

**立法會**  
***Legislative Council***

LC Paper No. PWSC229/15-16  
(These minutes have been seen  
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/F/2/1(22)B

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

**Minutes of the 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting  
held in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex  
on Wednesday, 4 May 2016, at 8:30 am**

**Members present:**

Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, SBS, MH, JP (Chairman)  
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, JP (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon LEE Cheuk-yan  
Hon James TO Kun-sun  
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP  
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP  
Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP  
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP  
Hon WONG Kwok-hing, BBS, MH  
Prof Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long, SBS, JP, PhD, RN  
Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, GBS, JP  
Hon Andrew LEUNG Kwan-yuen, GBS, JP  
Hon WONG Ting-kwong, SBS, JP  
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan, JP  
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, JP  
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, JP  
Hon WONG Kwok-kin, SBS  
Hon IP Kwok-him, GBS, JP  
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC  
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung  
Hon Claudia MO

Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP  
Hon Steven HO Chun-yin, BBS  
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH  
Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP  
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen  
Hon CHAN Han-pan, JP  
Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN Ka-lok  
Hon CHAN Yuen-han, SBS, JP  
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, BBS, MH, JP  
Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP  
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki  
Hon KWOK Wai-keung  
Hon Dennis KWOK  
Hon Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung, SBS, JP  
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung  
Hon SIN Chung-kai, SBS, JP  
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan  
Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, JP  
Hon TANG Ka-piu, JP  
Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, JP  
Hon Christopher CHUNG Shu-kun, BBS, MH, JP  
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS  
Hon Alvin YEUNG Ngok-kiu

**Members absent:**

Hon Albert HO Chun-yan  
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung  
Dr Hon LEUNG Ka-lau  
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip

**Public officers attending:**

Mr Raistlin LAU Chun, JP	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) <sup>3</sup>
Mr CHAN Chi-ming, JP	Deputy Secretary for Development (Works) <sup>2</sup>
Mr Michael WONG Wai-lun, JP	Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)
Ms Anissa WONG, JP	Permanent Secretary for the Environment

Miss June HO Hoi-kwan	Principal Assistant Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) (Works) (Acting)
Mr LO Kwok-kong	Chief Civil Engineer (Public Works Programme) Transport and Housing Bureau
Mr CHEUNG Chi-hoi	Regional Highway Engineer (Urban) Highways Department
Mr CHAN Che-keung	Chief Highway Engineer (Kowloon) Highways Department
Mr Alan HUI Bing-chiu	Chief Architect (3) Housing Department
Mr HO Hin-leung	Chief Civil Engineer (1) Housing Department
Mr LEE Man-ho	Principal Transport Officer (Urban) (Acting) Transport Department
Mr Kelvin LO Kwok-wah	Project Manager (Major Works) Highways Department
Mr Antony LO Kam-yan	Chief Engineer (3) (Major Works) Highways Department
Mr TANG Kin-fai, JP	Assistant Director of Environmental Protection (Environmental Assessment)
Mr Maurice YEUNG Kwok-leung	Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Assessment and Noise) Environmental Protection Department
Mr John LEE Ka-chiu, PDSM, PMSM, JP	Under Secretary for Security
Mr Andrew TSANG Yue-tung	Principal Assistant Secretary for Security (E)
Mr Dennis CHING Chung-cham	Assistant Secretary for Security (E) <sup>1</sup>

Mr Stephen TANG Man-bun, JP	Director of Architectural Services (Acting)
Mr David CHAK Wing-pong	Chief Project Manager 201 Architectural Services Department
Mr Duncan Stuart MCCOSH	Regional Commander (Kowloon East) Hong Kong Police Force
Mr Andrew Charles LOVATT	Chief Superintendent of Police (Planning and Development) Hong Kong Police Force
Mr Mark YEUNG Kai-ho	Executive Officer (Projects) Kowloon East Hong Kong Police Force
Mr Laurie LO Chi-hong, JP	Deputy Secretary for Home Affairs (1)
Mr Vincent FUNG Hao-yin	Principal Assistant Secretary for Home Affairs (Civic Affairs)1
Mr Alan SIN Kwok-leung	Chief Technical Adviser (Subvented Projects) Architectural Services Department

**Attendance by invitation:**

Mr James CHAN Yum-min	Chief Executive Officer Po Leung Kuk
Mrs Bridget YU CHAN Wai-ping	Principal Social Services Secretary (Family, Child Care, Children and Youth) Po Leung Kuk
Mr Eddie LEUNG Yu-cheung	Head of Property and Works Po Leung Kuk
Ms Amy FUNG	Deputy Executive Director The Hong Kong Federation of Youth Groups
Ms Phoenix NGAI	Supervisor The Hong Kong Federation of Youth Groups
Mr C H NG	Managing Director Handi Architects Limited

**Clerk in attendance:**

Ms Sharon CHUNG

Chief Council Secretary (1)2

**Staff in attendance:**

Mr Fred PANG

Senior Council Secretary (1)2

Mr Raymond CHOW

Senior Council Secretary (1)6

Ms Christina SHIU

Legislative Assistant (1)2

Ms Clara LO

Legislative Assistant (1)8

Ms Haley CHEUNG

Legislative Assistant (1)9

---

Action

The Chairman advised that there were nine funding proposals on the agenda for the meeting. The first six items on the agenda were those carried over from the previous meeting of the Subcommittee on 23 April 2016. He reminded members that in accordance with Rule 83A of the Rules of Procedure ("RoP") of the Legislative Council, 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 proposals. He also drew members' attention to Rule 84 of RoP on voting in case of direct pecuniary interest.

**Head 711 – Housing**

**PWSC(2016-17)8**

**82TI**

**Public Transport Interchange at  
Northwest Kowloon Reclamation Site 6,  
Sham Shui Po**

2. The Chairman said that the proposal, i.e. PWSC(2016-17)8, was to upgrade 82TI to Category A at an estimated cost of \$174 million in money-of-the-day ("MOD") prices for building a public transport interchange ("PTI") and conducting associated works. The Administration had consulted the Panel on Housing on the proposed project on 7 December 2015. Panel members supported the submission of the funding proposal to the Subcommittee for consideration. A report on the gist of the discussion of the Panel on Housing had been tabled at the meeting.

Ventilation design of the public transport interchange

3. Mr WU Chi-wai supported the funding proposal. He expressed concern about the problems of noise and poor ventilation at a number of PTIs,

and enquired how the Administration would prevent these problems from occurring in the proposed PTI. Noting that there was public housing development above the proposed PTI, Mr WU sought explanation from the Administration on how the PTI's ventilation system was designed in a way to minimize the nuisances caused by its emission to the users of the PTI and the households in the public housing blocks above it.

4. Chief Civil Engineer (Public Works Programme), Transport and Housing Bureau ("CCE(PWP)/THB"), advised that natural ventilation was adopted as far as possible for the proposed PTI. Given that the site was subject to the prevailing south-westerly winds in summer, the main ventilation openings were situated at the south-eastern and north-eastern sides of the PTI to allow natural air to circulate through the PTI. The simulation tests conducted by the Administration also showed that passengers still felt comfortable when using the PTI in summer under natural wind conditions.

5. CCE(PWP)/THB further explained that a mechanical ventilation system would be installed at the PTI to cater for sultry weather. Fresh air would be drawn from the ambient background outside by the air supply units of the ventilation system and channeled to the inside of the PTI at low level through air ducts and fans. The exhaust air units of the system, with exhaust points at the high level of the PTI, would discharge air to the outside through exhaust air ducts and fans. Therefore, households in the public housing blocks above would not be affected. The mechanical ventilation system would be equipped with sensors for detection of the levels of air pollutants (e.g. carbon monoxide, sulphur dioxide and nitrogen dioxide) inside the PTI. If the levels of air pollutants were high, the system would be activated to provide at least 15 air changes per hour.

6. Mr WU Chi-wai enquired how natural ventilation could be achieved given that the proposed PTI was surrounded by buildings on all sides. In response, CCE(PWP)/THB said that in addition to an opening of nearly 100 metres on the side of the proposed PTI facing Lin Cheung Road, there were ventilation openings on the side facing Sham Mong Road and in other directions. These openings would facilitate natural ventilation.

#### Facilities to be provided in the public transport interchange

7. Mr WONG Kwok-hing enquired whether toilets and rest places for drivers of public transport vehicles would be available inside the proposed PTI, and the location of such facilities.

8. In response, CCE(PWP)/THB said that toilets and drivers' rest rooms would be provided by bus operators in the proposed PTI. Chief Architect

(3), Housing Department ("CA(3)/HD"), supplemented that the toilets and rest rooms to be provided in the proposed PTI were located near the side facing Sham Mong Road. The Administration had laid infrastructure, such as drainage and power connection points, at respective locations to facilitate the provision of toilets and rest rooms by bus operators.

9. Mr WONG Kwok-hing was of the view that toilets and rest rooms should be constructed by the Administration together with the PTI, and the toilets should be open for public use. He was worried that those toilets and rest rooms in the PTI would be provided only in the form of temporary structures if their construction was left to bus operators.

10. CA(3)/HD further explained that the toilets to be provided in the PTI were permanent facilities and not temporary structures. During the construction of the proposed project, the Administration would coordinate with bus operators for the timely completion of the toilets and rest rooms for use by their staff upon the commissioning of the bus stops in the PTI.

11. Mr TANG Ka-piu opined that unless the public transport vehicles (including buses and minibuses) using the PTI were operated by a single operator, the toilets in the PTI would eventually be built by one of the several operators and drivers of other operators might not be allowed to use them. Mr TANG suggested that the Administration should consider providing a toilet facility that was open for use by drivers and passengers of all public transport vehicles when planning for the provision of new PTIs. Mr WU Chi-wai enquired about the reasons for not including the construction cost of the toilets in the capital cost of the proposed project, given that toilets would be provided in the proposed PTI.

12. CCE(PWP)/THB advised that the proposed PTI would provide 10 bays for franchised buses and green minibuses. The Transport Department would make arrangements regarding the public transport routes using the PTI one to two years before its completion and the District Council concerned would be consulted on such arrangements.

13. Principal Transport Officer (Urban)(Acting), Transport Department ("PTO(U)/TD(Atg)"), supplemented that if public toilets were available in the proximity of PTIs for use by passengers, the Administration would only provide space and basic amenities such as water and power supply in such PTIs for the construction of toilets for drivers of public transport operators while the operators concerned would fund the building works and manage the toilets themselves. A wet market equipped with a public toilet would be provided at the Northwest Kowloon Reclamation Site 6 where the proposed PTI would be located. The PTI would be about 80 metres away from the

wet market, and it was only a two-minute walk for minibus drivers and passengers using the PTI to go to the toilet in the market. As for toilets for bus drivers, franchised bus companies were required under the franchise agreements to open their toilets for use by employees of other franchised bus companies.

14. Mr TANG Ka-piu questioned if a franchised bus company would open its toilets for use by employees of other franchised bus companies. He considered it undesirable to ask minibus drivers to use the toilet in the wet market. Mr TAM Yiu-chung said that toilets in the proposed PTI should be open for use by minibus drivers and passengers although they were to be built by bus operators. Mr WONG Kwok-hing commented that the Administration was shirking its responsibilities by not providing public toilets in the proposed PTI. He said he had reservation about the funding proposal unless the Administration gave a satisfactory response on the provision of public toilets in the proposed PTI before submitting the funding proposal for the proposed project to the Finance Committee ("FC") for consideration.

15. PTO(U)/TD(Atg) reiterated that it was incumbent upon a franchised bus company to open its toilets for use by employees of other franchised bus companies. The Administration would continue to explore other options to enable drivers of public transport vehicles using the PTI to have easy access to toilets. CCE(PWP)/THB supplemented that the Administration would negotiate with bus operators to open the toilets in the proposed PTI for use by minibus drivers and passengers.

16. In response to the enquiry of Mr WU Chi-wai about the location of public toilets near the proposed PTI, CA(3)/HD said that apart from the one in the wet market adjoining the PTI, there were public toilets in the sports centre, five-a-side soccer pitch and public library not far from PTI.

Admin

17. The Chairman and Mr WONG Kwok-hing requested the Administration to provide information on (a) the location plan of permanent toilets to be provided in the proposed PTI; (b) the design and construction arrangements of such toilets; and (c) whether the Administration would be responsible for construction of toilets in the PTI for use by bus drivers, minibus drivers and passengers using the PTI and, if not, the reasons for that.

#### Design of the public transport interchange

18. Mr James TO expressed support for the funding proposal. He noted that a "parallel platform type" layout was adopted for the proposed PTI, which made it necessary for passengers to use road crossing facilities in order



to reach the bus/minibus bays for boarding or to leave after alighting. Mr TO suggested that the Administration might consider, subject to the availability of a larger floor space on the site, adopting a "peripheral saw-tooth" design for new PTIs in future, under which the boarding and alighting facilities were provided on the periphery of a PTI and bus/minibus bays were in the middle. Mr TO was of the view that a design which placed the boarding and alighting facilities on the periphery of a PTI could provide better ventilated places for passengers to wait for boarding and facilitate the installation of seating facilities for queuing passengers. Mr Tony TSE also suggested that the design of PTIs be improved to provide a more comfortable environment for waiting passengers.

19. CCE(PWP)/THB replied that according to the Transport Planning and Design Manual, the "peripheral saw-tooth" design should be given priority in the planning for new PTIs. However, given the fact that such a design would require a relatively larger floor space, and the site of the proposed PTI, which was limited in size, had to accommodate 10 bays for buses and green minibuses, the "parallel platform type" layout was the only option for the PTI.

20. Mr WU Chi-wai enquired about the considerations of the Administration in deciding the lighting systems to be used for new projects, and whether light emitting diode ("LED") lights with lower power consumption would be adopted.

Admin 21. Chief Highway Engineer (Kowloon), Highways Department, advised that the Administration would use environment-friendly lighting devices for works projects as far as possible. He undertook to provide written response to Mr WU Chi-wai's enquiry after the meeting.

#### Connectivity of the public transport interchange with the surrounding developments

22. Mr CHAN Kam-lam noted that the proposed PTI was located near the proposed footbridge system to be built at the junction of Sham Mong Road and Tonkin Street West. Upon opening of the proposed footbridge system, the existing at-grade pedestrian crossings at the road junction would be removed. He enquired how members of the public could go from the PTI to the streets on the opposite side via the development above the PTI and the proposed footbridge system.

23. CCE(PWP)/THB and CA(3)/HD advised that members of the public could take the escalators and lifts adjacent to the PTI to reach the podium level and the proposed footbridge system connected thereto and go to the

streets on the opposite side. They could also use the lifts on Sham Mong Road to gain direct access to the footbridge.

Estimated cost of the proposed project

24. Mr Tony TSE referred to paragraph 8 of the discussion paper (PWSC(2016-17)8) which stated that the estimated capital cost of the proposed project was \$133.6 million in September 2015 prices. Mr TSE pointed out that it often took ten-plus months from the time cost estimation of a project was made to the time funding approval was obtained from FC, during which there could be fluctuations in the project cost. In this connection, he enquired if cost estimates would be updated on a regular basis to reflect more accurately the latest costs of works, and whether the Administration would still base the estimate of the capital cost of the proposed project on September 2015 prices instead of updating the estimate.

25. CCE(PWP)/THB confirmed that the capital cost of the proposed project was still estimated in September 2015 prices. Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury)<sup>3</sup> supplemented that the estimated costs of works would be adjusted based on the price adjustment factors updated by the Administration on a half-yearly basis. Such adjustments were reflected in the cost estimates in MOD prices.

26. Mr Tony TSE opined that the Administration's practice of adjusting the project cost estimates merely based on the price adjustment factors updated on a half-yearly basis without updating the estimates in response to market changes was the reason for cost overruns in quite a number of public works projects. Deputy Secretary for Development (Works)<sup>2</sup> clarified that the Administration would, in the light of the latest market situation, make timely updates to the project cost estimates, which would be reflected in the discussion papers of the relevant projects.

27. There being no further questions from members on the item, the Chairman put the item to vote.

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

**Head 706 – Highways****PWSC(2016-17)9      814TH    Retrofitting of noise barriers on Tuen Mun Road (Fu Tei Section)**

29.     The Chairman said that the proposal, i.e. PWSC(2016-17)9, was to upgrade 814TH to Category A at an estimated cost of \$786.2 million in MOD prices for the retrofitting of noise barriers on the section of Tuen Mun Road (Fu Tei Section) between the footbridge to Fung Tei Station and Lam Tei Raw Water Pumping Station. The Panel on Environmental Affairs had been consulted on the proposed project on 22 February 2016. Panel members supported the submission of the funding proposal to the Subcommittee for consideration. A report on the gist of the discussion of the Panel on Environmental Affairs had been tabled at the meeting.

Expected effect of the proposed works in mitigating traffic noise

30.     Miss Alice MAK noted that a total of about 860 dwellings in the vicinity of Tuen Mun Road (Fu Tei Section) were exposed to traffic noise level exceeding 70 dB(A) and the proposed works could benefit about 830 dwellings there. She enquired how the problem of noise impact on the remaining 30 dwellings could be addressed.

31.     Project Manager (Major Works), Highways Department ("PM(MW)/HyD"), explained that the some 30 dwellings were located to the north of Siu Hong Court near Lam Tei Interchange. There was a bend on the section of Tuen Mun Road adjacent to these dwellings. If noise barriers were retrofitted on this road section, the pillars supporting the noise barriers must be erected on roadside and the central median of the road, and this would obstruct the view of drivers and affect road safety. Hence, it was not appropriate to retrofit noise barriers on this road section. That said, the road section had been surfaced with low noise material with a view to mitigating traffic noise impact on the some 30 dwellings.

32.     The Chairman sought clarification from the Administration as to whether the approach of surfacing the road section with low noise material could help reduce the traffic noise impact on the aforesaid 30 dwellings to an acceptable level. Miss Alice MAK expressed concern about whether, apart from surfacing the road section with low noise material, the Administration would take other measures to tackle the traffic noise problem faced by the 30 dwellings.

33.     PM(MW)/HyD advised that surfacing of roads with low noise material had a less significant effect on traffic noise mitigation than

installation of noise barriers. As such, this mitigation measure could not reduce the noise level at the aforesaid 30 dwellings to 70 dB(A) or below. Nonetheless, the Administration had alleviated the traffic noise problem faced by the dwellings concerned as far as practicable.

34. Assistant Director of Environmental Protection (Environmental Assessment) ("ADEP(EA)") supplemented that compared with other affected dwellings in the area, the 30 dwellings were exposed to less noise generated from Tuen Mun Road due to their relatively far distance from Tuen Mun Road. The highest noise level at these dwellings was 71 to 72 dB(A), which was slightly higher than the noise standard of 70 dB(A) for residential premises.

35. Miss Alice MAK noted that in response to the views of local residents, the Administration had amended the scheme for the proposed works by excluding the proposed noise barriers along Castle Peak Road – San Hui in front of Brilliant Garden. She enquired whether such an amendment would affect the overall effectiveness of the works in mitigating traffic noise.

36. PM(MW)/HyD replied that the Administration's original plan was to retrofit some 190-metre long noise barriers along Castle Peak Road – San Hui in front of Brilliant Garden. After the proposed works had been gazetted in January and February 2014, the Administration received 141 objections from the public (mainly the residents of Brilliant Garden). The Administration had arranged four meetings with the objectors attempting to resolve the objections. After unsuccessful attempts to convince the objectors to withdraw their objections, it had been decided that the proposed works should be amended to exclude the proposed noise barriers along Castle Peak Road – San Hui in order that the project could commence early to benefit the residents in the vicinity of Tuen Mun Road (Fu Tei Section) as soon as possible. He further said that the Administration had subsequently consulted the Environment, Hygiene and District Development Committee of the Tuen Mun District Council on the amendment scheme of the proposed works. Its members supported the amendment scheme. The amendment scheme had been gazetted in September 2014 and no objection had been received.

37. Referring to the Administration's view that no matter whether noise barriers were retrofitted along Castle Peak Road – San Hui or not, the proposed works would benefit about 830 dwellings, Miss Alice MAK requested the Administration to explain why it had proposed to retrofit noise barriers on this road section at the outset. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen requested the Administration to confirm whether it would give consideration to retrofitting noise barriers on this road section if the residents of Brilliant

Garden made such a request in the future; and if so, whether a higher cost would be incurred because the noise barriers retrofitting works on this road section would have to be conducted separately.

38. PM(MW)/HyD explained that according to the policy definition, an affected dwelling would be regarded as a "benefitted dwelling" if the noise mitigation measures could reduce its noise level by at least 1 dB(A); and an affected dwelling would be regarded as a "protected dwelling" if the noise mitigation measures could reduce its noise level to 70 dB(A) or below. Despite the fact that the noise barrier retrofitting works on the aforesaid road section had been excluded, the total number of benefitted dwellings remained unchanged. There would be more protected dwellings if such noise barriers could be retrofitted.

39. ADEP(EA) added that the residents of Brilliant Garden were affected by the traffic noise generated from both Tuen Mun Road and Castle Peak Road. The proposed project could mitigate the traffic noise impact of Tuen Mun Road on the 830 dwellings (including those in Brilliant Garden). The noise levels in Brilliant Garden would be reduced from the highest 80 dB(A) at present to 74 dB(A). If noise barriers were retrofitted along Castle Peak Road – San Hui in front of Brilliant Garden, the noise levels in Brilliant Garden would be further reduced. Notwithstanding this, some residents of Brilliant Garden did not consider it necessary to retrofit noise barriers on the aforesaid road section.

40. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen enquired about the number of dwellings in which the noise level would be reduced to below 70 dB(A) among the 830 dwellings to be benefitted from the proposed works, and the distribution of the benefitted dwellings (with three levels of reduction in traffic noise), as set out in Enclosure 4 of the discussion paper, by housing estates/courts.

41. PM(MW)/HyD said that the proposed works would alleviate the traffic noise problem faced by the dwellings in Siu Hong Court and those in the vicinity of Lam Tei Raw Water Pumping Station and Tuen Fu Road, as well as residents of Napa Valley, Parkland Villas and Brilliant Garden. Since there was a bend on Tuen Mun Road adjacent to the dwellings situated to the north of Siu Hong Court, and no noise barrier could be retrofitted on that section, the number of protected dwellings in the area was fewer than that of benefitted dwellings. Of the dwellings near Lam Tei Raw Water Pumping Station and Tuen Fu Road, Napa Valley and Parkland Villas, the numbers of protected dwellings and benefitted dwellings were almost the same. As for Brilliant Garden, since the proposed construction of noise barriers along Castle Peak Road – San Hui in front of it had been excluded

from the project, the number of protected dwellings in this estate would also be fewer than that of benefitted dwellings.

42. Mr Tony TSE supported the funding proposal. He enquired about the daily average number of hours for which the dwellings affected by traffic noise exceeding 70 dB(A) were exposed to traffic noise levels of above 70 dB(A), and the highest noise level recorded. Noting that the residents of Brilliant Garden objected to the retrofitting of noise barriers along Castle Peak Road – San Hui in front of their estate, Mr TSE enquired whether this road section had been surfaced with low noise material.

43. Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Assessment and Noise) explained that the current noise standard for domestic premises was 70 dB(A), which referred to road traffic noise at peak traffic flow. For busy road sections of this kind, the period with peak traffic flow was usually between about 9 am and 4 pm. For other periods (such as during night-time) when there was less traffic flow, the noise levels were lower.

44. ADEP(EA) added that, taking Brilliant Garden as an example, the noise levels to which it was exposed could be as high as 80 dB(A). Upon the completion of the proposed project, a small number of dwellings in the estate would still be affected by a noise level up to 74 dB(A) because the Castle Peak Road – San Hui section in front of the estate would not be retrofitted with noise barriers. The Administration had surfaced the sections of Tuen Mun Road and Castle Peak Road in front of Brilliant Garden with low noise material.

45. Mr TAM Yiu-chung expressed support for the funding proposal. He said that there was a dilemma in deciding whether or not to retrofit noise barriers: while noise barriers could reduce traffic noise nuisance to nearby residents, they would create visual impact and ventilation problem. In this context, he understood the reasons why the residents of Brilliant Garden had objected to the retrofitting of noise barriers.

#### Implementation timetable of the proposed project

46. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen enquired when the proposed project would commence and whether the Administration had conducted a tender exercise for the relevant works contract. PM(MW)/HyD replied that in order to expedite the commencement of the proposed works, the Administration had conducted a tender exercise for the works contract in January 2016, and the tender evaluation was underway. If funding approval was obtained from FC by late June 2016, the Administration planned to commence the proposed

works in the second quarter of 2016 for completion in the fourth quarter of 2019.

Traffic impact of the proposed project

47. Given the heavy traffic on Tuen Mun Road, Miss Alice MAK enquired whether the Administration would take measures (such as shortening the construction period) to ensure that the proposed project would not cause any traffic impact.

48. PM(MW)/HyD replied that to ensure that the traffic along Tuen Mun Road, a major trunk road, would not be affected, the number of traffic lanes in each direction of Tuen Mun Road would remain unchanged at peak hours during the construction period of the proposed project. The contractor would only be allowed to carry out the works at night-time or during non-peak hours. Having considered the engineering constraints, the Administration had shortened the construction period as far as possible.

Design of noise barriers

49. Mr WONG Kwok-hing considered that the proposed works should commence as soon as possible to benefit the local residents. He enquired whether transparent panels would be used on cantilevered noise barriers to provide a more open view, and whether the Administration would incorporate environmentally friendly design features in the semi-enclosures and carry out greening works on the top of them.

50. PM(MW)/HyD replied that opaque absorptive panels would be installed at the lower portion of the proposed cantilevered noise barriers while transparent panels would be used for the upper portion. As for the top of the semi-enclosures, translucent panels would be used to prevent nuisances caused by reflected glare. Of the 229 trees within the site boundary, 227 trees would be preserved, except for two which were not important trees, subject to removal due to poor condition. The Administration believed that as most of the trees within the site boundary would be preserved, the proposed works would not cause much visual impact on the surrounding. Therefore, it had no plan to provide greening facilities for the noise barriers.

51. There being no further questions from members on the item, the Chairman put the item to vote.

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

**Head 703 – Buildings**

**PWSC(2016-17)3      237LP      Kowloon East Regional Headquarters  
and Operational Base-cum-Ngau Tau  
Kok Divisional Police Station**

53. The Chairman said that the proposal, i.e. PWSC(2016-17)3, was to upgrade 237LP to Category A at an estimated cost of \$3,186 million in MOD prices for the construction of Kowloon East Regional Headquarters and Operational Base-cum-Ngau Tau Kok Divisional Police Station. The Panel on Security had been consulted on the proposed project on 2 July 2013. Panel members supported in principle the submission of the funding proposal to the Subcommittee for consideration. A report on the gist of the discussion of the Panel on Security had been tabled at the meeting.

54. The Chairman informed members that the Administration had submitted the funding proposal on the project to the Subcommittee for discussion on 26 November 2014 (Paper No. PWSC(2014-15)35). At the meeting on 9 January 2015, the Subcommittee voted down the proposal. In view of the necessity of the project, the Administration submitted the funding proposal of the project to the Subcommittee again for consideration, and the project cost had also been updated. Moreover, Enclosure 9 to the discussion paper (PWSC(2016-17)3) set out the Administration's response to the concerns about the project raised by members of the Subcommittee at its meetings on 26 November 2014, 17 December 2014 and 9 January 2015.

55. There being no questions from members on the item, the Chairman put the item to vote.

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



**Head 708 – Capital Subventions and Major Systems and Equipment**  
**PWSC(2015-16)60      44QJ   Youth Hostel Scheme – construction**  
**works by Po Leung Kuk for the youth**  
**hostel project in Ma Tin Pok, Yuen Long**

57. The Chairman said that the proposal, i.e. PWSC(2015-16)60, was to upgrade part of 44QJ to Category A at an estimated cost of \$68.1 million in MOD prices to carry out the pre-construction works for the youth hostel project of Po Leung Kuk in Ma Tin Pok, Yuen Long. The Panel on Home Affairs had been consulted on the proposed project on 22 December 2015. Panel members supported the submission of the funding proposal to the Subcommittee for consideration. A report on the gist of the discussion of the Panel on Home Affairs had been tabled at the meeting.

58. Mr WONG Ting-kwong declared that he was a member of the Po Leung Kuk Advisory Board.

59. There being no questions from members on the item, the Chairman put the item to vote.

60. The item was voted on and endorsed. Dr KWOK Ka-ki requested that the item be voted on separately at the relevant FC meeting.

**Head 708 – Capital Subventions and Major Systems and Equipment**  
**PWSC(2016-17)10      41QJ   Youth Hostel Scheme – Construction by**  
**The Hong Kong Federation of Youth**  
**Groups**

61. The Chairman said that the proposal, i.e. PWSC(2016-17)10, was to upgrade 41QJ to Category A at an estimated cost of \$150.9 million in MOD prices to carry out the construction works for the proposed youth hostel project of the Hong Kong Federation of Youth Groups ("HKFYG") in Tai Po. The Panel on Home Affairs had been consulted on the proposed works on 24 March 2016. Panel members supported the Administration's submission of the funding proposal to the Subcommittee for consideration. A report on the gist of the discussion of the Panel on Home Affairs had been tabled at the meeting.

Rental level of the youth hostel

62. Ms Cyd HO noted that under the Youth Hostel Scheme ("YHS"), non-governmental organizations ("NGOs") operating the hostels should set the rental at a level which did not exceed 60% of the market rent of flats of

similar size in the nearby areas. She expressed disagreement to this approach. She pointed out that at present, the youth hostel projects were implemented in Sheung Wan, Jordan and Tai Po, etc. Under the aforesaid requirement, the rentals of the youth hostels in urban areas would be set at a higher level as compared with those in the New Territories. However, the income and total net asset limits for applicants of hostel places in various districts were the same. Young people would find it difficult to afford the rentals of the youth hostels in urban areas under this arrangement. Ms HO suggested that the rentals should be set at a level comparable to the median income of local young people in the age group of youth tenants to ensure that the rents were affordable to young people.

63. Deputy Secretary for Home Affairs (1) ("DSHA(1)") explained that to enable youth tenants to have the opportunity to accumulate savings for future development, youth hostels needed to set the rental at a level which did not exceed 60% of the market rent. For example, for a one-person unit of a youth hostel with an area of about 10 to 15 square metres ("m<sup>2</sup>"), the Administration believed that if the rental was set at a level not exceeding 60% of the market rent, it would be affordable to working youths. Individual operating NGOs were even willing to set the rental at a level below 60% of the market rent. Moreover, when applying for residence in youth hostels in different districts, young people would give full consideration to the rental level in the respective district and their own needs.

64. Given that market rents varied in different districts, Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung queried why different eligibility criteria could not be set under YHS for respective districts where the hostels were situated. Mr LEUNG opined that if young people were to live in youth hostels in urban areas, they would have to pay higher rents and would thus have less money for savings. As such, YHS could not help young tenants accumulate savings. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen expressed similar views that the scheme could not help young tenants accumulate savings for buying homes or starting business.

65. DSHA(1) replied that under YHS, the income level of a one-person household applicant should not exceed the 75th percentile of the monthly earnings of employed persons aged 18 to 30 (\$17,000 in 2014). An applicant should also meet the requirement on total net asset limit. The purpose of such eligibility criteria was to ensure that the limited hostel places would be allocated to youths who had genuine housing needs but were not among the highest income earners. DSHA(1) stressed that YHS was not a housing scheme but was a youth development scheme to encourage youths to prepare for future development.

66. In response to Dr KWOK Ka-ki's enquiry about the rental of the Tai Po Youth Hostel, Ms Amy FUNG, Deputy Executive Director of the Hong Kong Federation of Youth Groups ("DED/HKFYG"), said that the rental level for a hostel unit with an area of 15 m<sup>2</sup> was about \$2,300 per month.

67. Dr KWOK Ka-ki considered that the rental level was too high for young people who just started working. He enquired about the management cost of the Tai Po Youth Hostel and its percentage in the operating cost of the hostel. Ms Cyd HO pointed out that the rental of a flat of more than 20 m<sup>2</sup> in Central was about \$13,500 per month. She opined that even if the hostel units in the same district were offered to tenants at a rental level of up to 60% of the market rent, the rental would still be too high for young people who wished to reside in the urban areas. Ms Emily LAU also expressed concern about the excessively high rental levels of youth hostels.

68. DED/HKFYG responded that the Tai Po Youth Hostel was a self-financing project and all rentals charged would be spent on the operation of the hostel. The operating cost mainly involved the expenses on cleaning, security and maintenance. To achieve cost saving, HKFYG would streamline the management and adopt a smart system for the Tai Po Youth Hostel. Citing Tai Po Youth Hostel as an example, the rental expenditure (about \$2,300 per month) only accounted for 13.5 % of the 75th percentile of the monthly earnings of employed persons aged 18 to 30 (\$17,000 in 2014).

69. DSHA(1) added that the size of a single-person hostel unit was relatively small, usually about 10 m<sup>2</sup> to 15 m<sup>2</sup>. As the rental of youth hostel units would be set by making reference to the rental of flats of similar size in the nearby areas, the rental levels of those hostel units in the urban areas might not be as high as Ms Cyd HO thought. He further pointed out that the aggregate tenancy period for youth hostel units might last up to five years. Hostel tenants were required to undergo income and asset limit tests only at the time of application and were not subject to the tests again upon renewal of tenancy. The Administration believed that as the young tenants would be developing their career and their income would likely increase, they should be able to pay the rental of the youth hostels.

70. Mr Abraham SHEK expressed support for the project. Given that the rent of domestic units had continued to increase in recent years, he enquired whether the Administration would consider pegging the rental level of youth hostels to the construction and operating costs instead of making reference to the market rent of flats of similar size in the nearby areas.

71. DSHA(1) advised that the Administration had not considered pegging the rental level of youth hostels to the construction costs in the formulation of

YHS because the construction costs of different youth hostels varied with site conditions and construction methods.

### Purpose of the Youth Hostel Scheme

72. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen did not subscribe to the Administration's view that YHS was a youth development scheme instead of a housing scheme. He opined that except for the hostels provided, the complementary youth development services provided by the operating NGOs could not help much in facilitating the future development of youth tenants. In this connection, he asked whether the expenditure on youth development services would be borne by the operating NGOs themselves or covered by the rental income of the hostels. He was of the view that, if such expenditure was to be covered by the rental income of the hostels, the operating NGOs should cut down the youth services in order to reduce the rental levels, given the limited effectiveness of these services.

73. DED/HKFYG said that a service centre of HKFYG, namely Youth Space for Participation, Opportunities and Training ("Youth S.P.O.T."), would be reprovisioned to Tai Po Youth Hostel. The service centre, which provided youth services for the tenants of Tai Po Youth Hostel, was operated on the subvention of the Social Welfare Department. In other words, the expenditure on the youth services would not be covered by the rental income of the hostel.

74. Mr Alan LEONG was concerned whether YHS was a housing scheme that merely catered for the housing needs of the youth or a youth development scheme with a wider scope of coverage. He was worried that if the positioning of the scheme was not clear enough, it would not be able to meet the youth's keen demand for housing. Mr LEONG also opined that if YHS was a youth development scheme, the operating NGOs might take into account the circumstances or factors other than the housing needs of the youth in considering the applications for hostel places.

75. DSHA(1) advised that YHS aimed to meet the needs of the working youths who wished to have their own living space, and to unleash the potential of underutilized sites held by NGOs. The Administration would bear the construction cost of the works to facilitate the construction of youth hostels by NGOs. It was believed that the scheme could promote youth development through nurturing the self-independence of the young tenants and broadening their social circles. As for the criteria for assessing the applications for hostel places, DSHA(1) said that the Administration had only set the income and total net asset limits, which were the most basic eligibility criteria for applicants of YHS. Other than that, the operating NGOs might

formulate their own criteria for assessing the applications for hostel places. DED/HKFGY added that HKFGY would consider factors such as the floor areas and living conditions of the residence of the applicants at the time of application and the urgency for the applicants to move out of their existing residence.

76. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung noted that one of the purposes of YHS was to unleash the potential of underutilized sites held by NGOs. He was of the view that if there was underutilized potential of any sites which were owned by the Government, such sites should be used for public rental housing ("PRH") development. Mr LEUNG considered that the scheme could not meet the housing needs of youths. He enquired how the Administration would assess the effectiveness of the scheme (such as by compiling statistics on the number of hostel tenants who eventually accumulated enough savings for home purchase).

77. DSHA(1) responded that quite a number of young people no longer regarded accumulation of savings for home purchase as their sole development goal. Hence, the effectiveness of YHS should be measured by the number of tenants who were able to develop self-independence and broaden their social circles during their residence in youth hostels, which would facilitate their future career development.

78. Ms Emily LAU asked HKFGY to explain how the youth problems in Hong Kong and the keen demand of the youth for housing could be addressed through the implementation of YHS. DED/HKFGY responded that HKFGY was committed to promoting the development of youth hostels. HKFGY believed that by offering hostel places and complementary youth development services, YHS could help young people broaden their horizons and enhance their job skills.

79. Dr Fernando CHEUNG said that the Administration's high land price policy had resulted in high property prices and rentals which were beyond the affordability of the general public including young people. For this reason, YHS was implemented to lease hostel units to young people at a relatively low rental to cater for their housing needs. However, the limited number of hostel units that could be provided under YHS was inadequate to address the housing problem of the youth.

#### Use of surplus generated from the operation of youth hostels

80. Ms Cyd HO noted that the operating NGOs of the youth hostels were allowed to allocate the surplus generated from hostel operation to support other non-profit-making undertakings of the organizations. She expressed

objection to this arrangement and asked whether the Administration would make any change to it.

81. DSHA(1) said that the Administration would only bear the construction cost of a youth hostel. The maintenance expenses incurred after the completion of the hostel would be borne by the operating NGO. Therefore, the operating NGO was required to establish a "mandatory reserve" to cover the cost concerned. With the prior approval from the Secretary for Home Affairs, the operating NGO might allocate the operating surplus arising from the "mandatory reserve" to fund its other non-profit-making undertakings to benefit the wider community. This arrangement could also encourage the NGO concerned to operate the youth hostel in a more effective manner.

82. Ms Cyd HO considered that it was unreasonable for the Administration to bear the project cost for the construction of a youth hostel while the operating NGO was allowed to use the surplus generated from the operation of the youth hostel to fund its other services. She suggested that the operating surplus arising from the "mandatory reserve" under YHS should be used directly for reduction of hostel rents.

#### Progress of the proposed project and its impact on the surrounding areas

83. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen asked whether Tai Po Youth Hostel was the first project to be completed under YHS and when the project would be completed and ready for inviting tenancies.

84. DSHA(1) said that subject to the funding approval of FC, the Tai Po Youth Hostel would be the first project to be completed under YHS. DED/HKFG supplemented that Tai Po Youth Hostel would be completed within 24 months from the commencement of the project and tenancy invitation would commence nine months before the completion of the project.

85. Mr Alvin YEUNG noted that Po Heung Estate situated near the site of Tai Po Youth Hostel would soon be ready for occupation. Given that Po Heung Lane, at which the hostel site was located, would lead to a dead end, Mr YEUNG requested the Administration to explain how it would ensure that the traffic near the site and the PRH residents who would soon move in would not be affected during the construction period of the proposed project, as well as the arrangements for public transport and access of large construction vehicles to the hostel site. Mr YEUNG was also concerned about whether the piling works of the proposed project would affect the relatively old community centre nearby.

86. DSHA(1) replied that the traffic impact assessment of the proposed project had been completed and the project had complied with the relevant environmental protection requirements. Mr C H NG, Managing Director, Handi Architects Limited, said that the entrance and exit of the site were provided at Po Heung Lane to minimize the impact on the nearby traffic during the construction period of the youth hostel. As for the piling works of the proposed project, the geotechnical engineer and the structural engineer had conducted an assessment on the impact of the piling works on the surrounding areas and the works had also obtained the approval of the Buildings Department.

Construction works by Po Leung Kuk for the youth hostel project in Ma Tin Pok

87. Dr KWOK Ka-ki referred to an approved agenda item, i.e. PWSC(2015-16)60, under which Po Leung Kuk planned to construct a youth hostel at a site at Ma Tin Pok, Yuen Long donated by the Chairman of Henderson Land Development Company Limited ("HLD"). Dr KWOK enquired whether HLD owned any land near the site at Ma Tin Pok and whether the youth hostel project in Yuen Long would facilitate HLD's future land development in the district. In his view, the actions of private developers were often based on the benefits that the developers would derive from the property projects concerned. Mr Abraham SHEK said he disagreed with Dr KWOK Ka-ki's comments that private developers had other intentions behind their donation of sites for community use.

88. DSHA(1) replied that the Administration did not have the information on the land owned by HLD near the site at Ma Tin Pok. Moreover, HLD was required to comply with the relevant planning and land use requirements when undertaking any land development.

89. Noting that a few members were still waiting for their turns to speak, the Chairman advised the Subcommittee that due to time constraints, the discussion on the item would be continued at the next meeting.

*[At 10:23 am, the Chairman asked members if they agreed to extend the meeting for 15 minutes up to 10:45 am. The majority of the members agreed to extend the meeting. The Chairman then directed that the meeting be extended for 15 minutes.]*

90. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 10:45 am.