their proximity to the terminal of the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link and the SCL station at Wan Chai North respectively. Visitors from the Mainland would be able to access the retail facilities at the underground space in these areas conveniently. He considered that the study on Causeway Bay and Happy Valley should be placed in lower priority as the transport links to these two areas were already near their full capacities. Unless the North Island Line would be constructed, the transport problems in these two areas would remain unresolved.

Impact of underground space development on the existing residents

71. Dr KWOK Ka-ki expressed concern that some areas of open spaces would be used as entrances/exits to the underground space and asked whether the local communities would be compensated for the loss. In his opinion, as underground space development for commercial and retail uses would attract more visitors, thus putting more pressure on the pedestrian and traffic networks in the areas, the local residents would not be able to benefit from the development of underground space. He also asked if the Administration had conducted any socio-economic impact assessment for the proposed works.

72. PAS/DEV(W)2 said that one of the objectives of the Study was to prioritize the potential underground space development projects taking into account various factors. While large open spaces were considered suitable for large-scale underground space development, the existing above-ground facilities would be maintained. Despite that there might inevitably be some temporary disturbances to the above-ground facilities during construction, upon the completion of works, the above-ground and underground facilities could be operated independently. He further advised that the Study would

include a planning study during which social and economic impact might be assessed.

73. H(GEO)/CEDD supplemented that there were both pros and cons with the proposal to develop underground space in each of the four selected areas. He stressed that development of underground space needed careful planning and hence an Underground Master Plan would be formulated for each of the four selected areas. Besides, the priority projects identified under the Study would not be all taken forward at the same time.

74. Sharing other members' concerns on the impact of providing retail facilities at the underground space in the four selected areas on the existing residents, Ms Emily LAU queried whether these areas had the carrying capacity for additional visitors. In response, PAS/DEV(W)2 said that one of the important tasks to be covered in the Study was to conduct preliminary engineering design of priority projects and the supporting transport infrastructure. Assessment of impacts on road traffic and pedestrian circulation would be conducted and mitigation measures, if necessary, would be recommended. He added that developing underground space would provide an opportunity for resolving the pedestrian and vehicular congestions in the four selected areas. A win-win option would be sought to cater for the needs of the local communities and to address the land shortage problem at the same time.

75. While supporting the direction to explore the development of underground space to increase land supply, Mr IP Kwok-him expressed concern that underground space development and the relevant construction works would affect the traffic and pedestrian circulation in densely developed areas. The residents were also worried about the impact of underground space works on the safety of the buildings in the vicinity. He said that the existing buildings in built-up areas might limit the amount of underground space available for development.

76. PAS/DEV(W)2 advised that the Administration was mindful that the existing road-based transport might not be able to support the additional traffic drawn to these urban areas by the new underground space developments. Instead, integration of mass transit systems, such as the existing and new MTR lines, with the new underground space developments should be considered to alleviate the heavy at-grade pedestrian and vehicular flow. He assured members that the local DCs and communities would be consulted on the transport linkage proposals. AD/PlanD(T) supplemented that the four selected areas were chosen for the Study as they

would have new transport infrastructures, such as railway systems, in the future. H(GEO)/CEDD said that for densely developed areas, the primary use of the underground space would be to improve the pedestrian circulation on the ground level.

Underground space development in other areas

77. While supporting developing underground space to address the land shortage problem, Mr CHAN Kam-lam pointed out that the Administration would meet a lot of challenges in undertaking works in the four selected areas, given the existing underground utilities and land ownership problems. Consideration should be given to constructing underground space in less developed areas, such as Kai Tak Development ("KTD"). Relevant provisions could be incorporated in the land leases for the concerned sites to allow the developers to develop the underground space. As such, higher premiums could be asked for the sites and the Administration could take a more proactive role in the planning for the development of underground space in the areas. Mr CHAN Kin-por enquired if the Administration had considered developing underground space in Sham Shui Po and Mong Kok.

78. PAS/DEV(W)2 said that the Administration had proposed in the Kai Tak outline zoning plan two underground shopping streets to connect Kowloon City and San Po Kong. Other urban areas, excluding the four selected areas, would be covered under the Territory-wide Study. AD/PlanD(T) supplemented that the Administration had not ruled out the possibility of selecting other locations for further similar studies at a later stage. Pointing out that underground street and underground city were two different concepts, Mr CHAN Kam-lam urged the Administration to consider the planning of the use of underground space from a broader perspective.

79. Ms Emily LAU asked if the Administration had previously conducted a study on developing an underground city in Central. As regards new commercial and retail facilities, she suggested that consideration could be given to developing such in a large scale on the Airport Island.

80. AD/PlanD(T) advised that PlanD had previously conducted planning studies on underground space development in individual areas, such as Causeway Bay, with a view to improving the local pedestrian circulation. As a result, some underground passageways in the urban areas had been developed. Gaining the experiences from previous planning studies, the implementation issues would be carefully considered under the Study.

81. Mr YIU Si-wing supported the Administration's planning work for underground space development. Noting that three of the four selected areas were on Hong Kong Island, which did not have direct transport links with the Mainland, he was concerned that visitors coming from the Mainland would have to change to other railway lines or ground transport to travel to those areas, exerting great pressure on these transport links. As such, he had reservation on underground space development for commercial and retail facilities on Hong Kong Island. In his view, consideration could instead be given to exploring the suitability of other areas in Kowloon, such as the Hung Hom Station, in order to divert visitors from the existing hot spots for shopping.

82. PAS/DEV(W)2 clarified that while the Study would examine three selected areas on Hong Kong Island, it did not mean that underground space developments proposed for the three areas would be carried out at the same time. H(GEO)/CEDD added that Tsim Sha Tsui West had the potential for underground space development. While the three areas on Hong Kong Island had their constraints, they were located in close proximity to one another and shared the same transport network such that they were included in the Study for an assessment on the synergy effect. He assured members that the projects for the development of underground space would be implemented in a well-planned manner.

Ownership of underground space

83. Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok expressed concern about the ownership of the underground space underneath private properties, having regard to possible lengthy negotiations between the Government and the property owners that might be needed in developing such space. H(GEO)/CEDD acknowledged that Hong Kong, as well as other overseas cities, faced the same challenge in respect of the land ownership issue. He pointed out that there were successful precedents of underground space developments both overseas and in Hong Kong. One of the objectives of the Study was to identify priority projects suitable for early implementation, which would probably fall within Government land.

Submission of the funding proposal to the Public Works Subcommittee

84. At the request of Ms Emily LAU, the Administration was requested to provide the following information in the relevant paper to PWSC --

- (a) Respective scopes of the Territory-wide Study and the Study; and the justifications for conducting two separate studies on underground space development concurrently; and
- (b) Reasons for selecting the four areas, on which there were concerns about the impact of underground space development on the traffic conditions and pedestrian flows, for the Study.

(Post-meeting note: The Administration's supplementary information was included in LC Paper No. PWSC(2014-15)31, which was circulated to all FC members on 24 June 2014.)

85. In concluding the discussion, the Deputy Chairman said that the Panel raised no objection to the Administration's submission of the funding proposal on PWP Item No. 769CL to PWSC.

VI PWP Item No. 065TR -- Detailed feasibility study for Environmentally Friendly Linkage System for Kowloon East

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1456/13-14(04) -- Administration's paper on 65TR -- Detailed feasibility study for Environmentally Friendly Linkage System for Kowloon East

LC Paper No. CB(1)1456/13-14(05) -- Paper on the proposed Environmentally Friendly Linkage System for Kowloon East prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat (Background brief))

Relevant papers

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1491/13-14(03) -- Submission from a member of the public (Dfsad Dfsa) dated 21 May 2014

LC Paper No. CB(1)1491/13-14(04) -- Submission from Ms SO Lai-chun, Vice Chairman of Kwun Tong District Council dated 22 May 2014

LC Paper No. CB(1)1491/13-14(05) -- Submission from Mr TANG Wing-chun, Kwun Tong District Council member dated 22 May 2014)

86. Members noted the following submission tabled at the meeting --

Submission from Laguna City Estate Owner's Committee.

(Post-meeting note: The above submission was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1525/13-14(13) on 28 May 2014.)

87. PAS/DEV(W)2 briefed the Panel on the outcome of the two-stage public consultation ("PC") exercise on the proposed Environmentally Friendly Linkage System ("EFLS") for Kowloon East ("KE") completed in February 2014 and the Administration's proposal to upgrade 65TR to Category A at an estimated cost of about \$92 million in MOD prices for carrying out a detailed feasibility study ("DFS") and preliminary site investigation works for the proposed EFLS. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Head (Kai Tak Office), CEDD ("H/KTO/CEDD"), highlighted the salient points of the PC exercise and the proposed way forward for EFLS. She advised that the Administration intended to submit the funding proposal for 65TR for the endorsement of PWSC and the approval of FC in late 2014. Subject to FC's approval, the Administration planned to commence DFS in early 2015 for completion in phases from early 2017.

(Post-meeting note: A soft copy of the powerpoint presentation materials was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1524/13-14(03) by email on 28 May 2014.)

88. The Deputy Chairman reminded members that in accordance with Rule 83A of RoP of LegCo, they should disclose the nature of any direct or indirect pecuniary interests relating to the subjects under discussion at the meeting before they spoke on the subjects. Under Rule 84 of RoP, a member should not vote upon any question in which he had a direct pecuniary interest except under certain circumstances as provided for in the rule.

Financial viability of the proposed Environmentally Friendly Linkage System

89. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen expressed opposition to the proposed adoption of an elevated monorail system as EFLS for KE. He was concerned about the cost-effectiveness of such a system, of which, as advised by the Administration earlier, the estimated capital cost would be around \$12 billion (in 2010 prices) and the projected return would be as low as only +1%. He asked if the Administration had made reference to overseas successful examples in the planning for EFLS. He noted that during the Stage 2 PC, the Administration had received a proposal for the use of modern tramway as EFLS for KE. However, the Administration did not consider modern tramway to be a viable alternative solution for KE and stated in the discussion paper that the proponent did not offer any substantiation on the cost estimate, completion timetable and other claimed benefits. He considered that the proposed DFS should examine the alternative of modern tramway vis-à-vis monorail and to compare the pros and cons of both systems. He also asked if the proposed monorail would be constructed and operated by MTRCL and whether any operating loss would be borne by the Administration or the operator.

90. PAS/DEV(W)2 said that one of the factors for consideration in choosing a suitable type of EFLS for KE was whether at-grade green transport could meet the future demand of KE. The limited capacity of the road network within the highly built-up areas of KE could not accommodate a tramway or other additional road-based green transport without significant impact on other road users. The tramway would also have interchange problems with MTR's elevated stations. The proposed DFS would further review these issues. The proposed elevated monorail system would be a separate system from the MTR lines, though interchanges with the existing lines would be provided for passengers' convenience. Issues on the construction and operation of the proposed monorail would also be examined under DFS. According to the results of the preliminary feasibility study, an elevated monorail system for KE would be financially sustainable if the construction cost was not taken into account. The project cost estimate would be updated in DFS. Project Manager (Kowloon), CEDD, added that there were many variables, such as the scope of the proposed works and any additional measures to mitigate the impact on the Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter, which would have a bearing on the project cost. In response to members' enquiries about the up-to-date project cost estimate for the proposed monorail system, he advised that the Administration would update the project estimate in DFS.

91. Dr KWOK Ka-ki pointed out that EFLS for KE was a transport issue. He was concerned that the residents in KE would have to pay a high fare for the monorail and called on the Administration to seek expertise advice on the issue from a transport perspective. He queried why the proposed DFS would only consider the adoption of an elevated monorail system but not other alternative transport means, such as the modern tramway, for KTD. He was worried that approving the funding proposal for DFS would be tantamount to giving a green light for the elevated monorail system. Ms Emily LAU expressed dissatisfaction that the Administration could not provide an updated cost estimate for the proposed monorail system.

92. PAS/DEV(W)2 said that the central business district to be developed in KE would have an integrated multi-modal linkage system to serve different connectivity objectives. Subject to FC's funding approval, EFLS would only be commissioned in 2023 at the soonest. Before 2023, different transport modes, such as improved pedestrian facilities, road-based green transport and MTR would be used to meet the transport needs of KE. In response to Dr KWOK Ka-ki's enquiry, H/KTO/CEDD said that the EFLS fare level should be comparable with that of MTR and the preliminary feasibility study estimated it to be in the range of around \$3.6 to \$5.0.

93. Responding to Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung's enquiry, H/KTO/CEDD advised that she was a civil engineer with extensive years of experience involved in traffic planning. Mr LEUNG queried that the EFLS proposal did not have expert input from the transport perspective. He enquired if the Administration had studied the unsuccessful cases of overseas monorail systems, such as the Sydney Monorail. In view of the uncertain patronage demand at this stage, he suggested that travelator and electric bus be considered as alternative transport modes for EFLS.

94. Ir Dr LO Wai-ki said that the past consultation on the proposed EFLS for KE was based on an elevated rail system, which would occupy a relatively small amount of road space and could also be a tourist attraction. Citing that the monorail in Tokyo linking the city and the Haneda Airport was a successful example with a significant patronage, he considered that the proposed DFS should examine the cost, the patronage demand as well as the alternative transport links. He called on the Administration to implement measures to improve the water quality of Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter and Kai Tak Approach Channel as soon as possible.

95. Mr Frederick FUNG expressed disagreement to the Administration's presumption that EFLS for KE would take the form of an elevated monorail.

Referring to paragraph 9 of the Administration's paper, he said that it was not fair for the Administration to ask the proponent of the use of modern tramway to provide substantiation on the cost estimate, completion timetable and other claimed benefits. He considered that both options of modern tramway and elevated monorail should be included in DFS with the same weighting. Otherwise, he would object to the present funding proposal. He had made suggestions to the Administration that within KTD, a modern tramway, which could be connected to an elevated monorail in other parts of KE, should be used.

96. Mr YIU Si-wing expressed disappointment that the transport arrangements for KTD was still under discussion when the Cruise Terminal had been commissioned and other major residential, sports and tourism facilities at KTD were under construction or in the pipeline. He considered that the proposed DFS should set out an implementation timetable for different transport services to tie in with the commissioning of the various facilities at KTD from now until 2023. The proposed DFS should also review both successful and unsuccessful examples of operation of elevated monorail systems to facilitate the discussion of Panel members and the public. Sharing Mr Frederick FUNG's views, he supported that a mixed mode of transport, i.e. the use of an elevated monorail and a modern tramway, could be considered, as the latter had a much lower operation and construction cost.

97. Miss CHAN Yuen-han said that while modern tramway might have to face the space constraint problem in the old areas in KE, the design of a modern tramway could well blend in with the features and characteristics of the local communities. She asked the Administration to justify the cost-effectiveness of the proposed elevated monorail system, in comparison with modern tramway.

98. PAS/DEV(W)2 said that the proposed DFS would examine if a mix of both modern tramway and elevated monorail was technically feasible. In addition, it would formulate a cost-effective multi-modal linkage system for phased implementation, covering the period before the commissioning of EFLS, and assess whether at-grade transport could meet the growing traffic demand in KE in the long run.

99. Mr Paul TSE expressed disappointment that the development of EFLS for KE had been dragged on for a long time. He was worried that the target commissioning year of 2023 for EFLS would be delayed. He asked if public consultation could be made on each proposed transport mode under

the multi-modal linkage system, including tramway and travelator. The Administration should ensure that the proposed DFS be comprehensive enough to cover all transport link options. While the Sydney Monorail was closed due to insufficient patronage, this would likely not happen for EFLS for KE, which would pass through a lot of residential and commercial areas. He pointed out that the operator of the Sydney Monorail was the proponent for modern tramway for EFLS.

100. H/KTO/CEDD advised that the demolition of the Sydney Monorail was not related to technology issues. There were many contributing factors, such as limited service coverage, single direction, poor connection with the light rail and other public transport systems, resulting in the closure of the monorail system.

Alignment and coverage of the proposed Environmentally Friendly Linkage System

101. While showing support for the present proposal, Miss CHAN Yuen-han relayed the request of the local communities for extending the coverage of the proposed EFLS to Kowloon City and To Kwa Wan. She was disappointed that the proposed alignment only aimed to serve new commercial developments in Kwun Tong and Kowloon Bay. She said there were also concerns among the local residents that if EFLS was to be constructed and operated by MTRCL, the company would further monopolize Hong Kong's railway service. Mr Frederick FUNG asked if EFLS could be connected to To Kwa Wan Station of SCL where some archaeological remains had been discovered. He opined that the site might be developed as a tourist attraction in future.

102. PAS/DEV(W)2 replied that the Administration had received views about the locations of the stations as well as extending the alignment to other areas. The proposed DFS would further examine these views and consider some minor adjustments to the locations of the stations and the alignment.

Public consultation

103. Mr CHAN Kam-lam said that the development of EFLS was important for connecting KTD and the nearby developed areas such as Kwun Tong and Kowloon Bay. The study and PC on the use of elevated monorail as EFLS for KE had taken a long time. He welcomed the present proposal to take forward EFLS a step further and asked the Administration to expedite the process.

104. PAS/DEV(W)2 said that the Administration would endeavour to speed up the proposed DFS and the EFLS project. H/KTO/CEDD added that public engagement activities would be carried out concurrently with the conduct of DFS. From past experience, local communities were concerned about the design and locations of the stations. The Administration would maintain close liaison with the local communities which would be consulted on the proposals made under DFS.

105. Ms Emily LAU asked whether the contentious issues associated with the proposed elevated monorail system had been raised during the PC and how the Administration had addressed them. She questioned the effectiveness of conducting public consultation concurrently with DFS. She was concerned that such consultation might be piecemeal, given that the public could not grasp the overall picture and provide meaningful views. She considered that public works projects should only be carried out after the public consultation had been thoroughly conducted.

106. PAS/DEV(W)2 advised that the concerns and views expressed by members at the meeting had been raised during the PC exercise. A preliminary feasibility study had been conducted to address the concerns and the Administration had given its response in Stage 2 PC. The response was reproduced in Enclosure 3 to the Administration's paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)1456/13-14(04)). The proposed DFS would examine the issues raised by members as well as the financial viability of the EFLS project in detail. Further information would be provided to members and the public for discussion.

107. H/KTO/CEDD said that at different stages of the development of KE, different services of the integrated multi-modal linkage system would be proposed to meet the connectivity objectives. It was important to seek the local communities' views on the proposed services at different stages.

Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter and Kwun Tong Transportation Link

108. Mr CHAN Kam-lam urged the Administration to finalize the planning for the relocation, if necessary, of Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter ("KTTS") as soon as possible. There were public views supporting the use of KTTS for yacht berthing or water recreational and sports activities. He suggested that the Administration could consider relocating KTTS to the western waters to meet the demand of the industry. He asked if the Development Bureau would liaise with the Marine Department on the re-provisioning of KTTS.

109. PAS/DEV(W)2 replied that DFS would look into possible mitigation measures to address the impact of the Kwun Tong Transportation Link ("KTTL") on high-mast vessels and reprovisioning options for KTTS in consultation with the industry and the relevant Government departments.

110. Mr Paul TSE said that KTTL would provide an important linkage between KTD and Kowloon Bay/Kwun Tong. He asked whether the plan to construct KTTL had been finalized. In his view, without KTTL, the financial viability of EFLS would be seriously in doubt.

Submission to the Public Works Subcommittee

111. The Deputy Chairman enquired whether members supported the submission of the funding proposal on PWP Item No. 65TR to PWSC. He put the question to vote. Mr Frederick FUNG requested a division. Two members voted for, three members voted against and one member abstained. Other members present did not take part in the voting. The voting result was as follows:

For

Mr CHAN Kam-lam

Mr IP Kwok-him

(2 members)

Against

Mr Frederick FUNG

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung

(3 members)

Abstain

Ms Emily LAU

(1 member)

The Deputy Chairman concluded that the Panel did not support the submission of the proposal to PWSC for consideration.

VII Any other business

112. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 6:40 pm.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
22 September 2014