

**立法會**  
***Legislative Council***

LC Paper No. PWSC115/14-15

(These minutes have been seen  
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/F/2/1(11)B

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

**Minutes of the 8th meeting  
held in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex  
on Friday, 23 January 2015, at 10:45 am**

**Members present:**

Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC (Chairman)  
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon LEE Cheuk-yan  
Hon James TO Kun-sun  
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP  
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung  
Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP  
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP  
Hon Frederick FUNG Kin-kee, SBS, JP  
Hon WONG Kwok-hing, BBS, MH  
Prof Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long, SBS, JP, PhD, RN  
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan, JP  
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, JP  
Hon CHAN Kin-por, BBS, JP  
Hon IP Kwok-him, GBS, JP  
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP  
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung  
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip  
Hon Claudia MO  
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP  
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming  
Hon Gary FAN Kwok-wai  
Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP

Hon CHAN Chi-chuen  
Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN Ka-lok  
Hon CHAN Yuen-han, SBS, JP  
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, BBS, MH, JP  
Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, JP  
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki  
Hon Dennis KWOK  
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung  
Hon SIN Chung-kai, SBS, JP  
Hon IP Kin-yuen  
Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, JP  
Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, JP  
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, BBS, MH, JP  
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS

**Members absent:**

Hon Albert HO Chun-yan  
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP  
Hon Ronny TONG Ka-wah, SC  
Dr Hon LEUNG Ka-lau  
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-che  
Hon CHAN Han-pan, JP  
Hon Kenneth LEUNG  
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan  
Hon Christopher CHUNG Shu-kun, BBS, MH, JP

**Public officers attending:**

Mr YEUNG Tak-keung, JP	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) <sup>3</sup>
Mr WAI Chi-sing, JP	Permanent Secretary for Development (Works)
Mr Thomas CHAN Chung-ching, JP	Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands) <sup>1</sup>
Ms Anissa WONG, JP	Permanent Secretary for the Environment
Mr Bryan HA Kwok-fung	Assistant Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) (Works) <sup>2</sup>

Ms Linda LAW Lai-tan	Principal Assistant Secretary for Home Affairs (Recreation and Sport) <sup>2</sup>
Mr LEUNG Koon-kee, JP	Director of Architectural Services
Mrs Alice YU NG Ka-chun	Project Director (3) Architectural Services Department
Mr Eric HUI Kwok-sun	Assistant Director (2) Home Affairs Department
Mr David LAU Kam-kuen	District Officer (Tuen Mun) Home Affairs Department
Mr Donald CHOY Chi-mun	Assistant Director (Leisure Services) <sup>3</sup> Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Ms Shirley CHUNG Yuk-fong	Chief Executive Officer (Planning) <sup>2</sup> Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Mr FUNG Ngai-wa	Principal Immigration Officer (Registration of Persons) Immigration Department
Mr TAN Tick-yee	District Social Welfare Officer (Tuen Mun) Social Welfare Department
Mr WAN Siu-yin	General Manager (Planning and Development) Post Office
Ms Christine LOH Kung-wai	Under Secretary for the Environment
Mr Samson LAI Yiu-kei	Assistant Director (Waste Management Policy) Environmental Protection Department
Dr Alain LAM Kwok-lun	Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Waste Management Policy) Environmental Protection Department
Ms Mimi LEE Mei-mei	Deputy Secretary for Security (1)

Mr Vic YAU Cheuk-hang	Principal Assistant Secretary for Security (A)
Mr Frank WONG Tak-choi	Project Director (1) Architectural Services Department
Mr LIN Shun-yin	Assistant Commissioner (Administration and Human Resource Development) Customs and Excise Department
Mr SIN Ying-sang	Staff Officer (Staff Relations) Customs and Excise Department

**Clerk in attendance:**

Ms Sharon CHUNG	Chief Council Secretary (1)2
-----------------	------------------------------

**Staff in attendance:**

Mr Fred PANG	Senior Council Secretary (1)2
Mr Hugo CHIU	Senior Council Secretary (1)6
Mr Raymond CHOW	Council Secretary (1)2
Ms Christina SHIU	Legislative Assistant (1)2
Ms Christy YAU	Legislative Assistant (1)7
Ms Haley CHEUNG	Legislative Assistant (4)8
Miss Joey LAW	Clerical Assistant(1)2

Action

The Chairman advised that there were five funding proposals on the agenda for the meeting. The first three were the items carried over from the previous meeting. The other two items were carried over from the meeting on 29 October 2014. 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 in case of direct pecuniary interest.

**Head 703 – Buildings**

**PWSC(2014-15)41 56RG Government Complex in Area 14  
(Siu Lun), Tuen Mun**

2. The Chairman advised that the proposal, i.e. PWSC(2014-15)41, was to upgrade 56RG to Category A at an estimated cost of \$1,250.7 million in money-of-the-day prices. The Panel on Home Affairs had been consulted on the proposal on 11 April 2014. Panel members did not object to the submission of the proposal to the Subcommittee for consideration. A gist of the Panel's discussion had been tabled at the meeting.

Implementation of the project

3. Dr KWOK Ka-ki urged the Administration to implement the project in a timely manner. He said that the project was beneficial to local residents but had been put in the pipeline for more than a decade. He commented that the Administration had all along disregarded the need of grassroot residents, and had only focused its efforts on taking forward "white elephant" projects to protect commercial interests.

4. Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing and Miss Alice MAK said that they were supportive of the proposal. Mr TAM said that residents of Tuen Mun were keen to see the proposed Government Complex be constructed. He commented that, because of the Subcommittee's slow progress of examination of the Administration's funding proposals, the discussion on the proposal had been delayed for months. He opined that, apart from the item, other funding proposals involving infrastructure projects such as those related to the development of the Liantang/Heung Yuen Wai Boundary Control Point were equally important to the society. He hoped that the Subcommittee would make timely decisions on whether to endorse these proposals. Mr WONG regretted that the Subcommittee's examination of the item had been delayed. He hoped that the proposal would be implemented as early as possible to meet the local residents' aspiration. Miss Alice MAK asked whether the delivery of the project could be expedited.

5. Director of Architectural Services ("DArchS") replied that subject to the approval of the Finance Committee ("FC") for the item, the Administration would invite tenders for the project as early as possible with a view to commencing the construction works in August 2015 for completion in February 2019. When working out the implementation timetable for the project, the Administration needed to take into account the views of the schools in the vicinity of the project site on the mitigation measures to reduce the noise nuisances caused by the construction works.

Cost and design of government buildings

6. Noting that the estimated cost for constructing the Government Complex was more than \$1,250 million, Mr Albert CHAN enquired about the construction cost per square feet for the proposed building. He reiterated his view raised previously about the importance for the Administration to control the costs of public works projects taking into consideration that the overall construction expenditure on these projects would hit a record high of \$170 billion per year in the next few years. DArchS replied that the Government Complex would have a modest design. Taking into account the need for long-term maintenance of the proposed Complex, the Administration had adopted a functional approach in designing the building and the installations therein. The estimated construction unit cost, represented by the building and building services costs, was \$29,735 per square metre of construction floor area in September 2014 prices.

7. Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok and Mr Tony TSE said that they were supportive of the proposal and hoped that the project would be implemented in a timely manner. Ir Dr LO cited a government complex in To Kwa Wan as an example and opined that many existing government buildings were well designed. He said that the environmentally friendly designs and green measures provided in some of the existing government facilities could provide a learning experience for students. Considering that the design and contract administration of the project would be undertaken by in-house resources, Mr TSE said the Administration should ensure that the building would have its own design characteristics without compromising the principle of adopting a modest design. To promote a sense of belonging among the young people to the districts that they lived in, the Administration should encourage youth participation in the design of government facilities as far as practicable. Consideration should be given to holding design competitions in this regard.

8. DArchS replied that the views of Ir Dr LO and Mr TSE had been noted. The Administration would inject more creativity to the design of the proposed building as far as practicable. He advised that upon completing government building projects, the Architectural Services Department ("ArchSD") would review the effectiveness of the projects in light of the comments received from the user departments.

9. Mr WU Chi-wai asked whether the Administration had fully utilized the permitted development plot ratio for the proposed site. DArchS replied that the building height and site coverage of the proposed Complex would be eight storeys and 75% respectively, which had reached the permitted building

height and site coverage under the relevant Outline Zoning Plan and the Building (Planning) Regulations respectively. He explained that the relevant planning parameters and the reference plot ratio determined by the Planning Department would be taken into account in the design.

10. Mr WU Chi-wai requested the Administration to provide information on: (a) the planning restrictions (including the plot ratio, building height and site coverage restrictions, etc.) on the site reserved for the proposed Complex; and (b) whether the site of the Complex had been fully utilized under the proposal in light of the restrictions in (a).

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's supplementary information was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. PWSC109/14-15(01) on 24 February 2015.)*

#### Facilities in the proposed Government Complex

11. Dr Elizabeth QUAT said that she was supportive of the proposal. She opined that, to facilitate family participation in the activities held in Government facilities, the Administration should provide a family-friendly environment at such facilities and set an example for the private sector to follow. She enquired about the family-friendly facilities to be provided in the proposed Complex. DArchS replied that toilets and hand-washing facilities for children would be provided in the Complex. There were separate baby care rooms with a floor area of 7.5 square metres each provided within the Government Complex for public use. In response to Dr QUAT's enquiry on the male-to-female toilet cubicle ratio, DArchS advised that the ratio would not be lower than 1:3 and was hence higher than the stipulated requirement under the relevant legislation.

12. Mr Albert CHAN opined that the Administration should provide more multi-purpose rooms in the proposed Community Hall to facilitate local groups to host social and recreational activities. He said that the Administration should be reprimanded because it had all along not committed adequate resources to the provision of multi-purpose rooms in districts, making it difficult for underprivileged political groups to organize community activities. Assistant Director (2), Home Affairs Department ("AD(2)/HAD") replied that in the 2011-2012 legislative session, the Panel on Home Affairs had been consulted on and agreed to the Administration's proposed new design standard for community halls under planning. The Public Works Subcommittee had also been informed of the new design standard of community halls in early 2012. Under the new design standard, a total of three individually accessible multi-purpose function rooms could be provided concurrently. Moreover, the multi-purpose hall in a new

community hall could be converted into two individually accessible smaller venues by a movable, sound-proofing and full-height partition. In this way, a maximum of five end-user groups could use the facilities in a community hall at the same time. He advised that there were currently 10 community halls in Tuen Mun. Average utilization rate of the conference rooms/activity rooms in these 10 community halls in 2014 was about 44%. The Administration considered that the current standard on the provision of such venues was appropriate.

13. Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok opined that adequate facilities for temporary storage of the personal belongings of visitors and stage performers should be provided in the proposed Community Hall. AD(2)/HAD replied that in the community halls which were recently built/under planning, lockers were provided in the dressing rooms. He advised that District Councils could initiate and endorse under the District Minor Works Programme the installation of lockers for the earlier-built community halls which did not have such facilities. Ir Dr LO remained of the view that the Administration should give more thoughts on the appropriate design of the storage facilities at community halls to better meet the users' needs. He suggested that reference should be made to the design of the lockers provided in hotels.

14. Noting that the proposed Sports Centre would provide multi-purpose activity rooms and a table-tennis room with headroom of about six metres, Mr Tony TSE expressed concern that the installation of overhead electrical and mechanical devices would significantly reduce the clear headroom of these venues. DArchS assured members that the Administration attached importance to providing sports venues with adequate clear headroom. He explained that, in determining the heights of the headroom in such venues, the Administration would take into account a number of factors including possible uses of the venues, construction costs, etc.

15. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung enquired why the Administration provided only one table-tennis room at the proposed Sports Centre. Assistant Director (Leisure Services)3, Leisure and Cultural Services Department ("AD(LS3)/LCSD") replied that the proposed Sports Centre would include a multi-purpose arena which could be used for providing tables for table tennis or for holding table tennis competitions. He explained that, in planning the facilities to be provided at the proposed Sports Centre, the Administration had taken into account the views of Tuen Mun District Council ("TMDC") and the need to strike a balance between demands for different leisure facilities.

16. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung further enquired whether TMDC had agreed to the proposal of providing only one children's play room at the proposed



Sports Centre. AD(LS3)/LCSD advised in the affirmative. He reiterated that in line with the existing practice, the Administration would consult the relevant District Council on the facilities to be provided at a sports centre.

17. Mr WU Chi-wai enquired about the existing mechanism to determine the Government facilities to be accommodated in a Government Complex. Dr KWOK Ka-ki opined that the Administration should provide health centres for the elderly and for women in Tuen Mun to meet local demand. He asked whether the Administration had liaised with the Food and Health Bureau and the Department of Health on the provision of these facilities in the proposed Complex.

18. AD(LS3)/LCSD replied that in planning public works projects, the Administration attached great importance to seeking the views of the relevant District Councils. Having regard to their views, relevant Government departments would bid for resources to facilitate the timely implementation of the projects. When considering the facilities to be provided in the proposed Complex, the Planning Department had, in line with the established procedures, invited other departments to submit their accommodation requests. In light of the requests, the Administration had reserved space for the use of various Government departments as set out in the Administration's paper. After such requests had been acceded to, the plot ratio of the project had reached the permitted limit. DArchS supplemented that the Government Property Agency ("GPA") would also provide comments on the optimum utilization of Government sites. Before proceeding with a building project, GPA's consent to the proposed site utilization had to be sought.

19. Mr WU Chi-wai requested the Administration to provide supplementary information on the existing mechanism to determine the Government departments/units to be accommodated in a government complex and how to ensure that the use of land resources would fully respond to the needs of the community.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's supplementary information was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. PWSC109/14-15(01) on 24 February 2015.)*

#### Energy saving measures

20. Noting that the project would adopt various forms of energy efficient and renewable energy technologies, including a solar hot water system and a photovoltaic system, Mr WONG Kwok-hing said the Administration should apply such technologies to other Government building projects as far as

practicable. DArchS responded that the Administration would strive to adopt energy efficient and renewable energy technologies in the implementation of public works projects where practicable. In accordance with the relevant internal guidelines, the cost to be incurred for providing green features should not exceed 2% of the capital cost of a public works project.

21. Mr IP Kwok-him said that he was supportive of the proposal and welcomed the Administration's adoption of the energy conservation, green and recycled features mentioned in paragraphs 22 and 23 of the Administration's paper. He asked whether the proposed building would be provided with glass curtain walls. DArchS replied that glass curtain walls would be adopted in part of the proposed building. The material of glass curtain walls adopted would allow good light penetration and yet low heat transmission.

22. Mr Albert CHAN enquired about the implementation of vertical greening under the project. He opined that the Administration should draw up internal guidelines on the vertical greening ratio that should be adopted in Government buildings. DArchS replied that vertical greening would be provided at government buildings pursuant to internal guidelines. There would be vertical greening at the first, second, third and seventh floors of the proposed Complex with a total area of 245 square metres, representing about 15% of the proposed greening area.

23. Mr WU Chi-wai noted that the Administration would adopt a rainwater recycling system under the project. He enquired whether the system would also collect grey water for recycling purpose. DArchS replied that the proposed rainwater recycling system would collect rainwater at the roof and at the podium level of the proposed Complex. The rainwater collected would be used for landscape irrigation within the site. The system did not include the collection or recycling of grey water.

24. Mr IP Kwok-him referred to paragraph 25 of the Administration's paper which stated that the energy efficient features under the project would achieve 10.6% energy savings in the annual energy consumption. He enquired whether the savings would outweigh the cost for adoption of these features. DArchS replied that the total estimated additional cost for adoption of the energy efficient features mentioned in items (a) to (h) under paragraph 22 was \$4 million with a payback period of about 4.6 years. As regards the renewable energy technologies mentioned in items (i) and (j) in the same paragraph, the payback period would be longer.

Accessibility of the proposed Government Complex

25. Mr LEUNG Che-cheung said that he was supportive of the proposal and considered that the proposed project would help make good use of the site concerned. Considering that the site was far away from the Light Rail stations in Tuen Mun, Mr LEUNG asked about the provision of parking spaces for private cars and coaches at the proposed Government Complex and the Administration's measures to deal with the demand for parking spaces from visitors. AD(LS3)/LCSD replied that the Complex would provide about 30 parking spaces to meet operational needs and for the use of visitors with disabilities as well as members of the public who used the services of the Marriage Registry in the Complex. Moreover, there were a number of parking spaces in Siu Lun Sports Ground in the vicinity. The Administration would provide appropriate assistance to the organizations holding large-scale events at the proposed Complex to facilitate their loading and unloading activities. Following the commissioning of the Complex, the Administration would examine whether some of the parking spaces in the Complex could be made available for public use after office hours and whether the public transport services in the area would need to be enhanced.

26. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung opined that the Administration should pay due regard to public concerns about the inadequate provision of parking spaces for visitors at Government facilities. He suggested that, to provide more parking spaces in the proposed Complex, the Administration might give consideration to the use of underground space. DArchS replied that significant additional cost and time would be incurred for providing an underground car park at the proposed site.

27. Mr WONG Kwok-hing and Dr Fernando CHEUNG were concerned about the adequacy of barrier-free access facilities to be provided at the Government Complex. Noting that the proposed Community Hall would include a stage, Mr WONG enquired about the provision of barrier-free access to the stage. DArchS replied that a ramp would be provided to facilitate the access of wheelchair users to the stage. In response to Dr CHEUNG's enquiry on whether the ramp was a permanent one and whether wheelchair users could access both the frontstage and backstage areas through the ramp, DArchS advised in the affirmative.

28. Dr Fernando CHEUNG enquired whether the barrier-free entrance/exit of the proposed Complex was designed for exclusive use by wheelchair users. DArchS replied that members of the public who were not wheelchair users might also use the entrance/exit with barrier-free access or the entrances/exits depicted in blue arrows in Enclosure 3 of the paper. Dr CHEUNG said it would be desirable for all the entrances/exits of

Government buildings to be designed in such a way that they could be used by all members of the public including wheelchair users. As regards the proposed Complex, the barrier-free entrance/exit and other entrances/exits should have a similar look. DArchS responded that the Administration would review the detail design taking into account Dr CHEUNG's view.

29. Mr LEUNG Che-cheung enquired how members of the public on the ground floor could access the proposed Community Hall and the floors accommodating the various Government departments. DArchS replied that separate entrances/exits would be provided at the ground floor level for the block where the Community Hall was located and the block accommodating Government departments respectively. Visitors might enter the building through these entrances and then travel to other floors of the two blocks by escalator or lift. Dr Fernando CHEUNG enquired whether the seventh floor, where a roof garden and a common area would be provided, would be accessible to wheelchair users. DArchS replied in the affirmative. He added that, as each floor of the building would be served by lifts, all the public areas on these floors would be accessible to wheelchair users.

#### Other issues

30. Miss Alice MAK was concerned whether local residents including the elderly would be aware of the proposed reprovisioning of the Butterfly Social Security Field Unit of the Social Welfare Department in the proposed Government Complex. District Social Welfare Officer (Tuen Mun), Social Welfare Department replied that before the relocation of the Unit, the Administration would inform in writing the Unit's services users of its new address. The other social welfare service units in Tuen Mun would also help publicize the new address to the local residents. He added that the distance between the existing office of the Unit at Hoi Wing Road, Tuen Mun, and the reprovisioned site was less than one kilometre.

31. Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung and Miss Alice MAK expressed concerns about the shortfall of sports and recreational facilities in Tuen Mun. Noting that under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, eight sports centres should be provided in Tuen Mun, Miss Alice MAK said that even with the commissioning of the proposed Government Complex comprising a sports centre, the district was still short of three sports centres. She enquired about the Administration's plan to address the shortfall and the relevant timetable. AD(LS3)/LCSD replied that two sites had been reserved in Areas 3 and 54 in Tuen Mun for the development of two sports centres. The Administration would seek TMDC's support for the construction of sports centres at the selected sites and consult the DC's view on the priorities of these projects. As regards the

provision of the third one, LCSD would liaise with relevant Government departments to identify a suitable site.

32. The item was voted on and endorsed.

33. The Chairman consulted members on whether the item would require separate discussion and voting at the relevant meeting of FC. Mr IP Kwok-him counter-proposed that members might consider requiring separate discussion and voting for the item at the relevant FC meeting after studying the supplementary information to be provided by the Administration. Members agreed to Mr IP's suggestion.

### **Head 705 – Civil Engineering**

#### **PWSC(2014-15)39 180DR Development of Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment Treatment and Recycling Facility**

34. The Chairman advised that the proposal, i.e. PWSC(2014-15)39, was to upgrade 180DR to Category A at an estimated cost of \$548.6 million in money-of-the-day prices for the development of a waste electrical and electronic equipment treatment and recycling facility ("WEEETRF"). The Panel on Environmental Affairs had been consulted on the proposal on 28 November 2011 and 28 April 2014 and Panel members supported the submission of the proposal to the Subcommittee for consideration. A gist of the Panel's discussion had been tabled at the meeting.

35. At the invitation of the Chairman, Under Secretary for the Environment ("USEN") briefed members on the proposal.

#### Treatment capacity of the proposed project

36. Mr CHAN Hak-kan said that the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong was supportive of the proposal of developing WEEETRF as it could enhance recycling and relieve pressure on landfills. Noting that about 70 000 tonnes of waste electrical and electronic equipment ("WEEE") generated in Hong Kong annually and the treatment capacity of the proposed WEEETRF was around 30 000 tonnes per annum (with the potential to increase to a maximum of 57 000 tonnes per annum), Mr CHAN enquired how the remaining WEEE would be handled. He also asked whether the imposition of recycling fees on the five types of electrical equipment to be regulated under the proposed mandatory producer responsibility scheme ("PRS") on WEEE ("the regulated electrical equipment"), namely (a) washing machines, (b) refrigerators, (c) air

conditioners, (d) television sets and (e) computer products, could reduce the volume of WEEE so as to suit the maximum treatment capacity of the proposed WEEETRF.

37. Assistant Director (Waste Management Policy), Environmental Protection Department ("AD(WMP)/EPD") replied that the five types of regulated electrical equipment accounted for about 85% of the 70 000 tonnes of WEEE generated per annum, some of which could be reused and some should be properly disposed of. There was scope for private recyclers to enter the market but, if needed, the proposed WEEETRF could expand its treatment capacity from 30 000 tonnes to 57 000 tonnes per annum. For the remaining 15% of WEEE, it was mainly generated from miscellaneous household appliances. The voluntary programmes operated by non-profit-making organizations with the Administration's funding support could provide proper recycling for these household appliances when they were discarded. Permanent Secretary for the Environment ("PSEN") further advised that while both the volume of WEEE generated and the treatment capacity of the proposed WEEETRF were estimated figures, the Administration believed that, with the provision of WEEETRF, together with the services provided by private recyclers and the introduction of PRS through legislation, Hong Kong would be capable of treating locally generated WEEE in an efficient and environmentally sound manner. International experience had shown that not all WEEE generated locally would be sent to the treatment facilities as some of them would be refurbished for reuse. On the question of whether the imposition of recycling fees could help bring down the volume of WEEE generated, AD(WMP)/EPD replied that no such assessment had been conducted.

38. Dr Kenneth CHAN indicated his support for the development of the proposed WEEETRF to handle WEEE generated in Hong Kong locally instead of exporting them overseas for treatment. Noting a gap between the amount of WEEE generated annually and that to be handled by the proposed WEEETRF, he enquired whether it was the Administration's policy to allow room for non-profit-making organizations and small-to-medium-sized private recyclers to develop WEEE treatment business to fill up the gap. He was also worried that the remaining 15% of WEEE, which would not be regulated under the proposed PRS on WEEE, would be exported overseas for treatment against the policy principle of treating locally generated wastes locally.

39. AD(WMP)/EPD explained that the Administration had adopted a progressive approach to the implementation of the proposed PRS on WEEE. As a starting point, the Administration would focus on the five types of regulated electrical equipment which accounted for about 85% of WEEE generated in Hong Kong annually. For the rest of WEEE, which was

mainly miscellaneous household appliances, it would not be covered under the proposed regulatory framework at this stage. AD(WMP)/EPD further advised that a "two-pronged" approach had been adopted in the development of local WEEE treatment facilities. Under such approach, the proposed WEEETRF would be the primary treatment facility of the regulated electrical equipment, while room would be provided for private recyclers to take part in the recycling of WEEE. Meanwhile, with the support of the Environment and Conservation Fund, some non-profit-making organizations had launched voluntary programmes that could provide proper recycling for miscellaneous household appliances.

40. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung sought details about the exportation of some of the WEEE generated in Hong Kong overseas. He also asked how the maximum capacity of the proposed WEEETRF had been worked out and whether such capacity would be sufficient to handle all the locally generated WEEE.

41. AD(WMP)/EPD said that all WEEE collected in Hong Kong would be detoxified and dismantled locally to become raw materials (e.g. plastic and metal) for exportation, but a small amount of WEEE components would be sent to competent facilities overseas for material recovery. For instance, used rechargeable batteries were exported to South Korea or Japan. On the treatment capacity of the proposed WEEETRF, AD(WMP)/EPD advised that it could be increased from 30 000 tonnes to 57 000 tonnes per annum by arranging an additional shift of workers. As the volume of WEEE generated had remained quite stable in the region of about 70 000 tonnes per annum over the past few years, the Administration believed that the treatment capacity of the proposed WEEETRF was sufficient.

#### Protection of workers and the environment

42. Mr CHAN Hak-kan recalled that during the deliberation of the Panel on Environment Affairs on the proposed WEEETRF, members of the Panel had expressed concern over the impact of the toxic materials released from WEEE during the dismantling process. He enquired about the measures to be undertaken to safeguard the health and safety of workers and protect the land and the underground water of the site against contamination. Dr Kenneth CHAN expressed a similar concern.

43. AD(WMP)/EPD assured members that there was proper control under the existing legislation for the treatment of hazardous WEEE. Under the proposed licensing control for treatment of WEEE, the treatment of other non-hazardous WEEE would be subject to tightened standards and the operator of the proposed WEEETRF would have to obtain such a licence.

Moreover, the EcoPark, where the proposed WEEETRF would be located, was specifically designed for eco-businesses. Environmental protection measures had already been taken in the design of the EcoPark.

44. Ms Claudia MO said that Hong Kong had lagged behind other places in the development of WEEE treatment and recycling, therefore she was in support of the proposed project. Concerned about the toxic materials released from WEEE during the dismantling process, Ms MO sought information on the toxic materials contained in WEEE and the protective measures to be introduced to safeguard the safety of workers. She cited the examples of dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane and asbestos, the harm of which had remained unknown after the materials had been in use for a long time, and enquired if the Administration would take into account the late discovery of harmful chemicals when formulating the protective measures.

45. Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Waste Management Policy), Environmental Protection Department explained that toxic materials in WEEE included leaded glasses of cathode ray tubes in television sets, mercury contained in cold cathode fluorescent lamps of liquid crystal displays, and refrigerants in refrigerators. WEEE would firstly be manually dismantled in WEEETRF to separate the toxic materials for detoxification. These toxic wastes would be either treated locally or exported for proper treatment in accordance with the requirements under the relevant legislation. PSEN added that there was legislation governing the handling and discharge of hazardous waste and the legislative controls would be updated from time to time to include newly discovered hazardous materials. Once they were included, the equipment and treatment process of the proposed WEEETRF would have to be upgraded to comply with the new statutory requirements.

46. Expressing support for the development of the proposed WEEETRF, Mr Tony TSE sought elaboration on how the project could improve the environment and whether any other facilities were needed to achieve the targeted results.

47. AD(WMP)/EPD explained that at present, most WEEE generated in Hong Kong was exported for reuse or dismantling to recover valuable materials. However, there was no guarantee of proper treatment in the receiving destinations and the environmental problem arising from improper handling of WEEE had aroused international concerns for the tightening of import control over WEEE. Timely development of the WEEETRF would help ensure that locally generated WEEE would not end up being disposed of at landfills in Hong Kong. Moreover, the public consultation exercise on PRS conducted in 2010 revealed that there was demand for the



Administration to develop a local treatment facility to kick-start PRS instead of relying on private investments.

48. Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok said that the Business and Professionals Alliance for Hong Kong was supportive of the proposal. Ir Dr LO also opined that investment of the Government was essential to the development of WEEE treatment facilities as the development cost was too high for the private sector to afford. He believed that WEEETRF, in response to market demand, would enhance its waste management facilities and technologies in future and expand its services from handling the five types of regulated electrical equipment to other types of WEEE. He urged the Administration to make efforts to extend PRS to products other than electrical and electronic equipment.

49. While stating support for the development of the proposed WEEETRF, Miss CHAN Yuen-han called on the Administration to closely monitor every link of the WEEE recycling chain in future to ensure that it was in good order and complied with the highest standards, so that the treatment and recycling process would not cause any contamination.

50. AD(WMP)/EPD responded that the proposed WEEETRF would be developed as a public works project under the supervision of the Administration. The operator of WEEETRF would be subject to licensing control. USEN advised that the proposed WEEETRF would be developed under a Design-Build-and-Operate ("DBO") contract in which there would be stringent terms and conditions to ensure a high standard of service delivery. The Administration would report the performance of WEEETRF to the Legislative Council in future. Members of the Legislative Council were welcome to visit the future WEEETRF to observe its operation.

#### Scope of regulated electrical equipment

51. Ms Claudia MO enquired whether the proposed WEEETRF would handle second-hand mobile phones. She opined that if such mobile phones were subject to regulatory control under the proposed PRS on WEEE, it would convey a wrong message to the public that the disposal of used mobile phones would not result in wastage as they could be dismantled and recycled for use.

52. AD(WMP)/EPD replied that the proposed WEEETRF would handle the five types of regulated electrical equipment, which did not include mobile phones. In fact mobile phones were very marketable in the local and overseas second-hand markets. Unlike mobile phones, the regulated

electrical equipment would be dismantled in the proposed WEEETRF to recover valuable materials.

53. In response to Mr Paul TSE's enquiry on the proportion of mobile phones in the total amount of WEEE generated in Hong Kong, AD(WMP)/EPD said that the 70 000 tonnes of WEEE generated annually included mobile phones. However, mobile phones were not included in the 85% of the total volume of WEEE which would be regulated under the proposed mandatory PRS. Together with miscellaneous household appliances, mobile phones were included in the other 15% of WEEE.

Waste management technology to be adopted for the proposed project

54. Ms Cyd HO expressed support for the development of the proposed WEEETRF. She said that, during an overseas duty visit of the Panel on Environmental Affairs to Europe to study the development and operation of thermal waste treatment facilities in 2014, the delegation observed that gasification technology was a feasible waste treatment option, in particular for WEEE and wastes with heavy metal contents. She asked if the proposed WEEETRF would have room to accommodate a small WEEE gasification facility in future.

55. USEN said that it was premature to advise whether the proposed WEEETRF would be further developed; and if so, which type of new waste management technology would be adopted. The Administration would keep in view the operation of WEEETRF after its commissioning and the development of waste management technologies.

Procurement mode for the proposed project

56. Mr Tony TSE enquired about the rationale for adopting the DBO approach in the development of WEEETRF and setting the contractual operation period at 10 years. He asked if the Administration had sought professional advice and the views of the relevant industry in this regard.

57. AD(WMP)/EPD advised that there was a close linkage between the design of the proposed WEEETRF and the waste management technologies to be adopted in the facility. If WEEETRF was designed, built and operated by different parties, the operator would face many interface problems. To ensure operation efficiency, the Administration considered it appropriate to adopt the DBO approach in the development of WEEETRF. Regarding the 10-year contractual arrangement, AD(WMP)/EPD said that the duration was appropriate as it would facilitate the adoption of any suitable waste management technologies that might be developed in the coming years.

The fact that 12 tenders had been received for the proposed project indicated that the 10-year period was well received by the industry.

Other issues

58. Ms Cyd HO enquired whether the Administration would reduce funding support to non-profit-making organizations which had been engaging in the recovery of computers after the commissioning of the proposed WEEETRF.

59. AD(WMP)/EPD said that the Administration would review the relevant recycling programmes in conjunction with the relevant non-profit-making organizations so as to explore whether they could focus on miscellaneous household appliances which were not covered under PRS. Apart from treatment services, these programmes would also refurbish reusable electrical appliances for donation.

60. In response to Ms Cyd HO's enquiry, the Administration advised that 200 to 300 jobs relating to the collection and dismantling of WEEE would be created after WEEETRF commenced operation. At Ms HO's request, the Administration would provide information and analysis, other than a rough estimation, on the number of jobs to be created directly or indirectly after the proposed WEEETRF was in place.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's supplementary information was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. PWSC107/14-15(01) on 23 February 2015.)*

61. The item was voted on and endorsed.

62. The Chairman consulted members on whether the item would require separate discussion and voting at the relevant FC meeting. No member made such a request.

**Head 703 – Buildings**

**PWSC(2014-15)40      65JA      Construction of Rank and File Quarters  
for Customs and Excise Department at  
Yau Yue Wan Village Road, Tseung  
Kwan O**

63. The Chairman advised that the proposal, i.e. PWSC(2014-15)40, was to upgrade 65JA to Category A at an estimated cost of \$604.8 million in money-of-the-day prices for the construction of rank and file quarters ("R&F

quarters") for the Customs and Excise Department ("C&ED") at Yau Yue Wan Village Road, Tseung Kwan O. The Panel on Security had been consulted on the proposal on 18 March 2014. Panel members supported in principle the submission of the proposal to the Subcommittee. A gist of the Panel's discussion had been tabled at the meeting.

64. At the invitation of the Chairman, Deputy Secretary for Security (1) ("DS(S)1") briefed members on the proposal.

65. The Chairman suggested that, to allow sufficient time for discussion, the meeting be extended for 15 minutes up to 1:00 pm. Members raised no objection.

#### Provision of car parking spaces

66. Mr Gary FAN said that he was supportive of the proposal and shared the view of the Sai Kung District Council that the Administration should commence the proposed project as early as possible. He enquired about the measures to be taken by the Administration to address the local residents' concerns that the existing problems of illegal parking and inadequate car parking spaces in the vicinity of the proposed site would be aggravated upon the commissioning of the proposed R&F quarters. He asked about the Administration's response to members' view made at the relevant meeting of the Panel on Security that more car parking spaces should be provided in the quarters.

67. Miss CHAN Yuen-han expressed support for the proposed project. Noting that the proposed R&F quarters would provide 136 units but only 26 car parking spaces and 3 motorcycle parking spaces, she commented that the Administration had not taken into account the daily needs of the C&ED staff living in the quarters in future. She urged that the Administration should take heed of the views expressed by District Councils requesting the provision of adequate parking spaces to cater for the demand generated from new developments in the districts.

68. Mr WU Chi-wai opined that the demand for parking spaces by occupants of disciplined services quarters was usually substantial, and illegal parking was common in the vicinity of these quarters. He was concerned that the same problems would occur at Yau Yue Wan Village Road following the commissioning of the proposed R&F quarters. Mr LEE Cheuk-yan said that he had recently visited the area and subscribed to the view that the Administration should resolve the illegal parking problem in the area timely before it was aggravated.

69. Dr Elizabeth QUAT said that whereas there was an imminent need for the Administration to take forward the proposed project to cope with the demand of C&ED staff for departmental quarters ("DQ"), the Administration should work out solutions to address the concerns raised by residents at Yau Yue Wan Village Road about the traffic conditions and the shortfall of parking spaces in the area. Having regard to the fact that it might not be practicable to add more parking spaces in the proposed R&F quarters, she opined that C&ED should liaise with relevant Government departments to provide more parking spaces in the vicinity of the quarters.

70. In reply, DS(S)1 explained that adding more parking spaces to cater for new developments in the area was a district planning issue, and should be addressed at a district level by relevant Government departments having regard to the views of the concerned District Councils. She explained that in planning the provision of parking spaces in the proposed R&F quarters, the Administration had taken into account the standard set out in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines issued by the Planning Department and relevant assessments conducted by the Transport Department. The proposed parking provision had been submitted to the Government Property Agency for vetting. In light of the concern that had been raised by the relevant District Council about the inadequacy of parking spaces, the Administration had carefully studied the matter. The existing R&F quarters had adopted a ratio comparable to other DQ projects and the parking spaces in these DQs were adequate to cater for the demand. The Administration would keep in view the impact of the development of the proposed project on the demand for car parking spaces in the concerned area.

71. DS(S)1 continued that providing the proposed R&F quarters did not necessarily generate additional demand for parking spaces in its vicinity. The Administration expected that the R&F officers living in the quarters in future would commute by public transport services as far as possible, given that parking spaces were generally not provided for C&ED R&F officers at their workplaces at the border control points. If there were operational needs, C&ED would consider arranging shuttle bus services for the staff living at DQ to commute to their workplaces.

#### Planning restrictions on the proposed site

72. Mr WU Chi-wai asked whether the Administration had fully utilized the permitted plot ratio of the site by developing a 19-storey building. He opined that the Administration should maximize the use of the site to provide more DQ units to address the current shortfall. DArchS replied that the planning parameters on building height, plot ratio and site coverage of this

project site were 86 metres, 2.5 and 34% respectively. He advised that the plot ratio of the site had been fully utilized, and the building height and the site coverage of the proposed R&F quarters were 84.2 metres and 31.4% respectively.

73. Mr WU Chi-wai enquired whether the Planning Department had explored the possibility of relaxing the permitted plot ratio of the site. Miss CHAN Yuen-han opined that the Administration should have explored the possibility of relaxing the permitted plot ratios of the sites reserved for providing DQs in view of the current shortfall. DArchS responded that, in determining the plot ratio for a development, the Administration needed to take into account a set of planning factors including local development intensity, traffic and the possible impact of the development on the local environment, etc.

74. The Chairman recapitulated that Mr WU Chi-wai and Miss CHAN Yuen-han requested the Administration to provide supplementary information on whether the permitted plot ratio of the proposed site had been fully utilized; and the reasons for not relaxing the permitted plot ratio of the site, given that the Administration had earlier on introduced a policy initiative to increase the maximum plot ratios of residential sites in certain urban areas and new towns by around 20%.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's supplementary information was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. PWSC110/14-15(01) on 24 February 2015.)*

#### Energy saving measures

75. Mr IP Kwok-him said that Members belonging to the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong were supportive of the proposal. Referring to the information in paragraph 22 of the Administration's paper that the energy efficient features under the proposed project would achieve 1.5% energy savings in the annual energy consumption, he enquired why the savings were much lower than those to be achieved by the proposal to construct the Government Complex in Area 14 (Siu Lun), Tuen Mun, i.e. PWSC(2014-15)41. In reply, DArchS explained that some of the energy conservation measures for a government complex, such as energy efficient installations for illumination and central air-conditioning system, etc., were not quite relevant and could not be fully adopted in the proposed R&F quarters, as the latter was a residential building.

Shortfall of departmental quarters

76. Mr LEE Cheuk-yan was concerned about the shortfall of DQ for disciplined services. He enquired about the Administration's measures to enable early allocation of DQ units to the R&F staff who had been waiting for a long time. DS(S)1 replied that there were about 30 000 married officers of disciplined services departments eligible for DQ, while the number of DQ units were about 22 000 at present, representing a shortfall of almost 30%. C&ED was facing a severe shortfall of about 39.5%. She advised that, as announced in the 2014 Policy Address, the Administration would expedite eight DQ projects for disciplined services, including this project. It was hoped that the completion of these projects could help ease the DQ shortage problem of the disciplined services.

77. Mr WU Chi-wai requested the Administration to provide (a) information about the progress of the other seven DQ projects for disciplined services mentioned in the 2014 Policy Address and the development plot ratio of each of the project sites; and (b) how the Administration would ensure that, in the planning of these projects, the concerned sites would be fully utilized.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's supplementary information was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. PWSC110/14-15(01) on 24 February 2015.)*

78. Taking in view that the DQs for staff of C&ED were usually not located near their workplaces, Mr LEE Cheuk-yan asked whether the Administration would consider providing them with housing allowance for buying their own flats. DS(S)1 advised that R&F officers eligible for married quarters who chose not to move into such quarters might switch to applying for a housing allowance or a public rental housing ("PRH") unit. In view of the amount of the monthly housing allowance and the seniority requirement, only a small number of officers had opted for the allowance. As regards PRH, the waiting time of disciplined services staff to move into such units might be longer than that of general applicants, given the relatively small pool of PRH units available for the disciplinary services. She added that the current practice of providing DQ units to married staff of C&ED would allow them to live in the same buildings, which would facilitate the department to deploy manpower in a more efficient manner to meet operational needs.

79. Ms Cyd HO and Mr LEE Cheuk-yan held the view that, compared with the proposal to commit a funding of \$604.8 million to construct a building with only 136 DQ units (representing a cost of about \$4.5 million per unit), it was more cost-effective for the Administration to use the funding

to provide more housing allowance to the eligible R&F staff who wished to buy their own flats. Ms Cyd HO said that R&F officers were currently not eligible for housing allowance because of their low ranks and salaries. The Administration should help them achieve their goals of home ownership so that they could live in their properties after retirement. Consideration might be given to providing residential buildings at the proposed site under the Civil Servants' Co-operative Building Society Scheme. The Chairman said that Ms HO might consider pursuing the suggestion at the relevant Panel.

80. The item was voted on and endorsed.

81. The Chairman consulted members on whether the item would require separate discussion and voting at the relevant meeting of FC. Mr WU Chi-wai suggested that the item be voted on separately at the relevant FC meeting and representatives of the Planning Department should attend the FC meeting to answer questions about utilization of land resources at the site as well as other sites for development of departmental quarters for disciplined services. Mr IP Kwok-him counter-proposed that members might consider requiring separate discussion and voting for the item at the relevant FC meeting after studying the supplementary information to be provided by the Administration. Members agreed to Mr IP's suggestion.

### **Any other business**

82. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 12:59 pm.