

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. PWSC270/17-18

(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/F/2/1(26)B

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

**Minutes of the 26th meeting
held in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex
on Saturday, 26 May 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 Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, GBS, JP

Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, SBS, JP

Hon CHAN Hak-kan, BBS, JP

Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP

Hon Claudia MO

Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, SBS, JP

Hon WU Chi-wai, MH

Hon YIU Si-wing, BBS

Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP

Hon CHAN Chi-chuen

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

Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan

Hon Alvin YEUNG

Hon Andrew WAN Siu-kin
Hon CHU Hoi-dick
Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP
Hon HO Kai-ming
Hon LAM Cheuk-ting
Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding
Hon Wilson OR Chong-shing, MH
Hon Tanya CHAN
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, JP
Hon LUK Chung-hung
Dr Hon CHENG Chung-tai
Hon KWONG Chun-yu
Hon Jeremy TAM Man-ho
Hon Gary FAN Kwok-wai
Hon Vincent CHENG Wing-shun, MH
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS

Members absent:

Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP
Hon CHAN Han-pan, JP
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
Hon HUI Chi-fung
Hon LAU Kwok-fan, MH
Hon AU Nok-hin

Public officers attending:

Mr Raistlin LAU Chun, JP	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) ³
Mr HON Chi-keung, JP	Permanent Secretary for Development (Works)
Ms Bernadette LINN, JP	Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)

Mr Elvis AU Wai-kwong, JP	Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1)
Ms Margaret HSIA Mai-chi	Principal Assistant Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) (Works)
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 Daniel CHUNG Kum-wah, JP	Director of Highways
Mr Kelvin LO Kwok-wah, JP	Project Manager (Major Works) Highways Department
Mr CHU Shun-wah	Principal Project Coordinator (Pedestrian Hillside Link) Highways Department
Mr Patrick HO Kwong-hang	Chief Traffic Engineer (New Territories West) Transport Department
Mr Sonny AU Chi-kwong, PDSM, PMSM, JP	Under Secretary for Security
Mr Percy LEUNG Siu-to	Principal Assistant Secretary for Security A (Acting)
Ms Winnie HO Wing-yin, JP	Deputy Director of Architectural Services
Mr David CHAK Wing-pong	Project Director (2) Architectural Services Department
Mr WONG Chi-lok	Senior Project Manager 231 Architectural Services Department
Mr NGAN Hing-cheung	Assistant Commissioner (Administration and Human Resource Development) Customs and Excise Department

Mr Simon LEE Chi-ming	Staff Officer (Staff Relations) Customs and Excise Department
Mr Tom YIP Chi-kwai	District Planning Officer (Kowloon) Planning Department
Ms Donna TAM Yin-ping	District Planning Officer (Sai Kung and Islands) Planning Department

Clerk in attendance:

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

Staff in attendance:

Mr Raymond CHOW	Senior Council Secretary (1)6
Ms Mandy LI	Council Secretary (1)2
Ms May LEUNG	Legislative Assistant (1)3
Ms Christy YAU	Legislative Assistant (1)7
Ms Clara LO	Legislative Assistant (1)8

Action

The Chairman advised that there were seven funding proposals on the agenda for the meeting. The first to third proposals were items carried over from the previous meeting, while the fourth to seventh proposals were new submissions from the Administration. 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.

2. Mr Abraham SHEK declared that he was an independent non-executive director of MTR Corporation Limited.

Head 706 – Highways

PWSC(2018-19)21	178TB	Lift and Pedestrian Walkway System between Castle Peak Road and Kung Yip Street, Kwai Chung
	182TB	Elevated Pedestrian Corridor in Yuen Long Town connecting with Long Ping Station

3. The Chairman advised that the proposal, i.e. PWSC(2018-19)21, sought to upgrade 178TB and 182TB to Category A at the estimated costs of \$584.4 million and \$1,708.5 million in money-of-the-day ("MOD") prices respectively. The Subcommittee had commenced deliberation on the proposal at the meeting on 23 May 2018.

Elevated pedestrian corridor in Yuen Long Town connecting with Long Ping Station

Alignment design and pedestrian flow analysis

4. Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Mr Gary FAN and Dr Fernando CHEUNG noted that according to page 9 of the extract of the report of Improvements to Pedestrian Environment in Yuen Long Town – Feasibility Study completed in 2014 ("the 2014 Feasibility Study") (English version) provided by the Administration vide the supplementary information paper (Annex 2 to [LC Paper No. PWSC223/17-18\(01\)](#)), the Development Bureau considered at the time that the proposed elevated pedestrian corridor should terminate at Castle Peak Road – Yuen Long. They enquired about the justifications for extending the elevated pedestrian corridor to Kau Yuk Road as currently proposed by the Administration. Mr CHU opined that the Administration should adhere to the 2014 proposal and shorten the proposed elevated pedestrian corridor, so as to reduce the construction cost.

5. Deputy Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport)1 ("DS(T)1/THB") and Project Manager (Major Works), Highways Department ("PM(MW)/HyD"), explained that the major objective of the 2014 Feasibility Study was to identify feasible options for commencing the next stage of investigation studies and design work of the proposed elevated pedestrian corridor. Subsequently, the Administration conducted another pedestrian flow analysis in 2015 for the proposed elevated pedestrian corridor and the at-grade footpaths and road crossing facilities in the vicinity. The relevant data of the analysis were set out at Annex 1 to the supplementary information paper ([LC Paper No. PWSC223/17-18\(01\)](#)) (Chinese version). As there were discrepancies between the contents of the report of the Feasibility Study (including the alignment, pedestrian connectivity platforms, structure and

foundation options of the proposed elevated pedestrian corridor) and the current proposal, and the rough estimates worked out previously were no longer applicable, it was not advisable to make reference to such information to avoid misunderstanding.

6. Dr Fernando CHEUNG referred to the submission from Green Power, a green group, which questioned the effectiveness of the proposed project in easing the congestion on the at-grade footpaths in the district. As the Administration had conducted another pedestrian flow analysis for the proposed elevated pedestrian corridor and the nearby at-grade footpaths and road crossing facilities in 2015, he enquired whether it was necessary for the Administration to re-initiate the relevant statutory procedures and conduct another environmental impact assessment ("EIA") in the light of the updated estimates. Mr Tony TSE also enquired about the estimated pedestrian traffic between Long Ping Station of the West Rail Line and the major streets in the district.

7. Director of Highways ("DHy") said that there might be a time gap between the conduct of the feasibility study of a project and its actual implementation. Generally speaking, after completion of the relevant feasibility study, the Administration would timely update and enhance the project design in the light of the latest conditions, and proceed with the required statutory procedures. PM(MW)/HyD said that the 2014 Feasibility Study had examined the feasibility of a number of pedestrian environment improvement measures for Yuen Long Town, including the proposed elevated pedestrian corridor. The findings indicated that the proposed elevated pedestrian corridor could provide a direct route connecting Long Ping Station of the West Rail Line with the areas around On Ning Road, Castle Peak Road – Yuen Long and Kau Yuk Road in Yuen Long, which would improve local pedestrian circulation in and enhance the accessibility of Yuen Long Town centre. In addition, according to the pedestrian flow analysis conducted in 2015, the proposed elevated pedestrian corridor was expected to achieve effective diversion of the pedestrian flow on the at-grade footpaths and at the road crossing facilities in Yuen Long Town centre in 2027. The section of the proposed elevated pedestrian corridor across Castle Peak Road – Yuen Long was expected to attract about 11 000 pedestrian trips per hour during peak hours by then, which could relieve congestion and improve road safety and pedestrian environment.

8. Mr CHU Hoi-dick and Dr Fernando CHEUNG questioned the accuracy of the pedestrian flow analysis of the major pedestrian facilities at grade in 2027 set out under Table 2a at Annex 1 to [LC Paper No. PWSC223/17-18\(01\)](#) (Chinese version). In response, PM(MW)/HyD said that the delays and revisions in the implementation schedules of some

development projects in the district and the successive completion of a number of small-to-medium-scale pedestrian environment improvement measures would be conducive to improving the pedestrian circulation on the major roads of the district and hence, changes were made to the estimated pedestrian traffic for the major pedestrian facilities at grade in 2027. At the request of Mr CHU Hoi-dick and Dr Fernando CHEUNG, the Administration should provide the following information after the meeting: (a) the information that had been redacted from pages 9 and 10 of the 2014 Feasibility Study; and (b) regarding the analysis made in 2015 on the pedestrian flow at major pedestrian facilities at grade in 2027 set out under Table 2a at Annex 1 to the supplementary information paper, the reason for the substantial decrease in the estimated maximum pedestrian flow (i.e. 6 620 pedestrian trips per hour) at location C1 (i.e. across Castle Peak Road – Yuen Long near Yuen Long Hong Lok Road) in the absence of the proposed elevated pedestrian corridor as compared with the corresponding estimated figure in 2026 under the 2014 Feasibility Study (i.e. 9 600 pedestrian trips per hour), including an explanation on how the pedestrian traffic forecast was affected by factors such as changes in development planning and the road improvement works concerned.

(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. PWSC258/17-18(01) (Chinese version) on 22 June 2018.)

9. Mr CHU Hoi-dick noted that according to the drawings and photomontages provided at the appendices of the 2014 Feasibility Study, the proposed elevated pedestrian corridor adopted a streamlined design from the outset. He enquired why it had been replaced by a straight-line design under the current proposal.

10. Ms Alice MAK said that residents were looking forward to the implementation of the project and requested the Administration to consider extending the elevated pedestrian corridor to Ma Tong Road. She further enquired about the extent of delay in project commencement should the alignment design of the proposed elevated pedestrian corridor be amended. Mr Tony TSE was disappointed with the slow progress made in taking forward the proposed project.

11. PM(MW)/HyD replied that initially, a streamlined design was chosen for the proposed elevated pedestrian corridor for aesthetic reasons. However, in view of the residents' strong aspiration for a direct pedestrian route between Long Ping Station and Kau Yuk Road, the Administration revised the design of the elevated pedestrian corridor and turned it into a straight line. DHy said that should there be any major amendments, the

Government would have to re-initiate certain statutory procedures, including re-gazettal of the relevant amendments under the Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance (Cap. 370), which would delay the construction of the elevated pedestrian corridor by at least three years.

Project cost

12. Mr KWONG Chun-yu enquired how the Administration worked out the estimated cost of the proposed project. Ms Alice MAK opined that the proposed project was costly. Dr Fernando CHEUNG questioned the cost-effectiveness of the proposed elevated pedestrian corridor and urged the Administration to bring down the construction cost of the proposed project.

13. DS(T)1/THB replied that the Administration had explained in [LC Paper No. PWSC223/17-18\(01\)](#) (Chinese version) that the proposed elevated pedestrian corridor was about ten times longer and 1.5 times wider than ordinary footbridges, and was subject to more unique constraints and challenges than footbridge projects in general. For instance, the foundation of the proposed elevated pedestrian corridor would be located in an area with varied geological conditions, and cavities were found in some rocks. Some rock strata lay more than 20 to 100 metres deep underground. As such, the piles of the proposed elevated pedestrian corridor needed to be founded at 55 metres deep underground on average and up to nearly 100 metres the deepest. Furthermore, the construction period of the project was long because foundation works taken place in the nullah could only be carried out during dry seasons, which drove up the cost estimate correspondingly. That said, efforts had been made in terms of design to minimize the weight of the elevated pedestrian corridor. The design was also endorsed by stakeholders.

14. Mr LUK Chung-hung said that he supported the proposed project. He requested the Administration to provide the location of the cavities in the vicinity of Yuen Long Town Nullah, and advise whether the cost of foundation works could be reduced by pursuing alternative options (e.g. adjusting the alignment of the proposed elevated pedestrian corridor to avoid the underground cavities, and using innovative pile founding techniques).

15. DHy replied that the distribution of cavities within the project scope of the proposed elevated pedestrian corridor as revealed by ground investigation was shown in the supplementary information paper provided by the Administration (Annex 3 to [LC Paper No. PWSC223/17-18\(01\)](#)). In summary, cavities were discovered at 21 ground investigation boreholes out of the total of 36 within the project scope. He said that as the underground cavities covered a large area, it was technically unfeasible to install piles at locations far from these cavities.

16. Mr Tony TSE noticed that according to the layout plan of the proposed project provided at Annex 1 to Enclosure 2 to the discussion paper ([PWSC\(2018-19\)21](#)), the proposed elevated pedestrian corridor would have six large pedestrian connectivity platforms. He requested the Administration to provide details of the construction cost of those pedestrian connectivity platforms, including whether the foundation cost was included, and whether the construction cost would escalate due to a host of factors. He also enquired whether the project cost estimate of \$1,708.5 million was worked out by the company which carried out the design work, and whether the Administration had appointed an independent consultant to evaluate the project cost estimate and explore ways to reduce the project cost. Mr LEUNG Che-cheung also enquired about the height of the piers to support the six pedestrian connectivity platforms, and whether the proposed elevated pedestrian corridor was pedestrian (in particular the elderly) friendly in terms of gradient and provision of escalators, etc. He also enquired whether the Administration would carry out beautification works for the footpaths on both sides of Yuen Long Town Nullah concurrently under the proposed project.

17. DHy said that the cost estimate of \$126.9 million set out under paragraph 5(a)(ii) of Enclosure 2 to PWSC(2018-19)21 was the cost of building the structure of the pedestrian connectivity platforms. Each of the pedestrian connectivity platforms would be fitted with a lift, two-way escalators and staircases to provide connection between the elevated pedestrian corridor and the at-grade footpaths. In general, the existing at-grade footpaths straddling the nullah (i.e. lying alongside the vehicular lanes) would be widened upon completion of the proposed elevated pedestrian corridor. This would effectively facilitate pedestrian circulation on the at-grade footpaths and ease the competition between pedestrians and vehicles for road space. He further pointed out that the proposed elevated pedestrian corridor, spanning about 540 metres from Long Ping Station of the West Rail Line to the south of Kau Yuk Road, was approximately 6.5 to 10 metres in height, among which the section connecting with Exit D of Long Ping Station was about 10 metres above the ground. While the bridge height at different sections varied by up to 3.5 metres, the deck gradient would meet the relevant standards.

18. Regarding the project cost estimate, DHy said that in addition to being scrutinized by an internal independent committee under the Highways Department ("HyD"), the cost estimate of the proposed project was also examined by the Project Cost Management Office ("PCMO") established under the Development Bureau. Permanent Secretary for Development (Works) ("PS(W)/DEVB") supplemented that since its establishment in 2016,

PCMO had closely scrutinized the cost estimates of major works projects in the planning and design stages. PCMO had scrutinized the cost and requirements of the proposed project to ensure its cost-effectiveness.

19. Mr Tony TSE further requested the Administration to provide a report on PCMO's scrutiny of the cost of the proposed project. The Chairman and Mr Alvin YEUNG requested the Administration to provide supplementary information on the mechanism adopted by PCMO to scrutinize the costs of public works projects, and the ways to ensure the proper and effective use of public money. Mr YEUNG opined that the Administration should make an effort to provide members with information on the cost assessment of the proposed project as far as possible.

20. PS(W)/DEVB said that since the tender exercise for the proposed project had not yet commenced, the project cost involved sensitive information. Disclosure of such information prior to the tender exercise would seriously prejudice the tender price and public interest. Notwithstanding this, he undertook to explore with HyD after the meeting how information could be provided at members' request as far as practicable while not compromising public interest.

(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. PWSC258/17-18(01) (Chinese version) on 22 June 2018.)

21. Mr Jeremy TAM enquired whether the Administration had briefed the Yuen Long District Council ("DC") that the estimated cost of the proposed project was only around \$200 million in order to secure its support. DS(T)1/THB replied in the negative. Mr LEUNG Che-cheung also said that Yuen Long DC had never been informed that the project cost was \$200 million.

22. Referring to paragraph 9 of Enclosure 2 to [PWSC\(2018-19\)21](#), Mr CHAN Chi-chuen said that the Administration would deliver the works under the New Engineering Contract ("NEC") form with provision for price adjustment in the contract. He enquired whether all contracts for works projects were awarded under the NEC form; whether the provision for price adjustment was meant to deal with project cost overruns; how NEC could facilitate cooperation, mutual trust and collaborative risk management between contracting parties; and how NEC was different from the conventional contract form as far as compensation claims were concerned.

23. The Chairman advised that quite a number of public works projects had been awarded in the NEC form in the past. DHy replied that currently,

most government works projects were delivered under the NEC form unless there were special reasons to use other forms (e.g. the conventional form). As evident from past experience, the contract terms in the NEC form encouraged both parties to deal with unforeseeable circumstances in a cooperative manner, which was conducive to working out a timely solution to the problems. The contract terms under the NEC form prescribed a timeframe so that problems could be resolved earlier. The provision for price adjustment under the works contract mainly allowed for adjustment arising from inflationary factors.

24. Mr WU Chi-wai requested the Administration to explain how the respective construction costs of the foundation works within Yuen Long Town Nullah being carried out throughout the year and only during dry seasons would differ. He also enquired how the Administration managed the cost and progress of the proposed project, such as whether the contractor would remove the machineries from the nullah and carry out other construction works concurrently during wet seasons.

25. DHy replied that according to a rough estimation, the project cost could be reduced by about one-fourth should foundation works need not be suspended during wet seasons. The Administration anticipated that the foundation works within the nullah area would take about three years to complete. It was inevitable for the foundation works within the nullah area to take a longer time to complete as the works could only be carried out during dry seasons. That said, the contractor must set out in its tender the arrangements and procedures, etc. for the construction works, including the removal of all machineries from the nullah at the end of dry seasons after works had been done, and the continuation of the construction works outside the nullah area as prescribed under the contract during wet seasons.

Implications on Yuen Long Town Nullah and the environment

26. Dr CHENG Chung-tai noted that the effluent of the nullah was discharged to the wetland park in Mai Po, which was a site of special scientific interest. He was concerned how the Administration would monitor and ensure that the effluent of the nullah would not affect the Mai Po Marshes during construction; and whether the Environmental Protection Department and green groups had submitted their views on the EIA report for the project.

27. Mr KWONG Chun-yu said that the Yuen Long Town Nullah was often flooded during wet seasons. He enquired how the Administration would minimize the impact of the proposed project on the drainage of the nullah. Ms Alice MAK said that local residents were concerned whether the

Administration would carry out beautification works for the nullah by drawing reference from the example of the Cheonggyecheon in Seoul.

28. Mr Jeremy TAM noticed that according to the submission from Green Power, the EIA report mentioned that the proposed elevated pedestrian corridor might render Yuen Long Town Nullah unable to withstand 50-year and 200-year floods and pose river flooding risks. In this connection, he requested the Administration to confirm whether the EIA report contained the above assessment; if so, why the Administration considered it appropriate to pursue the proposed project.

29. In response to members' concerns and enquiries raised above, DHy said that the proposed project was a designated project under Schedule 2 of the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (Cap 499), and an Environmental Permit ("EP") was required for the construction and operation of the project. The Administration had conducted an EIA for the proposed project. The EIA report was approved by the Director of Environmental Protection and an EP was issued.

30. On mitigating the impact of the proposed project on Yuen Long Town Nullah, DHy and PM(MW)/HyD said that all foundation works (e.g. piles and pile caps of the elevated pedestrian corridor) within the nullah area would be carried out only in dry seasons. During construction, HyD would install temporary cofferdams to minimize the impact on the water quality. The Administration had also conducted a drainage impact assessment ("DIA") for the proposed project, and the findings revealed that the drainage system of Yuen Long Town Nullah could withstand 200-year floods by design. PS(W)/DEVB added that the Drainage Services Department ("DSD") and HyD had maintained close liaison regarding the proposed project and would monitor vigorously the implementation of the mitigation measures proposed in the DIA.

31. The Chairman said that the proposed project was brought up during a conversation he had with the Director of Drainage Services ("DDS") on an informal occasion. He relayed the remarks of DDS that effective communication would be maintained between DSD and HyD on the project. DDS believed that the proposed project would not have any adverse impact on the drainage capacity of Yuen Long Town Nullah. As regards members' concern about the beautification and enhancement works for the nullah, the Chairman suggested that the Administration might consider submitting the relevant agenda item to the Panel on Development for discussion. PS(W)/DEVB took note of the Chairman's comments.

32. Mr KWONG Chun-yu and Mr LEUNG Che-cheung were concerned about the impact of the proposed elevated pedestrian corridor on residents and pedestrians upon its completion. DHy replied that the proposed elevated pedestrian corridor was about 15 metres away from the buildings in the neighbourhood so that its impact on the public would be minimized.

33. Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Mr Alvin YEUNG and Mr Jeremy TAM were concerned about the impact of the proposed elevated pedestrian corridor on the ventilation in the district. Mr TAM enquired whether the EIA had addressed the concern of the Hong Kong Institute of Architects ("HKIA") about ventilation being blocked by the proposed elevated pedestrian corridor. Dr Fernando CHEUNG referred to the submission from Green Power, which stated that the average temperature recorded in Yuen Long Town centre was high, while the temperature near the nullah was lower. The green group was concerned that the elevated pedestrian corridor would render the nullah area less ventilated and hence exacerbate the heat island effect. Dr CHEUNG enquired whether the Administration had considered the above adverse impacts when designing the elevated pedestrian corridor, and whether EIA studies had been conducted in this aspect.

34. DHy explained that HyD had appointed a consultant to conduct an air ventilation study for the proposed project and make an analysis with three-dimensional data. He said that the elevated pedestrian corridor was about 6.5 to 10 metres above the footpaths on both sides of the nullah and would not overshadow the nullah entirely. Coupled with the fact that the buildings on both sides of the nullah were about 40 metres apart, effective ventilation could be maintained. Besides, the light-weight and permeable design of the proposed elevated corridor of about 6-metre clear width facilitated ventilation. As such, the neighbouring buildings would not be subject to adverse effects.

35. Mr Tony TSE enquired about the size and number of piers to support the proposed elevated pedestrian corridor. At the request of the Chairman and Mr TSE, the Administration would provide after the meeting a design plan of the proposed project indicating the size and number of piers, and more artistic impressions showing the external appearance of the elevated pedestrian corridor and its piers in addition to the one provided at Annex 1 to Enclosure 2 to [PWSC\(2018-19\)21](#).

(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. PWSC258/17-18(01) (Chinese version) on 22 June 2018.)

Comments of professional institutes

36. Mr Alice MAK noted that according to the discussion paper, "[t]he professional institutes' representatives expressed that they would respect the final decision of T&TC of Yuen Long DC" and the professional institutes accepted the original scheme for the elevated pedestrian corridor proposed by HyD. She then enquired about the communication process between the Administration and the professional institutes in respect of the design of the proposed elevated pedestrian corridor.

37. DS(T)1/THB said that during the public engagement exercise in 2013, some local professional institutes, i.e. HKIA, the Hong Kong Institute of Planners, the Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design and the Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects, had proposed to widen the footpaths along both sides of Yuen Long Town Nullah as an alternative to some sections of the elevated pedestrian corridor. HyD and the professional institutes' representatives consulted T&TC of Yuen Long DC on 24 July 2014 on both the alternative and the original schemes. After detailed deliberation, T&TC of Yuen Long DC supported the original scheme for the proposed elevated pedestrian corridor. The reference to "[t]he Professional Institutes' representatives expressed that they would respect the final decision of the T&TC of Yuen Long DC" in the discussion paper was an extract from the minutes of the relevant meeting.

38. DHy said that the professional institutes expressed concerns mainly over such aspects as the ventilation and landscape and visual impacts of the project. HyD would implement the environmental mitigation measures and the environmental monitoring and audit programme recommended in the EIA report. Moreover, HyD had consulted the Advisory Committee on the Appearance of Bridges and Associated Structures ("ACABAS") on the proposed aesthetic design of the elevated pedestrian corridor under the proposed project. ACABAS comprised representatives of HKIA, the Hong Kong Institution of Engineers, the Hong Kong Institute of Planners, etc. ACABAS accepted the proposed aesthetic design of the proposed elevated pedestrian corridor.

39. Mr Tony TSE pointed out that when consulting ACABAS on the proposed elevated pedestrian corridor, the Administration only sought ACABAS's view on whether the proposed aesthetic design was acceptable, without putting forward any alternative proposals for its consideration.

40. Mr Jeremy TAM referred to some media reports that HKIA boycotted the consultation activities on the elevated pedestrian corridor in 2015. He

enquired whether the Administration had consulted HKIA on the proposed project again ever since.

41. DS(T)1/THB replied that the Administration gazetted the road scheme for the proposed works of the project under the Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance (Cap. 370) on 28 October and 4 November 2016. No objection was received during the statutory period and the project was hence authorized. Notwithstanding this, Mr Jeremy TAM opined that the Administration should have taken the initiative to consult the relevant stakeholders (including HKIA) on the final proposal of the project.

42. Mr CHU Hoi-dick noted that in the 2014 Feasibility Study, it was estimated that that should Option C (i.e. construction of three discrete footbridges across Yuen Long Hong Lok Road, Castle Peak – Yuen Long and Kau Yuk Road respectively) be adopted, the peak pedestrian flow on the footbridge across Castle Peak – Yuen Long would be 4 400 pedestrian trips per hour in 2026. This figure was lower than the forecast peak pedestrian flow of 6 700 pedestrian trips per hour under the professional institutes' alternative scheme. He enquired about the reasons for that.

43. In response, PM(MW)/HyD said that the alternative scheme comprised construction of a footbridge (about 180 metres long) connecting Long Ping Station of the West Rail Line with the south of Yuen Long On Ning Road; construction of a footbridge (about 90 metres long) across Castle Peak Road – Yuen Long; and widening of the at-grade footpaths along both sides of Yuen Long Town Nullah between Yuen Long On Ning Road and Kau Yuk Road (with a total length of about 650 metres). As longer footbridges could draw more users, the footbridge across Castle Peak Road – Yuen Long under the alternative scheme was expected to be used by more pedestrians than the one proposed under the option of building three discrete footbridges.

44. At the request of Mr CHU Hoi-dick, the Administration should provide a pedestrian traffic forecast under the alternative scheme of the elevated pedestrian corridor developed based on the proposal of the four professional institutes (i.e. HKIA, the Hong Kong Institute of Planners, the Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design and the Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects).

(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. PWSC258/17-18(01) (Chinese version) on 22 June 2018.)

[At 10:47 am, the Chairman said that he would allow members who were waiting for their turns to speak to do so, after which he would end the "question time" and proceed to deal with the motions proposed by members under paragraph 32A of the Public Works Subcommittee Procedure ("32A motions").]

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

45. At 10:53 am, the Chairman said that he had received one motion proposed by Mr CHU Hoi-dick under paragraph 32A of the Public Works Subcommittee Procedure. He said that the proposed motion was directly related to the agenda item.

46. The Chairman put to vote the question that the proposed motion be proceeded forthwith. At the request of members, the Chairman ordered a division and the division bell was rung for five minutes. The question was negatived.

Voting on PWSC(2018-19)21

178TB – Lift and pedestrian walkway system between Castle Peak Road and Kung Yip Street, Kwai Chung

47. There being no further 32A motions or questions from members on the item, the Chairman then put PWSC(2018-19)21 to vote. At the request of Mr CHU Hoi-dick, the Chairman ordered that the two proposed projects under the item be voted on separately. The Chairman first put 178TB to vote. The project was voted on and endorsed.

182TB – Elevated pedestrian corridor in Yuen Long Town connecting with Long Ping Station

48. The Chairman then put 182TB to vote. At the request of members, the Chairman ordered a division. Sixteen members voted for and thirteen members voted against the proposal. One member abstained from voting. The votes of individual members were as follows:

For:

Mr Abraham SHEK
Ms Starry LEE
Mr Paul TSE
Mr YIU Si-wing

Mr Tommy CHEUNG
Mr CHAN Hak-kan
Mr Frankie YICK
Mr MA Fung-kwok

Mr LEUNG Che-cheung
Mr Christopher CHEUNG
Mr Holden CHOW
Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan
(16 members)

Ms Alice MAK
Mr HO Kai-ming
Mr Wilson OR
Mr LUK Chung-hung

Against:

Mr Charles Peter MOK (Deputy Chairman)
Mr CHAN Chi-chuen
Mr Alvin YEUNG
Mr CHU Hoi-dick
Ms Tanya CHAN
Mr KWONG Chun-yu
Mr Gary FAN
(13 members)

Ms Claudia MO
Dr Fernando CHEUNG
Mr Andrew WAN
Mr LAM Cheuk-ting
Dr CHENG Chung-tai
Mr Jeremy TAM

Abstain:

Mr Tony TSE
(1 member)

49. The Chairman declared that the project was endorsed by the Subcommittee. Mr CHU Hoi-dick requested that 182TB be voted on separately at the relevant meeting of the Finance Committee ("FC").

Head 703 – Buildings

PWSC(2018-19)20

- 67JA Construction of Departmental Quarters for Customs and Excise Department at Tseung Kwan O Area 123 (Po Lam Road)**
- 68JA Construction of Departmental Quarters for Customs and Excise Department at No. 57 Sheung Fung Street, Tsz Wan Shan**

50. The Chairman advised that the proposal, i.e. PWSC(2018-19)20, sought to upgrade 67JA and 68JA to Category A. The estimated cost of 67JA was \$1,035.2 million in MOD prices for construction of departmental quarters ("DQs") for the Customs and Excise Department ("C&ED") at Tseung Kwan O Area 123 (Po Lam Road) ("the proposed DQs in TKO"); while the estimated cost of 68JA was \$533.1 million in MOD prices for construction of DQs for C&ED at No. 57 Sheung Fung Street, Tsz Wan Shan ("the proposed DQs in TWS"). The Administration consulted the Panel on Security on the two projects on 13 April 2018. Panel members had no

objection in principle to the submission of the two funding proposals to the Subcommittee for consideration. A report on the gist of the Panel's discussion on the two projects was tabled at the meeting.

Supply of departmental quarters and allocation criteria of departmental quarters units

51. Mr Wilson OR said that he supported the two proposed DQs projects. In view of the pressing demand of disciplined services staff for DQs, Mr OR enquired about the other DQs development plans the Administration had in place for disciplined services staff in the next five years. Dr Helena WONG also said that members belonging to the Democratic Party supported the two proposed DQs projects. She raised a similar question on the Administration's development plans of new DQs for the rank and file ("R&F") officers of C&ED.

52. Under Secretary for Security ("US for S") replied that the current shortfall rate of DQs for C&ED was 33% and the average waiting time was 6.2 years. Upon completion of the two proposed DQs projects, the shortfall rate of DQs for C&ED would be brought down to 10%. However, the demand for DQs would remain high as C&ED would continue to recruit more manpower to cope with the commissioning of many new control points in Hong Kong. The Security Bureau would continue to work with other government departments to identify suitable sites for construction of new DQs.

53. Dr Helena WONG enquired, apart from married R&F officers, whether C&ED officers of other marital statuses (e.g. single, cohabiting, divorced and widowed) could be allocated DQs units. Dr WONG pointed out that while certain existing government policies were not subject to the provisions of the Sex Discrimination Ordinance (Cap. 480) ("SDO"), she was concerned whether it was necessary for the Administration to examine if the exclusion of officers of other marital statuses from the allocation of DQs units might amount to marital status discrimination and conduct a review accordingly. She also enquired whether the Administration would provide other forms of housing allowance for officers of other marital statuses.

54. US for S responded that it was the current policy of the Government to provide DQs for married disciplined services staff subject to the availability of resources, especially for those having children and hence in more urgent need of accommodation. This would not amount to marital status discrimination under SDO.

55. Dr Helena WONG requested the Administration to provide supplementary information on the current marital status profile of R&F officers of C&ED, their demand for DQs, and the number of officers among them who were not eligible for DQs.

(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC238/17-18\(01\)](#) on 6 June 2018.)

Parking places provided at the proposed departmental quarters

Number of parking places

56. Mr Holden CHOW said that he supported the two proposed DQs projects. He pointed out that during its deliberation on the funding proposals for other DQs projects previously, members of the Subcommittee had repeatedly urged the Administration to review the planning standards on parking space provision under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines ("HKPSG"), so as to increase the supply of parking spaces at DQs. In this connection, Mr CHOW enquired whether the Administration would consider breaking away from the restrictions under the current HKPSG by providing more parking places under the proposed DQs projects for use by the residents concerned.

57. US for S and District Planning Officer (Kowloon), Planning Department ("DPO(K)/PD"), explained that the number of parking spaces provided at the proposed DQs in TKO and TWS had reached the upper limit stipulated under HKPSG. Besides, the Transport and Housing Bureau and the Transport Department reviewed from time to time the planning standards under HKPSG on the provision of parking spaces. The Planning Department would amend the standards in the light of the review findings.

58. The Chairman said that members of the Subcommittee had demanded the Administration to provide more parking places under a number of government building projects when considering the relevant funding proposals recently. However, the Administration was still unable to provide a satisfactory reply to address members' demands. The Chairman urged the Administration to complete the review on the planning standards on parking space provision under HKPSG as soon as possible. Mr Frankie YICK concurred with the Chairman. Mr Wilson OR was also dissatisfied that the Administration had failed to provide details on the progress of the HKPSG review.

59. Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands) ("PS(P&L)/DEVB") reiterated that the Transport and Housing Bureau and the Transport Department were conducting a review on the planning standards on parking space provision under HKPSG. She undertook that members' concerns would be relayed to relevant departments to facilitate the early completion of the review and the findings would be reported to the relevant Panels.

60. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen enquired whether HKPSG required that the number of parking spaces provided at DQs for disciplined services staff should be adjusted according to the distance between the DQs and public transport (e.g. MTR stations); how the Administration determined the numbers of parking spaces for private cars and motorcycles at the relevant DQs; and whether the proportion of parking spaces for private cars and motorcycles could be adjusted flexibly in the light of the actual needs of residents.

61. Mr Jeremy TAM was also concerned about the lack of parking spaces (especially motorcycle parking spaces) at DQs for disciplined services staff. A case in point was the proposed DQs in TWS, which provided only two motorcycle parking spaces despite the provision of 175 DQs units.

62. US for S explained that under HKPSG, one private car parking space should be provided for every six to nine flats in private housing development. Moreover, the number of parking spaces provided under a development project was subject to adjustment in the light of its proximity to MTR stations, development intensity and flat sizes. The Administration determined the number of parking spaces to be provided for residents of the proposed DQs in TKO based on the maximum number allowed under HKPSG (i.e. one car parking space for every six flats). DPO(K)/PD supplemented that as prescribed under HKPSG, a certain proportion of parking spaces should be provided for motorcycles in housing development projects. Parking spaces for private cars and motorcycles were generally not interchangeable because their space requirements were different and, in particular, motorcycle parking spaces were smaller.

63. Mr Gary FAN pointed out that residents of the proposed DQs in TKO had a strong demand for parking spaces because the DQs were far away from MTR stations. Mr FAN also said that at the meeting of the Panel on Security, he had suggested converting a vacant government site on Lam Shing Road near the proposed DQs for car park development. Mr FAN enquired about the Administration's follow-up actions on his suggestion, including whether public consultation had commenced and whether the car

park, if built, could be completed timely to tie in with the completion of the proposed DQs in TKO.

64. US for S and District Planning Officer (Sai Kung and Islands), Planning Department, said that the relevant government departments had visited the site mentioned by Mr FAN, which was zoned for "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") use, with members of the local DC. The site was presently covered by vegetation and was not served by a vehicular road. As such, relevant government departments had to examine whether it was technically feasible to convert the site for car park development. Local consultation should also be conducted to allow residents to express their views on whether the site should remain to be covered with vegetation or should be turned into a car park.

65. Mr HO Kai-ming said that he supported the two proposed DQs projects. Mr HO opined that the Administration should consider adopting the development model of "optimizing land use" and "single site, multiple use" when planning other DQs for disciplined services staff in future by providing public car parks within the DQs to benefit both the DQs occupants and nearby residents. US for S thanked Mr HO for his suggestion and support for the DQs projects.

66. Mr Frankie YICK enquired whether C&ED had compiled statistics on the proportion of R&F officers currently living in DQs who owned private cars or motorcycles. Mr YICK was also concerned that as the officers were required to carry out emergency operations at various locations in Hong Kong whenever a need arose, the lack of parking spaces at the DQs they resided in might affect their work.

67. US for S and Assistant Commissioner (Administration and Human Resource Development), C&ED ("AC/C&ED"), replied that C&ED had not compiled statistics on the proportion of existing DQs households which owned private cars or motorcycles. Besides, as most of the R&F officers of C&ED who would move into the proposed DQs were required to work shifts at boundary control points, C&ED would, subject to availability of resources, arrange feeder transport for these officers at various transport interchanges in Hong Kong to carry them to and from their places of work. Officers living in DQs might commute to and from their places of work by public transport which was available at both the start and end times of their shifts. In the event of emergency situations that called for special operations, C&ED might arrange special vehicles to pick up staff from DQs. AC/C&ED also advised that C&ED had conducted multiple rounds of consultation with the unions of R&F officers on the two proposed DQs projects. The unions were more

concerned about the number of DQs units rather than the number of parking spaces, and they hoped that R&F officers could be allocated DQs early.

Charging facilities for electric vehicles

68. Mr Christopher CHEUNG said that he supported the two proposed DQs projects. Mr CHEUNG and Mr Holden CHOW were concerned about the number of private car parking spaces at the proposed DQs which would be equipped with charging facilities for electric vehicles ("EVs"). Mr CHEUNG also enquired whether the charging facilities provided were slow, medium or quick chargers.

69. In response, US for S and Deputy Director of Architectural Services ("DDArchS"), said that given the safety concern on the use of electricity, EV charging facilities would only be provided at covered parking spaces at the proposed DQs, including five in TKO and two in TWS. Under the current proposal, slow chargers would be provided. Moreover, EV owners who used the chargers were required to pay for the power consumed under the user-pay principle.

70. Mr Jeremy TAM questioned why only slow chargers, not medium or quick chargers, were provided at the proposed DQs; and why the proportion of private car parking spaces equipped with EV charging facilities at the proposed DQs was far lower than the objective set by the Administration on the percentage of EVs or hybrid vehicles in the total number of private cars in Hong Kong in future (i.e. at 30%). Mr TAM enquired whether the Administration would consider building a cover for the open air parking spaces to facilitate the provision of more EV charging facilities.

71. DDArchS said that the Administration would determine whether quicker chargers could be installed by keeping an eye on various factors such as the development of charging technologies, the efficiency of charging facilities and the costs of various types of chargers. Moreover, should the open air parking spaces be provided with a cover, the parking spaces would have to be included in the construction floor area of the proposed DQs and the plot ratio of the site would be affected. As such, most of the parking spaces at the proposed DQs could only be in the open air.

72. Mr Christopher CHEUNG urged the Administration to install more EV charging facilities at the proposed DQs and provide quick chargers instead so as to promote environmental protection. Mr Frankie YICK made similar requests.

73. Mr Jeremy TAM suggested that the Administration, in its review of HKPSG, should consider allowing parking places to be exempted from the calculation of the construction floor area of government buildings in order to provide more parking spaces. The Chairman raised a similar suggestion.

74. PS(P&L)/DEVB undertook to relay members' concerns about EV charging facilities to the Environment Bureau ("ENB") so that ENB could discuss the matter with members of the relevant Panels in future.

Facilities of the proposed departmental quarters

75. Mr Wilson OR enquired about the respective areas of and the facilities provided at the amenity and communal areas of the two proposed DQs projects.

76. DDArchS replied that the Architectural Services Department would calculate the area of the amenity and communal areas provided under the two proposed DQs projects based on the number of DQs units provided and the assumptions that each unit would accommodate three residents and each resident was entitled to one square metre of open space. The two DQs projects would each be provided with a multi-function room of about 18 square metres.

77. Dr Helena WONG suggested that the Administration should consider turning part of the landscaped areas on the ground floors and roofs of the two DQs projects into community gardens for residents to grow edible plants. DDArchS replied that the Administration could make an effort in the design if it was the wish of the DQs residents.

78. As the contents of some questions put forward by members involved broad policy issues relating to the supply of parking spaces and the allocation criteria of DQs units, the Chairman reminded members that such policy issues should be raised at the relevant Panels.

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

79. At 11:55 am, the Chairman said that he had received [one motion](#) (Chinese version) proposed by Mr Gary FAN under paragraph 32A of the Public Works Subcommittee Procedure. The Chairman considered the proposed motion directly related to the agenda item.

80. The Chairman put to vote the question that the proposed motion be proceeded forthwith. The question was voted on and negatived.

Voting on PWSC(2018-19)20

81. There being no further 32A motions or questions from members on the item, the Chairman then put PWSC(2018-19)20 to vote.

82. The item was voted on and endorsed. Mr Gary FAN requested that 67JA (i.e. construction of DQs for C&ED at Tseung Kwan O Area 123 (Po Lam Road)) under this item be voted on separately at the relevant FC meeting.

[At 11:55 am, the Chairman asked members if they agreed to extend the meeting in order to complete the voting on the item. Members present agreed.]

83. The meeting ended at 12:01 pm.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
27 June 2018