

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. PWSC121/18-19
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/F/2/1(5)B

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

**Minutes of the 5th meeting
held in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex
on Wednesday, 28 November 2018, at 8:30 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
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP
Hon Claudia MO
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, SBS, JP
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH
Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen
Hon CHAN Han-pan, BBS, JP
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, SBS, MH, JP
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
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 Holden CHOW Ho-ding
Hon Wilson OR Chong-shing, MH
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, JP
Hon HUI Chi-fung
Hon LUK Chung-hung, JP
Hon LAU Kwok-fan, MH
Dr Hon CHENG Chung-tai
Hon Gary FAN Kwok-wai
Hon AU Nok-hin
Hon Vincent CHENG Wing-shun, MH
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS

Members absent:

Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP
Hon Tanya CHAN
Hon KWONG Chun-yu
Hon Jeremy TAM Man-ho

Public officers attending:

Mr Raistlin LAU Chun, JP	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) ³
Mr LAM Sai-hung, JP	Permanent Secretary for Development (Works)
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)

Mr TSE Chin-wan, BBS, JP	Under Secretary for the Environment
Mrs Vicki KWOK WONG Wing-ki, JP	Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (2)
Dr Samuel CHUI Ho-kwong	Assistant Director of Environmental Protection (Waste Infrastructure Planning)
Mr TO King-ho	Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Food Waste Recycle Group) (Acting) Environmental Protection Department
Mr Michael HONG Wing-kit	Chief Civil Engineer (Public Works Programme) Transport and Housing Bureau
Mr Michael LI Kiu-yin	Project Director (2) Architectural Services Department
Ms Suzanna CHAN Chung-kwan	Senior Project Manager 229 Architectural Services Department
Ms Wendy AU Wan-sze	Principal Assistant Secretary for Food and Health (Health) ⁵
Mr TAN Tick-yee	Assistant Director of Social Welfare (Elderly)
Ms Ann Mary TAM Kwai-yee	Chief Architect (2) Housing Department

Attendance by invitation:

Dr AU YEUNG Tung-wai	Service Director (Primary & Community Health Care) New Territories West Cluster Hospital Authority
----------------------	---

Clerk in attendance:

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

Staff in attendance:

Mr Keith WONG	Council Secretary (1)2
Ms Christina SHIU	Legislative Assistant (1)2
Ms Christy YAU	Legislative Assistant (1)7
Ms Clara LO	Legislative Assistant (1)8

Action

The Chairman advised that there were two funding proposals on the agenda for the 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 705 – Civil Engineering

**PWSC(2018-19)32 173DR Organic Resources Recovery Centre
Phase 2**

2. The Chairman advised that the proposal, i.e. [PWSC\(2018-19\)32](#), sought to upgrade 173DR to Category A at an estimated cost of \$2,453 million in money-of-the-day ("MOD") prices for the design and construction of the Organic Resources Recovery Centre ("ORRC") Phase 2 ("ORRC2") at Sha Ling of the North District. The Subcommittee had commenced deliberation on the proposal at the meeting on 14 November 2018.

Strategies for recovery and treatment of food waste from commercial and industrial and domestic sources

3. Mr Gary FAN was concerned that whether, according to the Administration's estimation, the source-separated food waste generated by the commercial and industrial ("C&I") sectors to be collected each day could reach 300 tonnes so that the design capacity (i.e. 300 tonnes) of ORRC2 could be brought into full play. In addition, he also enquired whether the Administration would provide financial incentives, such as subsidies on transportation cost, to attract the C&I sectors to deliver food waste to ORRCs.

4. Under Secretary for the Environment ("USEN") said that the Government attached great importance to promoting waste reduction and recycling. To complement the implementation of the Municipal Solid Waste ("MSW") Charging Scheme ("the Charging Scheme"), the Administration would provide additional recurrent resources and allocate the revenue generated from the Charging Scheme to support waste reduction and recycling under the approach of "dedicated-fund-for-dedicated-use". This included the provision of free delivery service for food waste from C&I sectors to ORRCs for treatment. The Government believed that after the Charging Scheme came into operation, the C&I sectors would become pro-active in separating food waste at source and delivering the food waste to ORRCs for treatment in order to save costs, whereby providing ORRCs with sufficient amount of food waste.

5. Dr CHENG Chung-tai was worried that the carbon emission generated during the delivery of the large amount of food waste from various districts of the territory to ORRCs on a daily basis would in effect offset the potential energy conservation benefits of recycling food waste into energy.

6. Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (2) ("DD(2)/EPD") said that the network of food waste recovery facilities had been expanded progressively. Apart from the proposed ORRC2, the Environmental Protection Department ("EPD") was also exploring the implementation of the "Food waste/sewage sludge anaerobic co-digestion" pilot trial at Tai Po Sewage Treatment Works ("STW") and Sha Tin STW. Following the gradual increase in the number of collection points, the delivery trips would be shortened correspondingly. The Government also planned to arrange a central transport pool to collect and deliver food waste so as to enhance transportation efficiency. Moreover, the Government would consult the trade on the mode of food waste collection and report the findings to LegCo in due course.

7. Mr WU Chi-wai expressed support for the Administration's work on promoting the recovery of food waste through the construction of ORRC2. He enquired about the existing strategies to promote the separation and recovery of domestic food waste, and whether the food waste/sewage sludge anaerobic co-digestion technology under trial at STW was applicable to the treatment of domestic food waste.

8. Mr HUI Chi-fung noted that according to the Administration's supplementary information paper (LC Paper No. [PWSC36/18-19\(02\)](#)), the Administration expected ORRC2 to be completed for operation in 2021 and ORRC3 would come into operation no earlier than 2026. He was concerned

that the slow progress in the development of ORRC by the Administration would delay the work of promoting the recovery of domestic food waste.

9. USEN said that the Government was studying and formulating the strategies for recovery of domestic food waste with a view to enhancing the treatment capacity of domestic food waste downstream. After ORRC1 and ORRC2 came into operation, there might be surplus capacity between 2021 and 2022 for treatment of domestic food waste on a trial basis. In addition, the "Food waste/sewage sludge anaerobic co-digestion" pilot trial at STW also helped increase the overall treatment capacity of C&I and domestic food waste in future.

10. Mr CHU Hoi-dick pointed out that supermarkets disposed large amounts of food that had not reached the expiry date every day. He enquired about the specific plans the Administration had in place for recovering this type of food waste.

11. DD(2)/EPD said that through the Environment and Conservation Fund ("ECF"), the Government had been supporting non-profit-making organizations in recovering food that had not reached the expiry date for distribution to those in need. As at October 2018, ECF had granted funding support of over \$68 million for 37 relevant projects, under which a total of 6 900 tonnes of surplus food was recovered to benefit 8.9 million headcounts.

Compost and renewable energy produced by Organic Resources Recovery Centres

12. Mr CHU Hoi-dick pointed out that local organic farmers were concerned that the compost produced by ORRCs would be in poor quality due to its high salt content. He enquired whether the organic crops grown with the compost produced by ORRCs could obtain organic certification issued by the Hong Kong Organic Resource Centre.

13. Assistant Director of Environmental Protection (Waste Infrastructure Planning) ("AD(WIP)/EPD") said that EPD had conducted laboratory tests on the compost produced by the now-defunct Kowloon Bay Pilot Composting Plant and confirmed the absence of genetically modified substances in the compost. As such, the organic crops grown with the compost should meet the criteria for organic certification. Moreover, the salt content, together with water, in food waste would be gone during the process of wet anaerobic digestion which was the technology currently adopted at ORRCs. The salt content in the compost therefore would not be too high. The compost would maintain a suitable carbon/nitrogen ratio to ensure a certain level of fertility.

He added that EPD would monitor the contents of the compost produced by ORRCs on a continuous basis.

14. Mr Tommy CHEUNG opined that the Administration should sell the biogas produced by ORRC2 directly to the gas company for production of town gas, so as to save the high cost of constructing the heat recovery and power generation systems at ORRC2. He enquired whether the Administration had approached the gas company recently to explore the feasibility of the direct sale of biogas.

15. USEN said that according to the tender documents of ORRC2, tenderers should specify in their tenders whether the surplus biogas would be sold to the gas company or the electricity generated would be sold to power companies. Tenderers were also required to provide in their proposals information on the costs of design, construction and operation over the 15-year period involved in the export of surplus renewable energy and the revenue received by the Government from the sale of renewable energy. The Government believed that determining the use of the surplus biogas through the tendering mechanism could ensure the adoption of the most cost effective arrangement ultimately. As the tender process had commenced, the Government would not discuss with individual companies directly the sale arrangement of biogas.

16. Mr LEUNG Che-cheung considered it inflexible for the Administration to refuse to explore the feasibility of selling the biogas directly on the grounds of the commencement of the tendering process. Mr Frankie YICK opined that should the Administration expect more economic benefits to be generated by selling the biogas to the gas company directly, it should suspend the tendering process for ORRC2 and re-consider the sale arrangement of the biogas.

17. USEN reiterated that open tendering was considered a suitable arrangement. The Government would not sell the biogas produced by ORRC2 to a particular company.

18. Mr WU Chi-wai said that ORRC1 currently produced electricity for its own internal use with the biogas it generated. He requested the Administration to provide supplementary information on the respective cost effectiveness of the two arrangements for the biogas generated by ORRC2, i.e. using the biogas generated to produce electricity for ORRC2's own use and selling the surplus electricity, and selling all the biogas generated and purchasing electricity to meet the demand of the ORRC2, using ORRC1 as the benchmark of calculation.

(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC105/18-19\(01\)](#) on 4 February 2019.)

19. USEN said that ORRC1, through its power generation installations, had been converting the methane it produced into electricity for its own use. The methane used for power generation accounted for about one-third of the total amount of methane it produced. In view of the power generation efficiency rate of up to 80%, which was far higher than the rate of 30% achieved by coal power generation, and the savings in transmission costs, the Government proposed to adopt the same arrangement for ORRC2 by installing power generation devices in the centre so that it could generate electricity with biogas for its own use.

Contract and tendering arrangements for Organic Resources Recovery Centre Phase 2

20. Mr Tony TSE requested the Administration to provide supplementary information on the performance indicators to assess the operating performance of the contractor of ORRC2, and whether there were mechanisms and penalties under the contract to handle situations where the operating performance of the contractor was found to be unsatisfactory. In addition, he urged the Administration to consider operating the proposed ORRC3 and ORRC4 by itself after having mastered the relevant food waste treatment technology, so as to prevent the facilities from being mismanaged and operated inefficiently by contracted operators.

(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC105/18-19\(01\)](#) on 4 February 2019.)

21. USEN and DD(2)/EPD said that if the contractor violated any specific requirements under the contract (including the relevant standards in respect of wastewater treatment or air quality monitoring) during the operation period and failed to rectify them within the specified timeframe, the Government could deduct the cost of the work process concerned from the operational fees. As for the subsequent phases of ORRC development, the Government would consider adopting other technologies or modes of operation.

22. Dr CHENG Chung-tai enquired whether the Administration could take over the operation of ORRC2 if the operator performed very poorly and failed to operate the facilities properly. USEN said that should there be any major problems with the operation of ORRC2, the Government would work

out its counter measures based on the actual situation, including considering whether it should shut down the ORRC and take over its operation by itself or invite other operators to undertake the task.

23. Mr CHAN Han-pan pointed out that local small and medium engineering companies generally did not have the experience of operating large-scale food waste recovery centres. If the Administration tendered the construction works of ORRC2 under a Design-Build-and-Operate contract, only large-scale enterprises would have the capability and experience required to take up the project. He urged the Administration to split projects into separate works contracts in similar tender exercises in future, so that small and medium enterprises would be able to submit their bids, which would in turn enhance the quality of works through the introduction of competition. USEN said that the Government would duly consider Mr CHAN's suggestion.

24. Mr LEUNG Che-cheung noted from the Government's submission (i.e. [PWSC\(2018-19\)32](#)) that an estimated sum of \$107.92 million was payable annually by the Administration to the operator of ORRC2 for the running costs and staff expenditure of the facilities. He enquired how the sum was arrived at.

25. AD(WIP)/EPD said that the annual operating cost of \$107.92 million was an internal estimate of the Government. Tenderers had to set out in their tenders the annual operating cost of the facilities for the Government's reference in tender assessment.

26. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen and Mr CHU Hoi-dick noted from Enclosure 1 to the Administration's supplementary information paper ([LC Paper No. PWSC36/18-19\(01\)](#)) that past performance (including site safety records, etc.) accounted for only 2.1% of the total score under the marking scheme for the ORRC2 tender assessment. They opined that the weighting assigned was on the low side and urged the Government to review the relevant arrangement. Mr CHAN requested the Administration to provide a summary of the tender assessment criteria in the marking schemes of other works of similar scale under the Environment Bureau specifying the evaluation weighting assigned to "past performance" (including site safety records, etc.) of tenderers, and explain whether the weighting of 2.1% assigned to "past performance" in the marking scheme for ORRC2 was on the low side.

(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC105/18-19\(01\)](#) on 4 February 2019.)

27. AD(WIP)/EPD said that the Government had referred to the relevant tender assessment criteria adopted in other similar projects when formulating the marking scheme for this tender exercise.

Project cost of Organic Resources Recovery Centre Phase 2

28. Mr Tommy CHEUNG pointed out that the Liberal Party did not oppose to the development of ORRC2. However, he questioned that the Government's current capital cost estimate of ORRC2 was too high. Referring to the experience of developing similar food waste treatment facilities on the Mainland and in other countries, he pointed out that the capital cost of those facilities was far lower than the cost estimate of ORRC2. Mr CHEUNG and Mr CHU Hoi-dick requested the Administration to provide supplementary information comparing the total capital cost (as well as major breakdown figures) of ORRC2 (i.e. \$2,453 million in MOD prices) with those of the food waste treatment facilities on the Mainland and in other countries, and explain the reasons for the higher/lower capital cost of ORRC2 than similar facilities on the Mainland and in other countries.

(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC105/18-19\(01\)](#) on 4 February 2019.)

29. USEN said that the Government had obtained some information on the project cost of developing food waste treatment facilities on the Mainland. However, the information could not be released to members for the time being as it had yet been verified. He added that after making reference to the capital cost of developing similar food waste treatment facilities in the world, the Government considered the current project cost estimate of ORRC2 in line with the international price level. Moreover, the project cost of ORRC2 was also comparable with that of local public works projects ("PWPs") in terms of site area and building area.

30. Mr Tommy CHEUNG said that according to the Administration's estimation, the cost of architectural, building and landscape works of ORRC2 was more than \$800 million, which was far higher than the costs of similar local works. He enquired about the reasons for the high cost of this item of works.

31. AD(WIP)/EPD said that the construction cost per square metre of floor area of ORRC2 was around \$26,000. According to the overall PWP cost statistics of the Government, the construction cost per square metre of

floor area of PWPs ranged from about \$20,000 to \$40,000, which was similar to that of ORRC2. In addition, the construction cost of ORRC2 was also comparable with that of the redevelopment of Queen Mary Hospital and extension of Tuen Mun Hospital.

[At 9:41 am, the Chairman said that he would allow members who were waiting for their turn to raise questions to each raise one question. After that, the "question and answer time" would end.]

Other issues

32. Mr Tony TSE, Mr Tommy CHEUNG and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen pointed out that many members had requested the Administration at the last meeting to provide supplementary information on the item. However, the Administration provided the relevant information only in the afternoon on the day before the meeting, making it difficult for members to peruse the papers thoroughly before the meeting. The Chairman considered it undesirable for the Administration to provide members with supplementary information belatedly.

Motion to adjourn the discussion on PWSC(2018-19)32

33. Mr Tommy CHEUNG moved a motion pursuant to paragraph 33 of the Public Works Subcommittee Procedure to adjourn the discussion on PWSC(2018-19)32.

34. The Chairman said that the Subcommittee would proceed forthwith to deal with Mr Tommy CHEUNG's motion. Each member could speak once on the motion, and the speaking time should not be more than three minutes.

35. Mr Tommy CHEUNG was dissatisfied with the Administration's belated written supplementary information and its failure to properly address members' questions regarding the project cost and the handling of biogas. As the "question and answer time" would soon end pursuant to the Chairman's direction, making it impossible for him to keep pressing the Administration for a response to his concerns, he moved the motion to adjourn the discussion on the item.

36. Mr Frankie YICK, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr HUI Chi-fung, Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Mr Abraham SHEK and Mr Andrew WAN spoke in support of the motion proposed by Mr Tommy CHEUNG. Mr AU Nok-hin spoke and pointed out that Mr Tommy CHEUNG had raised questions to government officials 14 times. He opined that when dealing with other agenda items in future, the Chairman

should allow members to raise adequate rounds of questions on an item before proceeding to voting.

37. In response, USEN said that the construction of ORRC2, if commenced expeditiously, would help promote the recovery of C&I food waste and expedite the launch of domestic food waste recovery programmes. In addition, he apologized for the late provision of written supplementary information for the Subcommittee, and undertook that improvement would be made.

38. When speaking on the motion, Mr Tommy CHEUNG stressed that he moved the motion to adjourn the discussion on the item out of his dissatisfaction with the Administration's failure to properly respond to members' questions. He was not opposing the Government's plan to develop ORRC2 on behalf of the catering constituency.

39. The Chairman put to vote the question that discussion on [PWSC\(2018-19\)32](#) be adjourned. At the request of members, the Chairman ordered a division. Twelve members voted for, 4 members voted against the motion and no one abstained. The votes of individual members were as follows:

For:

Mr Tommy CHEUNG
Mr WU Chi-wai
Dr KWOK Ka-ki
Mr Andrew WAN
Mr HUI Chi-fung
Mr Gary FAN
(12 members)

Mr Frankie YICK
Mr CHAN Chi-chuen
Mr Alvin YEUNG
Mr CHU Hoi-dick
Dr CHENG Chung-tai
Mr AU Nok-hin

Against:

Mr MA Fung-kwok
Mr LUK Chung-hung
(4 members)

Dr Junius HO
Mr Tony TSE

Abstained:

(0 member)

40. The Chairman declared that the motion to adjourn discussion on [PWSC\(2018-19\)32](#) was carried. The discussion on the submission should stand adjourned and the Subcommittee would proceed to deal with the next item on the agenda.

Head 711 – Housing

PWSC(2018-19)33 75MC Community health centre-cum-residential care home for the elderly at Tuen Mun Area 29 West

41. The Chairman advised that the proposal, i.e. [PWSC\(2018-19\)33](#), sought to upgrade 75MC to Category A at an estimated cost of \$1,046.4 million in MOD prices for provision of a community health centre-cum-residential care home for the elderly ("CHC-cum-RCHE") at the public housing development at Tuen Mun Area 29 West. The Administration had consulted the Panel on Housing on the proposed works on 5 November 2018. Panel members supported the submission of the funding proposal to the Subcommittee for consideration. A report on the gist of the Panel's discussion was tabled at the meeting.

Entrusting the design and construction to the Hong Kong Housing Authority

42. Mr Gary FAN pointed out that the proposed CHC and RCHE would be implemented in an integrated design with the public housing development at Tuen Mun Area 29 West. As the Hong Kong Housing Authority ("HKHA") would undertake the construction of the whole public housing project, the Administration planned to entrust the design and construction of the proposed works to HKHA. Mr FAN enquired about the cost apportionment between the Administration and HKHA for the construction of the CHC-cum-RCHE.

43. Chief Civil Engineer (Public Works Programme), Transport and Housing Bureau ("CCE(PWP)/THB"), and Project Director (2), Architectural Services Department, said that as the Government was required to provide infrastructure to support HKHA's public housing development at Tuen Mun Area 29 West, it should bear the cost of infrastructure, including road works and drainage improvement works, etc. For the construction of CHC and RCHE facilities, the cost would be apportioned between the Government and HKHA on a pro-rata basis mainly depended on the respective construction floor areas of the CHC, the RCHE and the public housing development. At the further request of Mr Gary FAN, the Administration would provide supplementary information on the details of cost apportionment between the Government and HKHA for works items (a) to (f) in paragraph 9 of [PWSC\(2018-19\)33](#).

(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC49/18-19\(01\)](#) on 10 December 2018.)

[At 10:26 am, the Chairman asked members if they agreed to extend the meeting for 15 minutes. Members present agreed.]

44. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen noted from the Government's submission that a total sum of around \$94.3 million was payable by the Administration to HKHA for the design, administration and supervision of the project. He enquired about the justifications for the Government to make such a payment to HKHA and how the sum was arrived at.

45. CCE(PWP)/THB said that it was the Government's established practice to pay on-cost, which included the costs of design, administration and supervision, to HKHA for entrusted construction projects. For the proposed project, the sum payable amounted to 12.5% of the construction cost, i.e. around \$94.3 million.

46. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen enquired whether a contractor which was prohibited by the Administration from tendering for government projects would also be prohibited by HKHA from submitting bids for the public housing development at Tuen Mun Area 29.

47. CCE(PWP)/THB said that HKHA's tender exercises for construction works would normally be conducted independently. During the tendering process, HKHA would conduct tender assessment procedures rigorously while drawing reference from government and market practices, including watching out for the tenderers which were prohibited by the Government from participating in government projects.

Integrated design with the public housing development at Tuen Mun Area 29 West

48. Mr Andrew WAN said that he did not oppose to the proposed PWP. He enquired whether the planning of the public housing development at Tuen Mun Area 29 West had maximized the plot ratio of the site. Mr AU Nok-hin enquired about the types of public housing that would be provided under the development, and whether sale flats under the Green Form Subsidised Home Ownership Scheme ("GSH") had been planned.

49. CCE(PWP)/THB said that given the small size of the site at Tuen Mun Area 29, the Government encountered many planning constraints. As the current design had already maximized the usable plot ratio of the site, it was difficult to add other facilities. He said that the public housing development at Tuen Mun Area 29 West was currently planned for public rental housing ("PRH") and was expected to provide about 1 000 units. HKHA would allow flexibility in the housing mix of the development, so as

to cope with future changes in the demand for PRH, GSH and other subsidized sale flats.

50. Mr LEUNG Che-cheung expressed support for the PWP proposal. He was concerned that some residents of the housing estate might be worried that their daily life would be affected by the operation of the CHC and RCHE facilities. He enquired how the Government and HKHA would properly segregate the CHC, the RCHE and the public housing in implementing the integrated design of the whole project, so as to ensure that the daily life of residents would not be affected.

51. CCE(PWP)/THB said that in planning the public housing development at Tuen Mun Area 29 West, the Government would segregate the public health related facilities, and the service target of the proposed CHC would be general patients whereas treatment services for serious illnesses would not be provided. The Government would strengthen communication with newly moved in residents after completion of the housing estate in order to receive their views on improving the community environment.

Residential care home facilities for the elderly

52. Mr AU Nok-hin pointed out that while RCHEs should be provided with at least one toilet on each floor and a lift according to the Best Practices in Design and Operation of Residential Care Home for the Elderly ("the Best Practices") laid down by the Social Welfare Department, the design of the proposed RCHE only met the minimum standard under the Best Practices. He enquired whether the Administration had assessed if the current design of the RCHE was adequate in meeting the needs of its staff and nearly 100 elderly residents.

53. Assistant Director of Social Welfare (Elderly) ("AD(E)/SWD") said that the proposed RCHE would be provided with a designated lift. According to the operational experience of other RCHEs of similar scale, the Government anticipated that one lift would be adequate for use by the residents and staff of the RCHE. Regarding the number of toilets, HKHA would provide one accessible toilet on each floor of the proposed RCHE as required by the relevant legislation. Moreover, given that the provision of unadorned premises would be HKHA's handover standard for the RCHE, the operator of the RCHE had to undertake the internal fitting-out works, including the provision of toilets and shower facilities for use by its elderly residents.

54. Mr Andrew WAN enquired about the type of residential home to which the proposed RCHE belonged. AD(E)/SWD said that the proposed

RCHE would be a contract home which offered both care-and-attention places providing a continuum-of-care and nursing home places.

55. Mr LEUNG Che-cheung pointed out that according to some public views, the statutory minimum area of floor space required for each resident in RCHEs and residential care homes for persons with disabilities should be revised to 9.5 square metres. He enquired whether the design of the proposed RCHE could satisfy this demand.

56. AD(E)/SWD said that the proposed RCHE had a net operational floor area of about 1 100 square metres. The actual area of the RCHE and the area of floor space per resident could only be ascertained and calculated after the premises had been handed over to the operator and the completion of internal fitting-out works. He added that the Government would ensure that the area of floor space per resident could meet the requirements under the relevant guidelines when the RCHE came into operation.

Community health centre facilities

57. Dr KWOK Ka-ki expressed support for the PWP proposal. He pointed out that there was a serious shortage of elderly health and dental services in Tuen Mun. He urged the Administration to provide elderly health and dental services in the proposed CHC to cope with the increasing elderly population in Tuen Mun.

58. Principal Assistant Secretary for Food and Health (Health)5 said that the Department of Health had been providing general health services for the elderly in Tuen Mun at Wu Hong Elderly Health Centre. Regarding dental services for the elderly, the government policy was to raise public awareness of oral health through publicity and education. At present, the elderly could also use their health care vouchers for dental care services at private dental clinics. She added that due to shortage of dentists, it was difficult for the Government to set up new government dental clinics for now. Neither did the Government have the plan to provide a dental clinic in the proposed CHC.

59. The Chairman said that the Subcommittee would continue discussion on this item at the next meeting. The meeting ended at 10:46 am.