

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. PWSC197/17-18

(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/F/2/1(19)B

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

**Minutes of the 18th meeting
held in Conference Room 3 of the Legislative Council Complex
on Saturday, 14 April 2018, at 9:00 am**

Members present:

Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, SBS, MH, JP (Chairman)

Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP (Deputy Chairman)

Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP

Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, SBS, JP

Hon CHAN Hak-kan, BBS, JP

Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP

Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP

Hon Claudia MO

Hon YIU Si-wing, BBS

Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP

Hon CHAN Chi-chuen

Hon CHAN Han-pan, JP

Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, SBS, MH, JP

Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP

Hon Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung, SBS, JP

Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung

Hon Alvin YEUNG

Hon Andrew WAN Siu-kin

Hon CHU Hoi-dick

Hon HO Kai-ming
Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding
Hon Wilson OR Chong-shing, MH
Hon Tanya CHAN
Hon LUK Chung-hung
Hon LAU Kwok-fan, MH
Dr Hon CHENG Chung-tai
Hon KWONG Chun-yu
Hon Jeremy TAM Man-ho
Hon Gary FAN Kwok-wai
Hon AU Nok-hin
Hon Vincent CHENG Wing-shun, MH
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS

Members absent:

Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, GBS, JP
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, SBS, JP
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan
Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP
Hon LAM Cheuk-ting
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, JP
Hon HUI Chi-fung

Public officers attending:

Mr Raistlin LAU Chun, JP	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) ³
Mr Vincent MAK Shing-cheung, JP	Deputy Secretary for Development (Works) ²
Ms Bernadette LINN, JP	Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)

Mr Donald TONG Chi-keung, JP	Permanent Secretary for the Environment
Ms Margaret HSIA Mai-chi	Principal Assistant Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) (Works)
Dr Raymond SO Wai-man, BBS, JP	Under Secretary for Transport and Housing
Mr Kenneth LEUNG Tak-yan	Chief Civil Engineer (Public Works Programme) Transport and Housing Bureau
Mr Edward TSE Cheong-wo	Project Director (3) Architectural Services Department
Mr Gabriel WOO Tai-on	Deputy Head of Civil Engineering Office (Project and Environmental Management) Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr TSE Chun-tat	Chief Engineer Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mrs Doris FOK LEE Sheung-ling	Assistant Director of Leisure and Cultural Services (Leisure Services)1
Ms Vera CHOI Sze-man	Chief Architect (7) Housing Department
Mr LEE Yun-cheung	Chief Civil Engineer (1) (Acting) Housing Department
Ms Rebecca PUN Ting-ting, JP	Deputy Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport)1
Ms Judy CHUNG Sui-kei	Principal Assistant Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport)5
Mr LAW Man-tim	Deputy Project Manager (North) North Development Office Civil Engineering and Development Department

Mr Zorro YUEN Tat-yung	Chief Engineer (North) ² North Development Office Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr Ricky HO Wai-kee	Chief Traffic Engineer (New Territories East) Transport Department
Mr SHEA Tin-cheung	Chief Engineer (Transport Planning) Transport Department
Mr WONG Chuen-fai	Assistant Director of Environmental Protection (Environmental Assessment)
Dr LAU Kwok-keung	Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Assessment and Noise) Environmental Protection Department
Mr NG Wai-keung	Deputy Project Manager (Major Works) ² Highways Department
Mr Stephen WONG Wai-kwong	Chief Engineer (3) (Major Works) Highways Department
Mr LIU Chun-san, JP	Under Secretary for Development
Ms Doris HO Pui-ling, JP	Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands) ¹
Mr Robin LEE Kui-biu, JP	Head of the Sustainable Lantau Office Civil Engineering and Development Department
Ms Joyce LAU Yiu-yan	Chief Engineer (Lantau) ³ Civil Engineering and Development Department
Ms Iris LEE Ho-ki	Principal Assistant Secretary for Security (A)
Ms Trinky CHAN Tsz-ki	Assistant Secretary for Security (A) ¹

Ms Joyce CHAN Nga-sze	Principal Assistant Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport)9
Mr West WU Wai-hung, MBS, GDSM, AE	Chief Pilot (Operations) Government Flying Service
Ms Clara WONG	Chief Safety Officer (Airport and Safety Regulation) Civil Aviation Department

Clerk in attendance:

Ms Doris LO	Chief Council Secretary (1)2
-------------	------------------------------

Staff in attendance:

Miss Rita YUNG	Senior Council Secretary (1)2
Ms Christina SHIU	Legislative Assistant (1)2
Ms Christy YAU	Legislative Assistant (1)7
Ms Haley CHEUNG	Legislative Assistant (1)9

Action

The Chairman advised that there were three funding proposals on the agenda for the meeting, all of which were items carried over from the previous meeting. He 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 proposals. He also drew members' attention to Rule 84 of RoP on voting in case of direct pecuniary interest.

Head 711 – Housing

PWSC(2017-18)35	286RS	Reprovisioning of recreational facilities at Hiu Ming Street Playground, Kwun Tong
	779CL	Site formation works for public housing development at Hiu Ming Street, Kwun Tong

2. The Chairman advised that the proposal set out in PWSC(2017-18)35 sought to upgrade 286RS and 779CL to Category A. The estimated cost of

286RS was \$106.2 million in money-of-the-day ("MOD") prices for reprovisioning of the recreational facilities at Hiu Ming Street Playground, Kwun Tong, while the estimated cost of 779CL was \$169.6 million in MOD prices for the site formation works to support the proposed public housing development at Hiu Ming Street, Kwun Tong. The total cost estimate of the two projects was \$275.8 million. The Government had consulted the Panel on Housing on the proposed works on 9 May 2017. Panel members supported the submission of the funding proposals to the Subcommittee for consideration. A gist of the Panel's discussion on the projects was tabled at the meeting.

Reprovisioning of recreational facilities at Hiu Ming Street Playground

3. Dr Fernando CHEUNG enquired whether the children's play equipment provided at the reprovisioned Hiu Ming Street Playground would be inclusive equipment. Assistant Director of Leisure and Cultural Services (Leisure Services)1 ("AD(LS)1/LCSD") replied in the affirmative.

4. Dr Fernando CHEUNG pointed out that the design of the play equipment currently provided in public children's play areas was all the same. Lacking fun and challenges, the play equipment could not arouse children's interest. He opined that the Government should consult local residents (including children) on the types of children's play equipment to be reprovisioned. Mr KWONG Chun-yu expressed similar views. He urged the Government to consider providing swings, a kind of popular play equipment in the past, at the reprovisioned Hiu Ming Street Playground.

5. The Chairman said that members had repeatedly raised their views and suggestions on children's play equipment during previous discussions on works projects for development of open spaces and public children's play areas. He considered that members might follow up on the overall policy issues concerned at the meetings of the Council or a relevant Panel.

6. Mr KWONG Chun-yu enquired whether a pet garden would be provided in the reprovisioned Hiu Ming Street Playground. AD(LS)1/LCSD replied that given the limited site area, there would not be enough space to accommodate a pet garden after the reprovisioning of all the existing recreational facilities at Hiu Ming Street Playground. She added that there were currently two pet gardens in Kwun Tong District, one of which were located at Kwun Tong Ferry Pier Square and the other was located in Tai Yip Street Garden.

7. Mr Jeremy TAM opined that the Government should formulate objective and quantifiable planning standards for the provision of pet gardens,

such as specifying the number of dogs-allowed residential developments in a planning area for the provision of a pet garden. In response, AD(LS)1/LCSD said that the Leisure and Cultural Services Department ("LCSD") kept an open mind on the provision of pet gardens. Should consensus be reached in the local community on this proposal, LCSD would provide pet gardens at existing venues or under new projects as far as practicable.

8. The Chairman advised that members might raise the overall policy issues relating to the provision of pet garden facilities at the meetings of the Council or to a relevant Panel.

9. Dr CHENG Chung-tai pointed out that the completion of a new public housing development at Hiu Ming Street in future would bring in some 3 000 residents. However, the Government would only re-provision the three existing tennis courts and two basketball courts, without any additional leisure facilities to cater for the extra population in the area. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen opined that the Government should consider the local demand for different sports venues and their usage when planning the re-provisioning of recreational facilities.

10. AD(LS)1/LCSD advised that Kwun Tong District Council ("DC") requested for re-provisioning all the existing recreational facilities at Hiu Ming Street Playground. Given the limited site area, the Government was unable to provide a wider variety of facilities. Under Secretary for Transport and Housing ("USTH") said that the open space provision in the Kwun Tong (South) planning area after completion of the proposed public housing development at Hiu Ming Street would be about 2.7 square metres per person, which was higher than the provision standard of open space under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (i.e. 2 square metres per person), and the proposed standard of 2.5 square metres per person under Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030. USTH supplemented that open spaces, children's play equipment and recreational facilities would be provided within the proposed public housing development at Hiu Ming Street for use by residents.

11. Mr HO Kai-ming pointed out that the Kwun Tong Recreation Ground (which was equipped with an artificial turf soccer pitch and hard-surface soccer pitches) and Kwun Tong Swimming Pool currently located in the vicinity of Hiu Ming Street provided various recreational and sports facilities for local residents.

12. Dr CHENG Chung-tai suggested that the Government should liaise with the secondary schools on Hiu Ming Street to encourage the school

management to open up their ball game courts/pitches for public use outside school hours, so as to provide more recreational and sports facilities for the community. The Chairman said that members might raise the overall policy issues relating to encouraging schools to open up facilities for public use at the meetings of the Council or a relevant Panel.

13. Mr Jeremy TAM said that he supported the two proposed projects. He enquired whether free Wi-Fi would be provided at the reprovisioned Hiu Ming Street Playground. In response, AD(LS)1/LCSD said that the wireless network contract which had already been awarded did not cover the reprovisioned recreational facilities at Hiu Ming Street Playground. LCSD would consider including the reprovisioned Hiu Ming Street Playground under the contracted service area during the mid-term contract review. Mr Jeremy TAM urged the Government to arrange for the provision of free Wi-Fi at Hiu Ming Street Playground prior to the completion of the reprovisioning works.

Public housing development at Hiu Ming Street

14. Mr AU Nok-hin enquired whether the proposed construction of the additional lay-by at Hiu Ming Street could address Kwun Tong DC's concerns about the traffic impact by effectively bringing improvement to the traffic conditions on Hiu Ming Street. Mr AU opined that the Government should provide the traffic impact assessment ("TIA") report for the proposed public housing development at Hiu Ming Street for members' reference.

15. USTH replied that the Government had consulted Kwun Tong DC and its relevant committees, as well as the relevant stakeholders (including the four secondary schools on Hiu Ming Street), on the proposed public housing development at Hiu Ming Street and related issues. They all supported the proposal of constructing an additional lay-by at Hiu Ming Street. USTH further said that at the request of the Subcommittee, the Government had provided earlier the full text of the TIA report for the proposed development of the Anderson Road Quarry ("ARQ") site ([LC Paper No. PWSC34/17-18\(01\)](#)) (Chinese version), which covered the latest developments of the ARQ site and its surrounding areas, including the public housing development at Hiu Ming Street.

16. Mr CHU Hoi-dick enquired why the car park entrance/exit of the public housing development at Hiu Ming Street would be on Hiu Kwong Street, which was higher up on the hill slope, instead of Hiu Ming Street. Chief Civil Engineer (Public Works Programme), Transport and Housing Bureau, replied that a two-level podium perched on Hiu Kwong Street and Hiu Ming Street respectively would be built at the site of the proposed public

housing development. As Hiu Ming Street was a cul-de-sac with a number of secondary schools, the Government considered it more appropriate to locate the car park of the proposed public housing development on the upper podium at Hiu Kwong Street, after taking into account the overall transport arrangements.

17. Given that the public housing development at Hiu Ming Street was built on an uphill area, Dr Fernando CHEUNG enquired whether pedestrian links connecting with the shopping facilities in the vicinity would be provided as appropriate to facilitate resident access. Chief Architect (7), Housing Department ("CA(7)/HD"), advised that as shown on the plan of barrier-free access at Annex 4 to Enclosure 1 to [PWSC\(2017-18\)35](#), a pedestrian connectivity facility next to the public housing development at Hiu Ming Street comprising pedestrian links, footbridges and lifts was being constructed by the Civil Engineering and Development Department ("CEDD") to connect with facilities in Sau Mau Ping Estate.

18. Dr CHENG Chung-tai enquired whether replacing the initial design of one residential block with a two-block design for the public housing development at Hiu Ming Street would have any implications on the ventilation of the project and the number of flats to be provided. CA(7)/HD replied that the Government adopted a proactive approach in refining the design of the public housing development at Hiu Ming Street. There would be a 15-metre-wide ventilation corridor between the two residential blocks to be built under the latest proposal to facilitate ventilation. The number of flats provided under the project would remain more or less the same.

19. Dr CHENG Chung-tai noted that CCC Mong Man Wai College opposite the public housing development at Hiu Ming Street had expressed concern about the close proximity of some flats under the project to its facilities. Dr CHENG enquired how the Government would address the school's concern. CA(7)/HD said that the enhanced two-block design could address the issue.

20. Mr CHU Hoi-dick noted that according to Annex 5 to Enclosure 1 to [PWSC\(2017-18\)35](#), the ancillary facilities of the public housing development at Hiu Ming Street included a number of social welfare facilities. He enquired whether the Government had consulted Kwun Tong DC to see if it supported the development of those social welfare facilities. He also enquired about the number of service quotas offered by those social welfare facilities.

21. USTH replied that the Government had consulted Kwun Tong DC and its relevant committees on the proposed public housing development at

Hui Ming Street and related issues. Kwun Tong DC supported the project and the associated works. The ancillary facilities of the proposed public housing development at Hui Ming Street comprised a social welfare facilities block, which would provide a residential care home for the elderly ("RCHE") with 100 places, a hostel for severely mentally handicapped persons with 50 places, a day activity centre with 50 places, a special child care centre with 60 places, an early education and training centre with 90 places, and a counselling centre for psychotropic substance abusers, etc.

22. Mr CHU Hoi-dick pointed out that the Government had proposed earlier the provision of an RCHE offering 150 places in the public housing development at Queen's Hill, Fanling, which could accommodate about 30 000 people. For the public housing development at Hui Ming Street which would house about 3 000 people, an RCHE offering 100 places would be built. Mr CHU queried the planning criteria adopted by the Government in providing RCHE places in various districts in Hong Kong and whether the demographic profiles of the districts concerned were taken into consideration.

23. In response, USTH said that the Government was aware of the demand of the community for social welfare facilities for the elderly. The Housing Department would provide suitable social welfare facilities under public housing projects as far as practicable on condition that public housing supply and development progress would not be affected. After consulting the Social Welfare Department and having regard to factors such as the prevailing supply of and demand for social welfare facilities in the district, the Government proposed to provide an RCHE with 100 places in the public housing development at Hui Ming Street.

24. The Chairman advised that members might raise overall policy issues relating to the territory-wide supply of RCHE places at the meetings of the Council or a relevant Panel.

Pedestrian connectivity facilities

25. Mr HO Kai-ming and Mr AU Nok-hin urged the Government to proactively liaise with the owners' corporation of Tsui Ping (North) Estate ("the OC") and address its concern, so as to take forward the construction of the pedestrian connectivity facilities linking Hui Ming Street and Tsui Ping Road via Tsui Ping (North) Estate to facilitate resident access to MTR Kwun Tong Station. Referring to a suggestion raised by Mr WU Chi-wai at the meeting of the Panel on Housing on 9 May 2017, Mr AU urged the Government to consider re-examining and planning the alignment of the pedestrian links between Hui Ming Street and MTR Kwun Tong Station after the relocation of the Kwun Tong campus of the Hong Kong Institute of

Vocational Education ("IVE (Kwun Tong)") on Hiu Ming Street to Cha Kwo Ling.

26. In response, USTH and Deputy Head of Civil Engineering Office (Project and Environmental Management), Civil Engineering and Development Department, said that the Government took note of the views of Mr WU Chi-wai and Mr AU Nok-hin. At present, the OC did not agree to the construction of an escalator link passing through Tsui Ping (North) Estate due to concern over the nuisances that might be caused to the residents by the increased pedestrian flow. Nevertheless, CEDD would continue to liaise with the OC on the matter. On the other hand, USTH explained that the relocation plan of IVE (Kwun Tong) had not been finalized.

Voting on PWSC(2017-18)35

27. There being no further questions on the item from members, 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 meeting of the Finance Committee ("FC"). No member made such a request.

Head 707 – New Towns and Urban Area Development

PWSC(2017-18)36 861TH Widening of Tai Po Road (Sha Tin Section) - construction

Head 706 – Highways

804TH Retrofitting of Noise Barriers on Tai Po Road (Sha Tin Section)

29. The Chairman advised that the proposal set out in PWSC(2017-18)36 sought to upgrade 861TH and 804TH to Category A. The estimated cost of 861TH was \$2,739.7 million in MOD prices for widening of Tai Po Road (Sha Tin Section), while the estimated cost of 804TH was \$851.8 million in MOD prices for retrofitting the noise barriers on sections of Tai Po Road (Sha Tin Section). The total cost estimate of the two projects was \$3,591.5 million. The Government had consulted the Panel on Transport on 861TH on 19 January 2018 and the Panel on Environmental Affairs on 804TH on 22 January 2018. Members of both Panels had no objection to the submission of the funding proposals to the Subcommittee for consideration. A gist of the two Panels' discussion on the projects was tabled at the meeting.

Widening of Tai Po Road (Sha Tin Section)

30. Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr Wilson OR and Mr LAU Kwok-fan expressed support for the proposed widening works to alleviate traffic congestion at the road section concerned. Mr LAU and Mr Gary FAN enquired how the traffic congestion at Tai Po Road (Sha Tin Section) could be relieved after completion of the proposed works. Deputy Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport)1 ("DS(T)1/THB") and Chief Traffic Engineer (New Territories East), Transport Department, said that the proposed widening works were expected to be completed in about the second half of 2023, by which time the traffic in the vicinity would have been improved. As shown by the data presented in Table 1 in Enclosure 1 to [PWSC\(2017-18\)36](#), after completion of the proposed works, the volume/capacity ("v/c") ratio of Tai Po Road (Sha Tin Section) during peak hours in 2026 was expected to improve. The v/c ratio during peak hours would be lowered to a level between 1.0 and 1.2, which indicated that the congested conditions remained under control. DS(T)1/THB added that the Government was planning the construction of Trunk Road T4 in Sha Tin with a view to further improving the traffic of Sha Tin.

31. Mr Gary FAN suggested that the Government should consider extending the noise enclosures at the proposed slip road from the left turning lanes of Tai Po Road (Sha Tin Section) southbound to Sha Tin Rural Committee Road, so as to further reduce the noise impact on the dwellings in Lek Yuen Estate near the slip road and enhance the landscape. Deputy Project Manager (North), North Development Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department ("DPM(N)/CEDD"), replied that the design of the proposed noise enclosures had to take into account various factors, e.g. the noise mitigation effect and whether drivers' view would be obstructed. He said that as the above location was a road intersection, obstruction of view would undermine driving safety. After thorough evaluation, the Government considered the design of the proposed enclosures conducive to preventing such problem.

32. Mr AU Nok-hin enquired whether the Government had evaluated the impact of the proposed widening works on the air quality of the vicinity when they were being carried out and after completion. DPM(N)/CEDD replied that the Government had conducted an environmental impact assessment ("EIA") for the construction and operation of the proposed widening works, which covered the noise and air quality impacts. The EIA report indicated that the proposed widening works complied with the criteria provided under the relevant legislation. The EIA report was approved by the Director of Environmental Protection.

33. Mr AU Nok-hin and Mr CHU Hoi-dick pointed out that the Public Transport Interchange ("PTI") at MTR Sha Tin Station was located near Tai Po Road (Sha Tin Section) where the proposed widening works would take place. They were concerned about the traffic impact on the PTI during the proposed construction works. Mr CHU also said that the space available at the PTI for buses to pull in was very crowded currently. He enquired about the Government's mid-term measures to improve the situation.

34. DPM(N)/CEDD replied that the Government was aware of the extremely busy traffic along Tai Po Road (Sha Tin Section). The contractor of the proposed widening works was required under the contract to submit proposals on any temporary traffic control measures to be implemented during construction for the Government's approval. Efforts would be made to minimize the impact of such control measures on traffic conditions nearby. Moreover, he pointed out that the scope of the proposed widening works did not cover the PTI at MTR Sha Tin Station.

35. Mr CHU Hoi-dick noted that the Government was exploring the use of a new low-noise material mixed with old tyres for road surfacing works in Hong Kong. He enquired about the road surfacing materials used in the proposed widening works. Assistant Director of Environmental Protection (Environmental Assessment) ("AD(EA)/EPD"), said that the Environmental Protection Department ("EPD") had carried out preliminary studies on a low-noise material containing recycled rubber and used it in different road surfacing works for testing purpose. Subject to test results, EPD would further explore the use of the material for road surfacing/resurfacing at suitable road sections. DPM(N)/CEDD replied that the low-noise material for road surfacing works currently recommended by the Highways Department would be used in the proposed widening works.

36. Mr Gary FAN noted that the proposed widening works would require the removal of 264 trees within the project boundary, including 256 trees to be felled and 8 trees to be transplanted. He enquired the reason why the some 200 trees must be cut down but not transplanted. DPM(N)/CEDD replied that Tai Po Road (Sha Tin Section) proposed to be widened was flanked by MTR's East Rail Line area on one side and residential buildings on the other. The consultant engaged by the Government had already conducted detailed design and site investigation work for the proposed widening works with a view to minimizing the number of trees to be felled. Upon completion of the study, the tree experts pointed out that the some 200 trees to be felled were common species with a low survival rate after transplanting.

Traffic congestion in North East New Territories

37. Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr Wilson OR, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr Gary FAN were concerned that the proposed widening of Tai Po Road (Sha Tin Section) was not sufficient to cope with the additional traffic flow arising from the on-going development of Sha Tin and North East New Territories ("NENT") in future. They requested the Government to conduct a study on the long-term transport infrastructure connecting Sha Tin or NENT with the urban areas as soon as possible.

38. In response, DS(T)1/THB and DPM(N)/CEDD said that the Government was planning the construction of Trunk Road T4 in Sha Tin. The Civil Engineering and Development Department ("CEDD") would engage a consultant to conduct an investigation study on Trunk Road T4 within this year. The study was expected to be completed in three years. The Government would consult Sha Tin DC on the investigation findings and gazette the Trunk Road T4 project. DS(T)1/THB added that the Government planned to take forward the "Strategic Studies on Railways and Major Roads beyond 2030" to gauge the transport demand arising from the long-term development of Hong Kong and formulate strategies on major transport infrastructure, so as to enable the timely provision of the necessary transport infrastructure.

39. Mr CHAN Han-pan enquired whether the Government would need to seek funding approval from LegCo for the aforesaid investigation study on Trunk Road T4. DS(T)1/THB replied that it was not necessary to submit a separate funding request to LegCo because CEDD had already deployed the necessary resources for the investigation study.

40. The Chairman advised that members might raise overall policy issues relating to the traffic and transport of Sha Tin and NENT at the meetings of the Council or the Panel on Transport.

Retrofitting of noise barriers at Tai Po Road (Sha Tin Section)

41. Mr AU Nok-hin noted that under 804TH, semi-enclosures were proposed to be retrofitted along the two southbound carriageways of Tai Po Road (Sha Tin Section) between Scenery Court and Citylink Plaza and between Wo Che Estate and Fo Tan Road. He pointed out that Sha Tin DC had requested that full noise enclosures be retrofitted at the road sections concerned for more effective noise mitigation. He enquired about the reason for the proposed provision of semi-enclosures only. He was also concerned whether the retrofitted semi-enclosures would instead bring about more traffic noise to the dwellings on higher floors on the side of the road.

42. AD(EA)/EPD said that having regard to the site constraints and the technical barriers at the road sections concerned (e.g. lack of sufficient space at the road verge or the central median at some locations for the construction of columns to support the noise enclosures, structural capability of the existing vehicular flyovers, road safety and fire escape related requirements, etc.), the Government had proposed to provide noise barriers (including semi-enclosures, cantilevered noise barriers or vertical noise barriers) at different locations as appropriate. In Annex 5 to Enclosure 2 to [PWSC\(2017-18\)36](#), the Government set out how the noise nuisance affecting the dwellings on the side of the road could be alleviated after the implementation of the proposed mitigation measures. AD(EA)/EPD confirmed that the dwellings on higher floors would not be exposed to additional traffic noise after completion of the proposed works.

Voting on PWSC(2017-18)36

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

44. 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 707 – New Towns and Urban Area Development

PWSC(2017-18)37 188GK Government Flying Service Kai Tak Division

45. The Chairman advised that the proposal, i.e. PWSC(2017-18)37, sought to upgrade 188GK to Category A at an estimated cost of \$469.1 million in MOD prices for establishing a Kai Tak Division ("KTD") for the Government Flying Service ("GFS") at the tip of the Ex-Kai Tak Runway ("Ex-KTR"). The Government had consulted the Panel on Security on the proposed works on 9 January 2018. Members of the Panel on Development were also invited to join the discussion. Panel members supported the submission of the funding proposal to the Subcommittee for consideration. A gist of the discussion of the Panel on Security was tabled at the meeting.

Location of the Government Flying Service Kai Tak Division

46. Mr CHU Hoi-dick enquired what other locations had been considered by the Government for establishing the GFS division except for the proposed

site at the tip of Ex-KTR. Under Secretary for Development ("USDEV") and Head of the Sustainable Lantau Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department ("H(SLO)/CEDD"), responded that the Government had conducted a feasibility study on 19 potential locations in Wan Chai, Hung Hom, Chai Wan, etc. After considering a host of factors, such as GFS's operational needs, compatibility with aviation safety requirements, land use planning, technical feasibility, optimal site utilization and compliance with the statutory requirements, the Government concluded that the proposed site was the ideal location for establishing the GFS division. The executive summary of the feasibility study on the proposed location would be uploaded onto the website of the Civil Engineering and Development Department ("CEDD") in due course.

47. Mr Holden CHOW was concerned whether the Government had considered if the new buildings to be built in the vicinity of the proposed site in future might hamper the flight route of GFS helicopters in the feasibility study on the proposed site.

48. USDEV responded that under the Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan S/K22/2 announced in 2007, facilities in the vicinity of the proposed site included the Kai Tak Runway Park, the Kai Tak Cruise Terminal building and the proposed Kai Tak Tourism Node. These facilities would have no implications on the flight route of the helicopters.

Proposal to possibly provide a cross-boundary heliport in future

49. Mr Vincent CHENG said that he supported the proposed works in principle. He sought details of the shared-use arrangement between KTD of GFS and the new commercial cross-boundary heliport that might possibly be built, including the commissioning date of the latter.

50. Regarding the proposal to provide a new commercial cross-boundary heliport, Mr AU Nok-hin also enquired when the demand for commercial heliports in Hong Kong was last assessed. Mr CHAN Hak-kan requested the Government to provide information on the other commercial heliport in Hong Kong (i.e. the heliport at the Hong Kong-Macau Ferry Terminal ("HKMFT") in Sheung Wan), including whether it was only used by flights to and from Macau currently, its usage, and if it had yet to reach its capacity, whether the new cross-boundary heliport proposed to be provided at the proposed site could be put on hold until then. Ms Claudia MO enquired whether the commercial cross-boundary heliport would be made available for rental by private helicopters in future.

51. Principal Assistant Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport)9 ("PAS(T)9/THB") replied that at present, the HKMFT heliport in Sheung Wan was the only heliport in Hong Kong which provided commercial cross-boundary helicopter flight service. The heliport, with a designed capacity of about 50 000 helicopter movements a year, had about 11 000 movements in each of the past two years. Currently, it only provided flight service to and from Macau. As such, the heliport had the capacity to meet new service demand. That said, given the guiding opinions announced by the State Council in May 2016 on further development of low-altitude airspace and the demand that might arise under the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macau Bay Area initiative, the Government intended to promote different modes of cross-boundary transport services and was conducting an internal study on further developing cross-boundary helicopter service. The study would cover the usage of existing facilities and the future demand for helicopter service and associated facilities. The relevant stakeholders would also be consulted. At this stage, the Government had not yet drawn up a timetable for development of the cross-boundary heliport at the proposed site. The availability of the new cross-boundary heliport for rental by private helicopters also required further study.

52. Mr CHU Hoi-dick noted that one office building, one hangar, one helicopter take-off/landing pad and two helicopter parking pads would be constructed at the proposed site. Mr CHU enquired which of those facilities would be shared by GFS and the commercial helicopter operators in future after the materialization of the cross-boundary heliport, and the location of the immigration and customs clearance area of the cross-boundary heliport. Ms Claudia MO and Mr CHAN Hak-kan raised similar questions. Mr Tony TSE enquired about the number of helicopters that the hangar could accommodate, and whether space was reserved for future expansion to allow the use by commercial helicopters as well.

53. USDEV and Chief Pilot (Operations), Government Flying Service ("CP(O)/GFS"), explained that the office building and hangar at the proposed site would be for the sole use of GFS. The hangar could accommodate two helicopters and would provide for storage of the associated rescue and maintenance equipment. GFS would not share the hangar with the cross-boundary heliport due to security and safety concerns. Moreover, while GFS and the cross-boundary heliport would share the use of the helicopter take-off/landing pad, they would each have their own helicopter parking pad. USDEV said that the Government had reserved space at the adjacent Kai Tak Cruise Terminal building for the future provision of supporting facilities for the cross-boundary heliport, including the immigration and customs clearance area. The space reserved for this

purpose was now being used by another government department on a temporary basis.

54. Mr CHU Hoi-dick was concerned whether the Government's proposal of providing the supporting facilities for the cross-boundary heliport separately at the Kai Tak Cruise Terminal building deviated from its initial plan. USDEV explained that both the Kai Tak Cruise Terminal and the cross-boundary heliport required the provision of an immigration and customs clearance area. The Government had included the supporting facilities for the cross-boundary heliport in the Cruise Terminal building in its initial plan, thereby putting resources to optimal use.

55. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen was concerned whether the shared-use of the helicopter take-off/landing pad by GFS and the cross-boundary heliport would affect GFS helicopters in carrying out emergency missions.

56. CP(O)/GFS said that GFS had the priority to use the helicopter take-off/landing pad of KTD when carrying out emergency missions. He pointed out that since the take-off or landing of helicopters only took a few minutes, the priority accorded to GFS helicopters to use the take-off/landing pad would not cause much delay to the movements of commercial helicopters in future.

57. Mr AU Nok-hin enquired whether the helicopter parking pad reserved for the commercial cross-boundary heliport would be placed under the temporary management of the Government prior to its commissioning, and its operation and management would subsequently be handed over to the successful tenderer.

58. PAS(T)9/THB responded that all facilities at the proposed site would be managed by GFS prior to the commissioning of the cross-boundary heliport. The Government would select the operator in accordance with established procedures after the proposal to build a new cross-boundary heliport (including the operational details) had been confirmed. She pointed out that at present, GFS shared the use of the helicopter take-off/landing pad next to the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre in Wan Chai with commercial helicopter companies. The arrangement had been running smoothly.

Land use of the proposed site

59. Mr HO Kai-ming questioned that the design to provide the proposed hangar at grade failed to optimize the use of the land resources of the proposed site, which was a prime waterfront location. Mr HO suggested

that in order to release more land for other uses, the hangar should be located underground and equipped with lifting platforms to transport the helicopters to the ground during operations.

60. CP(O)/GFS explained that the Government adopted the at-grade design for the proposed hangar having regard to the space constraint of the proposed site, the height limits, and the operational needs of GFS. Rescue operations would be delayed if helicopters had to be transported from an underground hangar by lifting platforms in times of emergency call-outs.

61. Mr HO Kai-ming suggested that the design of the proposed site should complement the Kai Tak Runway Park which had an aviation design theme, so as to promote public understanding of aviation in Hong Kong, including GFS. Mr HO was also concerned whether the Kai Tak Office ("KTO") under CEDD had coordinated the proposed works. He considered that representatives of KTO and other relevant bureaux/departments (e.g. the Commerce and Economic Development Bureau) should have attended the meeting to respond to members' questions.

62. USDEV said that the establishment of KTD of GFS at the proposed site complemented the adjacent Kai Tak Runway Park which had an aviation design theme. Moreover, KTO, which was under CEDD, had been actively involved in coordinating the proposed works.

Fleet and manpower arrangements of Government Flying Service Kai Tak Division

63. Mr Tony TSE enquired whether the number of GFS helicopters to be stationed at KTD was sufficient to cope with flying service demand of the new division; and whether the proposed hangar at KTD was built solely to meet the operational needs of KTD or to make up for the shortfall of the hangar capacity of GFS's Headquarters in Chek Lap Kok.

64. CP(O)/GFS replied that GFS currently had a total of seven helicopters, all parked at the Headquarters in Chek Lap Kok. At present, stand-by helicopters and fixed-wing aircraft were kept in the hangar at GFS's Headquarters in Chek Lap Kok, which also served as the maintenance ground. Upon completion of KTD, GFS would redeploy two helicopters from its Headquarters to KTD. The one parked on the parking pad would be mission-ready while the other would be kept in the hangar for stand-by use. In future, GFS might dispatch helicopters from its Headquarters in Chek Lap Kok or from KTD depending on the mission locations.

65. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen was concerned about the impact on the manpower of GFS after the completion of KTD, including the number of staff who would be stationed at KTD and whether it was necessary to recruit more staff.

66. CP(O)/GFS responded that GFS had recruited additional staff in recent years to cope with the workload. To meet the operational needs of KTD, GFS would deploy manpower from the Headquarters in Chek Lap Kok to KTD. There were plans to recruit even more suitable aircrew and engineering professionals and provide them with the necessary training.

Impact of the operation of Government Flying Service Kai Tak Division on the neighbourhood and park users

67. Mr Vincent CHENG was concerned about the daily number of take-offs/landings of GFS helicopters on mission at KTD; whether their flight route would cover the urban areas; and whether the noise generated from helicopter take-offs/landings and operation would affect the neighbourhood.

68. CP(O)/GFS said that as KTD was located on the waterfront at the tip of Ex-KTR, the flight route of helicopters was mainly above the sea and had some distance from the developments in Kowloon East. Moreover, the record of emergency call-outs in the past five years showed that the daily average number of call-outs of GFS helicopters was eight, which translated into 16 take-offs/landings per day. Given that helicopters took only a few minutes to complete the take-off or landing and KTD was more than one kilometre away from the nearest existing noise-sensitive receiver (i.e. Laguna City in Kwun Tong), the noise generated from helicopter take-offs/landings and operation would not cause any significant impact on the residents.

69. Mr AU Nok-hin opined that the EIA conducted by the Government for the proposed works should not only cover the noise impact of the operation of GFS's helicopters on noise-sensitive receivers (i.e. dwellings, hospitals, etc.), but also other parties such as users of the parks near the proposed site and passengers using the Cruise Terminal. Mr AU also enquired whether the flight route of helicopters would overlap with the sailing route of cruise ships, and whether the Government would introduce noise mitigation measures such as retrofitting acoustic glass panels at the Rooftop Park of Kai Tak Cruise Terminal.

70. Mr Tony TSE was concerned whether users of the Kai Tak Runway Park nearby would be exposed to the effect of noise if too many commercial

helicopters used the planned commercial cross-boundary heliport for taking-off/landing in future.

71. H(SLO)/CEDD replied that the Government had carried out a Preliminary Environmental Review under the technical feasibility study to assess the effect of helicopter noise on noise-sensitive receivers. The findings showed that the noise-sensitive receivers were generally exposed to helicopter noise at 75 to 77 dB(A), which was lower than the standards provided under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines. The Government would also provide downwash walls within the proposed site to mitigate the effect of the helicopter noise on the nearby Kai Tak Runway Park. The relevant departments had explored the proposal of providing acoustic glass panels at the Rooftop Park of Kai Tak Cruise Terminal and concluded that it would have landscape implications.

72. H(SLO)/CEDD pointed out that GFS helicopters could modify its flight route with reference to the berthing/setting sail of cruise ships so as to keep a distance from them.

73. Ms Claudia MO enquired how the projection that the noise-sensitive receivers would be exposed to helicopter noise at a maximum level of 75 to 77 dB(A) was worked out. H(SLO)/CEDD explained that the figures referred to the estimated noise level to which the noise sensitive receiver which was the closest yet still more than one kilometre away from KTD of GFS (i.e. Laguna City in Kwun Tong) would be exposed.

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

75. 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.

76. The meeting ended at 11:20 am.