

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. PWSC290/18-19
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/F/2/1(25)B

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

**Minutes of the 28th meeting
held in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex
on Saturday, 1 June 2019, 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

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

Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, 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
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
Hon CHAN Hoi-yan

Members absent:

Hon Tanya CHAN
Hon LAU Kwok-fan, MH

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)
Ms Maisie CHENG Mei-sze, JP	Permanent Secretary for the Environment
Mr CHIU Kwong-kin	Assistant Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) (Works) ²

Mr Edwin WONG Kuo-yang	Head of Energizing Kowloon East Office (Acting) Development Bureau
Mr Jimmy CHAN Pai-ming, JP	Director of Highways
Mr Harry MA Hon-ngai	Assistant Director of Highways (Development)
Dr LAU Kwok-keung	Assistant Director of Environmental Protection (Environmental Assessment) (Acting) Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Assessment and Noise) Environmental Protection Department
Mr LUK Wai-hung	Project Manager (Major Works) Highways Department
Mr Stephen WONG Wai-kwong	Chief Engineer (3) (Major Works) Highways Department
Mr Jacky WU Kwok-yuen	Principal Assistant Secretary for Development (Works) ⁵
Mr Kelvin LO Kwok-wah, JP	Director of Drainage Services
Mr Thomas WONG Hip-lik	Chief Engineer (Drainage Projects) Drainage Services Department
Mr Jimmy POON Sui-shun	Chief Engineer (Project Management) Drainage Services Department

Clerk in attendance:

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

Staff in attendance:

Mr Raymond CHOW	Senior Council Secretary (1) ¹⁰
Mr Keith WONG	Council Secretary (1) ²
Ms Christina SHIU	Legislative Assistant (1) ²
Ms Christy YAU	Legislative Assistant (1) ⁸
Ms Clara LO	Legislative Assistant (1) ⁹

The Chairman advised that there were seven funding proposals on the agenda for discussion at the meeting, which would involve a total funding allocation of \$12,602.1 million. 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 706 — Highways

PWSC(2019-20)3 188TB Footbridge near MTR Kowloon Bay Station Exit B

2. The Chairman advised that the proposal, i.e. [PWSC\(2019-20\)3](#), sought to upgrade 188TB to Category A at an estimated cost of \$173.5 million in money-of-the-day ("MOD") prices in order to construct another footbridge ("the proposed footbridge") across Kwun Tong Road near MTR Kowloon Bay Station Exit B. The Government consulted the Panel on Development ("the Panel") on the proposed project on 19 December 2018. The majority of the Panel members had no objection to 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.

Construction cost of the proposed works

3. Mr Gary FAN expressed support for the proposed project. Mr FAN and Dr CHENG Chung-tai pointed out that when the proposed project was put forward for the Panel's discussion earlier on, the cost of the project was estimated to exceed \$200 million, with the construction cost of the footbridge reaching \$6 million per metre in length. They requested the Administration to explain how the project estimate could be lowered to \$173.5 million without making any modifications to the proposed project.

4. Director of Highways ("DHy") advised that based on the information available at the time when the proposed project was submitted to the Panel in December 2018, the construction cost was estimated to exceed \$200 million. Following a tender exercise, the estimated construction cost of the proposed project was adjusted downward as the price quoted in the tender received by the Government was lower than the original estimate. Besides, the Government had initially expected that additional expenses would be incurred for implementing temporary traffic and pedestrian arrangements during construction due to limited space at the site. After coordinating with other projects in the vicinity, including the use of some site area of the East

Kowloon Cultural Centre ("EKCC") for implementing temporary traffic and pedestrian arrangements, there was a reduction in the relevant expenses.

5. Dr CHENG Chung-tai and Dr Fernando CHEUNG opined that the estimated project cost was still high in spite of the downward adjustment. They requested the Administration to explain the reasons for the high project cost.

6. DHy explained that as the proposed footbridge would span across the busy Kwun Tong Road, to ensure that the traffic there would not be affected by the works, temporary traffic and footway diversion arrangements would be implemented during construction before the foundation of the proposed footbridge could be built. Furthermore, having regard to the close proximity of the proposed footbridge to the existing walkway at MTR Kowloon Bay Station Exit B (No. KF(LNTKE)) ("the existing footbridge") and the railway viaduct of MTR Kwun Tong Line, piling works of the proposed project would be subject to restrictions such that the structure of these facilities would not be affected. Extra spending would be incurred for the project in overcoming obstacles associated with the works. He added that if calculated separately, the construction cost of the proposed footbridge, the ramp connecting to the existing walkway and the foundation works would be about \$220,000 per square metre, which was comparable to that of other similar projects.

7. Dr KOWK Ka-ki welcomed the downward adjustment of the cost estimate of the proposed project. He further asked how the Administration could ensure that public works projects would be completed at reasonable cost.

8. Permanent Secretary for Development (Works) advised that public works projects would first be put forward to the Project Cost Management Office ("PCMO") of the Development Bureau for its review before submission to the Legislative Council for consideration, so as to ensure that public works projects would observe the principles of "fitness-for-purpose" and "no-frills". PCMO would also make recommendations on how to reduce project cost. He added that most projects had their cost estimates reduced after scrutiny by the PCMO.

9. Dr Junius HO expressed support for the proposed project. Dr HO and Mr KWONG Chun-yu considered the Administration's approach desirable in that project cost was estimated based on the prices of the tender received, thus enhancing the accuracy of the estimation. Dr HO noted from the Administration's paper that the project cost included a sum of \$2.9 million

for consultants' fee and around \$15 million for contingency, he asked if the cost estimation was also based on the prices of the tenders received.

10. DHy advised that in preparing cost estimate for public works projects, reference would generally be made to the prices of recent tenders received for similar projects. As far as the proposed project was concerned, the current cost estimate was drawn up with reference made to the prices of the tenders received. DHy added that tender prices only covered the cost of works to be carried out by the contractor (i.e. the expenditure items set out in paragraph 8 (a) to (f) in the Administration's paper), while engineering consultants' fee and contingency provision were excluded. Like other public works projects, the amount of contingency set aside for the proposed project was meant to cater for any unforeseen situations during the construction period and to cover any possible cost overrun arising from such situations.

11. Dr KWOK Ka-ki sought explanation on the mechanism under which project cost was paid to contractors and asked whether unused funding reserved for contingency would be released to contractors eventually. In addition, he also requested the Administration to provide supplementary information on the use of contingency sum in the cost estimates of road and footbridge projects of the Highways Department ("HyD") over the past three years.

(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members via [LC Paper No. PWSC262/18-19\(01\)](#) on 11 July 2019.)

12. DHy advised that payment would be made to contractors under the contract in accordance with the actual implementation of the construction works. In case changes had to be made to the project proposal owing to the practical difficulty encountered which gave rise to cost overrun, the Government would, where justified, use the contingency sum to pay the contractor for the additional cost so incurred.

13. Mr Gary FAN and Mr AU Nok-hin asked the Administration how the remainder (i.e. the surplus funding) would be dealt with if the overall project estimate for a public works project approved by the Finance Committee ("FC") of LegCo was higher than the successful bid price.

14. Mr Abraham SHEK expressed support for the proposed project. He was concerned that the Administration, owing to concerns over cost overrun, often overestimated project costs in order to obtain from the LegCo funding

that exceeded the required amount, which he considered an unhealthy practice. He proposed that the Administration should review the existing funding mechanism, including requiring the Administration to report to this Council how the surplus funding of each public works project would be dealt with.

15. Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) advised that if the approved project estimate of a particular public works project was higher than the tender price of the successful bid upon completion of the tendering procedures, the difference would be retained in the Capital Works Reserve Fund through administrative arrangements. The retained fund could not be expended by the works department concerned on the project in question. The retained fund would accrue to the Capital Works Reserve Fund on its balance, which could be used for other Category A public works projects subject to the approval of LegCo.

16. Noting from paragraph 8 of the Administration's paper that the consultants' fee of \$2.9 million in the capital cost of the proposed project (i.e. item (g) of paragraph 8 of the paper) included the provision of \$800,000 for management of resident site staff ("RSS"), Mr Tony TSE enquired about the purpose of the relevant expenditure and whether it was to be used for paying emoluments to the RSS. In view of the construction difficulties associated with the proposed project, he also asked if the estimated provision for staff emoluments was adequate.

17. DHy advised that as the consultancy commissioned by the Government had to employ RSS to monitor the implementation of works, the provision of \$800,000 for management of RSS would be used to pay for the consultancy's relevant administration expenses for employing and managing RSS. As regards the estimated expenditure of \$20.3 million to be incurred on the emoluments of RSS (i.e. item (h) of paragraph 8 of the paper), the amount was determined taking into account the practical need of the proposed project, including the possible construction difficulties.

18. Mr Gary FAN noted from paragraph 11 of the Administration's paper that the Administration planned to deliver the proposed project under the New Engineering Contract ("NEC") form, and the contract would also provide for price adjustments. He enquired how the NEC form would facilitate the delivery of the project.

19. DHy advised that the Government had already started delivering some of its public works projects under the NEC form which emphasized cooperation, mutual trust and collaborative risk management between contracting parties. The new contract form enabled the contracting parties

to collaborate in solving problems at an early stage in the face of construction difficulties, so as to avoid increasing the cost or prolonging the construction period. In light of the contractual provision for price adjustments, the Government would adjust the project cost with reference to the latest levels of workers' pay and material costs, with a view to reducing contractors' risks in implementing the project.

Implementation of the proposed footbridge project

20. Pointing out that the proposed project included the construction of a covered ramp for barrier-free access connecting the existing footbridge and the elevated walkway adjoining MTR Kowloon Bay Station Exit B, Dr CHENG Chung-tai asked whether the height of the covered ramp would be adequate for double-deck buses using the lanes of Kwun Tong Road underneath the ramp. DHy advised that the Transport Department ("TD") had examined the design of the ramp and confirmed that the covered ramp would not affect the double-deck buses using Kwun Tong Road.

21. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen enquired about the gradient of the covered ramp and whether the Administration would consider providing barrier-free facilities on the existing footbridge.

22. DHy explained that a stairlift was built at the staircase which connected the existing footbridge and its lower platform. It would be difficult to build a new ramp there given the limited space. Hence, the proposed project included the construction of a covered ramp to connect the lower platform of the existing footbridge with the new footbridge, thereby enabling people to use the new footbridge to cross Kwun Tong Road. He added that the covered ramp would be about two metres wide with a gradient of 1:12.

23. Mr Wilson OR expressed support for the proposed project. Mr OR and Mr HO Kai-ming asked how the Administration could ensure that the traffic on Kwun Tong Road would not be adversely affected by the project.

24. DHy advised that HyD and the project contractor would, in collaboration with the Police and TD, study how temporary traffic arrangements were to be implemented on Kwun Tong Road during construction, so as to ensure the traffic there would not be adversely affected by the works. The preliminary proposal was that traffic lanes on Kwun Tong Road would be partially closed at night time to carry out works that occupied road space. In addition, HyD also planned to set up a liaison group to maintain close contact with local stakeholders, bus companies, etc. regarding the implementation of the project.

25. Pointing out that there had been media reports that some samples of couplers and steel bars at EKCC were found to be substandard recently, Ms Claudia MO asked how the Administration would follow up the matter.

26. DHy advised that he could not provide further details on matters concerning the EKCC project since the project was not undertaken by HyD. As far as the quality of the proposed project was concerned, when entering into contract with the contractor, HyD would specify the required quality and features of the materials in the contract. RSS hired by the Government would also perform quality control by conducting regular inspections on the materials used in the project.

Connectivity of the proposed footbridge

27. Mr Wilson OR and Mr HO Kai-ming were concerned that while EKCC was expected to be completed for commissioning in 2021, it was not until the first half of 2022 that the proposed footbridge was expected for completion. They were concerned that it would be difficult for the existing footbridge alone to cope with the additional pedestrian flow arising from the commissioning of EKCC. Mr HO opined that the Administration should consider building a third footbridge across Kwun Tong Road if both the existing footbridge and the proposed footbridge were insufficient to cope with the additional pedestrian flow arising from the commissioning of EKCC.

28. DHy advised that subject to the funding approval by LegCo, HyD would seek to commence construction as soon as possible such that the proposed footbridge could be completed and put into use as early as possible. He added that the proposed footbridge would be six metres wide whereas the existing footbridge was about four metres wide. It was expected that the footbridges would be sufficient to cope with the additional pedestrian flow arising from the commissioning of EKCC. The Government would also keep in view the operation of EKCC and provide additional pedestrian facilities in its periphery where necessary.

29. Mr Holden CHOW asked whether any barrier-free access would be provided at the end of the proposed footbridge connecting to EKCC for persons who were in need. Head of Energizing Kowloon East Office (Acting), Development Bureau ("H/EKEO(Atg)/DEVB") advised that the proposed footbridge would be connected to EKCC, where a 24-hour pedestrian walkway would be provided on the first floor linking to the proposed footbridge. People in need might use the lifts inside EKCC and in

the vicinity to travel between the footbridge and Kwun Tong Road or areas along Ngau Tau Kok Road.

30. Mr Jeremy TAM requested the Administration to provide a floor plan of the future EKCC to illustrate how people in need (including wheelchair users) could travel from MTR Kowloon Bay Station to Ngau Tau Kok Road via the proposed footbridge and the barrier-free access inside EKCC.

(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC262/18-19\(01\)](#) on 11 July 2019.)

31. Pointing out the heavy pedestrian flow between MTR Kowloon Bay Station and the residential areas near Ngau Tau Kok Road on weekdays, Mr AU Nok-hin asked whether the proposed footbridge would be able to cope with such pedestrian flow.

32. DHy advised that the existing footbridge mainly catered for pedestrians travelling to and from MTR Kowloon Bay Station and the residential areas near Ngau Tau Kok Road, the peak-hour traffic of which was estimated to have reached 10 000 pedestrians per hour. Upon completion of the proposed footbridge, people might travel to and from MTR Kowloon Bay Station and Ngau Tau Kok Road via EKCC and the new footbridge, and this would help divert pedestrian flow. H/EKEO(Atg)/DEVB added that private landowners in the Kowloon Bay Business Area had, under the policy initiative of facilitating provision of pedestrian links by the private sector as announced in the 2016 Policy Address, submitted an application to the Government for the construction of a footbridge connecting EKCC and Amoy Gardens at their own cost. The application was being processed by relevant departments. Upon completion, the footbridge was expected to further enhance pedestrian accessibility in the local district. In addition, the Government was also considering to construct a new footbridge near Exit A of MTR Kowloon Bay Station to cope with the additional pedestrian flow in future.

33. Mr WU Chi-wai pointed out that residents of Upper Ngau Tau Kok Estate generally used the footbridge near Tai Yip Street/Sheung Yee Road to cross Kwun Tong Road in order to get to MTR Kowloon Bay Station. He requested the Administration to provide a barrier-free access on the said footbridge to cater for the needs of the elderly and the disabled.

34. DHy and H/EKEO(Atg)/DEVB advised that the Administration would examine the feasibility of providing barrier-free access facilities on the footbridge, but had yet to draw up a timetable for the works.

Footbridge projects in other districts

35. Mr WU Chi-wai pointed out that he had proposed to HyD that traffic signs be installed on the footbridge at Lung Cheung Road near Hsin Kuang Centre in Wong Tai Sin, but his proposal was rejected by HyD for safety reasons. He requested the Administration to provide supplementary information giving justifications for not being able to install traffic signs on the footbridge.

(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC262/18-19\(01\)](#) on 11 July 2019.)

36. DHy advised that the footbridge in Wong Tai Sin was not of an enclosed design and that the installation of traffic signs on such a footbridge might affect the transverse wind loading and the overall load on the footbridge. As to the proposed footbridge at MTR Kowloon Bay Station, he added that HyD had no plans to install traffic signs on the footbridge.

37. Mr KWONG Chun-yu asked, in planning the construction of the "Elevated Pedestrian Corridor in Yuen Long Town connecting with Long Ping Station" ("the Elevated Pedestrian Corridor"), whether the Administration would draw reference from the approach adopted for the proposed footbridge project by conducting the tendering exercise prior to seeking funding support from the LegCo, so as to ensure that the estimated construction cost would be close to the actual construction cost.

38. DHy advised that the tendering exercise for the "Elevated Pedestrian Corridor" project was underway at the moment. The Government would be able to make a more accurate estimate of the project cost upon receipt of tenders, and would give an account of the details of the project cost when seeking funding support from the LegCo.

Voting on PWSC(2019-20)3

39. The Chairman put [PWSC\(2019-20\)3](#) to vote. At the request of members, the Chairman ordered a division. Twenty-five members voted for the proposal, and no member voted against it. No member abstained from voting. The votes of individual members were as follows:

For :

Mr Charles Peter MOK (Deputy Chairman)	Mr Tommy CHEUNG
Dr Priscilla LEUNG	Mr Frankie YICK

Mr WU Chi-wai
Mr CHAN Chi-chuen
Mr LEUNG Che-cheung
Mr Alvin YEUNG
Mr CHU Hoi-dick
Mr HO Kai-ming
Mr Wilson OR
Mr LUK Chung-hung
Mr KWONG Chun-yu
Mr Gary FAN
Mr Tony TSE
(25 members)

Mr MA Fung-kwok
Mr CHAN Han-pan
Ms Alice MAK
Mr Andrew WAN
Dr Junius HO
Mr Holden CHOW
Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan
Dr CHENG Chung-tai
Mr Jeremy TAM
Mr Vincent CHENG

Against :
(0 member)

Abstained :
(0 member)

40. The Chairman declared that the item was endorsed by the Subcommittee. The Chairman consulted members on whether the item would require separate voting at the relevant FC meeting. No member made such a request.

Head 706 — Highways

PWSC(2019-20)4 832TH Retrofitting of noise barriers on Long Tin Road

41. The Chairman advised that the proposal, i.e. [PWSC\(2019-20\)4](#), sought to upgrade 832TH to Category A at an estimated cost of \$304 million in MOD prices for retrofitting noise barriers on the section of Long Tin Road between Parkside Villa and Park Royale. The Government consulted the Panel on Environmental Affairs on the proposed project on 25 February 2019 and Panel members did not object to submitting the funding proposal to the Subcommittee for consideration. A report on the gist of the Panel's discussion was tabled at the meeting.

Project cost and implementation timetable

42. Mr KWONG Chun-yu was concerned whether the cost of the proposed noise barrier project was too high. He also enquired about the number of dwellings that would benefit from the project, and whether the Administration could reduce the project cost.

43. Project Manager (Major Works), Highways Department ("PM(MW)/HyD") replied that the Administration had estimated the cost of the proposed project based on the actual circumstances of the proposed noise barrier project (e.g. the need to construct additional piles owing to the problem of caverns in Yuen Long district) and by making reference to the construction costs of similar projects. Enclosure 6 to the discussion paper had set out the breakdown of the cost estimates for the noise barrier project, of which the costs of the superstructure and the foundation stood at \$68.6 million and \$123.3 million respectively. Tender invitations for the proposed project would be issued as soon as possible, and the unspent funds would be returned to the Treasury upon completion of the project. Assistant Director of Environmental Protection (Environmental Assessment) (Acting)/Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Assessment and Noise), Environmental Protection Department ("AD(EA)(Atg)/EPD") added that the number of benefitted dwellings in the proposed project would be about 440. The location maps with the number of the relevant dwellings and the respective levels of reduction in traffic noise were at Enclosures 4 and 5.

44. Considering that the Administration had upgraded the proposed noise barrier project to Category B as early as in 2008, Mr Tony TSE was concerned why the consultant was only engaged in 2017 to undertake detailed site investigation and design for the proposed project, and the factors based on which the order of urgency and priority of projects were determined.

45. Mr Gary FAN indicated support for the proposed noise barrier project and was equally concerned why it took such a long time before the funding proposal was submitted to LegCo. Mr LEUNG Che-cheung and Mr Holden CHOW also expressed support for the proposed project and urged the Administration to submit funding proposals for other traffic noise mitigation works to LegCo as soon as possible. Mr CHU Hoi-dick enquired whether the delayed submission of the funding proposal to LegCo was attributable to the proposed project's failure to obtain a higher priority in the Government's internal prioritization of public works because of its low urgency or due to other factors.

46. AD(EA)(Atg)/EPD and PM(MW)/HyD responded that given that the entire noise barrier retrofitting project involved many road sections and was massive in scale, works had to be implemented in phases according to their priorities notwithstanding that technical feasibility had been confirmed. DSD would determine the priority of various noise barrier projects based on

factors such as the road traffic noise impact on nearby residents, the number of affected residents, etc. In the past few years, the Administration had also sought funding approval from FC for carrying out noise barrier retrofitting projects.

47. Mr AU Nok-hin enquired why the proposed noise barrier project, which was planned to commence in the third quarter of 2019, would only be completed in the second half of 2023. PM(MW)/HyD explained that the cantilevered noise barriers along Long Tin Road were expected to be completed in 2022, whereas the vertical noise barriers along the verge of the southbound carriageway of the flyover on Long Tin Road and its slip road would need to be completed in phases, hence the entire project was expected to be completed in 2023.

Design of the noise barriers

48. Mr LEUNG Che-chueng enquired about the reasons for retrofitting three-metre high vertical noise barriers along the verge of both the southbound carriageway of Long Tin Road and its slip road near Park Royale, as well as the reasons for not retrofitting 7.5-metre high cantilevered noise barriers with better acoustic performance at the location concerned. Similar questions were raised by Mr Holden CHOW and Mr Gary FAN. Mr FAN also enquired why cantilevered noise barriers were retrofitted along the verge of both the southbound carriageway and footpath of Long Tin Road near Block 5 of Scenic Gardens, whether the existing noise barriers on Long Tin Road and Yuen Long Highway were vertical ones, and whether the noise barriers would be extended to Castle Peak Road (Ping Shan section) in future.

49. AD(EA)(Atg)/EPD and Chief Engineer (3) (Major Works), Highways Department ("CE(3)(MW)/HyD") replied that the traffic noise affecting Parkside Villa, Scenic Gardens and Park Royale came from Long Tin Road and the slip road connecting Castle Peak Road (Ping Shan section) to Long Tin Road. In particular, Long Tin Road was the major source of noise. According to the original plan of the Administration, noise barriers would be retrofitted along the verge of Long Tin Road to mitigate the noise generated from the road concerned. With Long Tin Road being a dual three-lane carriageway where the central reservation was merely one metre wide, it was impossible to retrofit a semi-enclosure there. Accordingly, cantilevered noise barriers would be retrofitted along the verge of the section of Long Tin Road near Parkside Villa and Scenic Gardens. In order to avoid the large water mains underneath Long Tin Road near Block 5 of Scenic Gardens, the Administration would respectively construct a section of cantilevered noise

barriers along the verge of the southbound carriageway and footpath at that location. Concerning the section of Long Tin Road near Park Royale, since the flyover there could only support the load of vertical noise barriers, the Administration would retrofit this type of noise barriers along the verge of the southbound carriageway of Long Tin Road. Taking into account the residents' preference, the Administration subsequently decided to retrofit noise barriers along the verge of the slip road to the southbound carriageway of Long Tin Road, so as to mitigate the noise generated from the slip road. As the limited space thereat could not accommodate large plant for bored piling, it was only possible to carry out shallow foundation works for retrofitting vertical noise barriers. Furthermore, the existing noise barriers on Long Tin Road and Yuen Long Highway were all vertical ones, and the proposed project did not include retrofitting noise barriers on Castle Peak Road (Ping Shan section).

50. Referring to the supplementary information paper ([LC Paper No. CB\(1\)937/18-19\(02\)](#)) provided by the Administration to the Panel on Environmental Affairs, Mr AU Nok-hin enquired whether transparent panels would be used in the proposed noise barrier project to replace solid sound absorptive panels.

51. PM(MW)/HyD advised that Enclosure 3 to the discussion paper had provided the artist's impressions of the proposed noise barrier project. As shown, the upper portion of the noise barriers proposed to be used in the project would be transparent panels while the lower portion would be solid absorptive panels.

Justifications for and effectiveness of implementing the proposed project

52. Citing Enclosure 4 to the discussion paper, Mr Holden CHOW stated that after retrofitting noise barriers, the traffic noise levels at more than 370 dwellings were still between 71 and 76 dB(A), which exceeded the traffic noise standard for residential premises (i.e. 70dB(A)) as laid down in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines ("HKPSG"). Mr CHOW enquired whether the Administration had considered other mitigation measures for further reducing the traffic noise levels at the dwellings concerned. Mr Gary FAN and Mr WU Chi-wai also raised similar questions.

53. AD(EA)(Atg)/EPD and PM(MW)/HyD responded that it was the Government's policy, where practicable and subject to availability of resources, to implement direct noise mitigation measures which included retrofitting of noise barriers and enclosures on roads, and road resurfacing

with low noise materials. Upon assessment, the Administration had confirmed that around 545 dwellings near the section of Long Tin Road between Parkside Villa and Park Royale were affected by traffic noise level exceeding 70dB(A). Long Tin Road had been surfaced with low noise materials and it was expected that about 440 dwellings would benefit from the proposed noise barrier project, with the traffic noise level reduced to 70dB(A) or below at some of the dwellings. In addition, other noise mitigation measures had been implemented. For example, Noise Control (Motor Vehicles) Regulation (Cap. 400I) required that all vehicles should comply with the relevant noise emission standards before first registration in Hong Kong. EPD would also keep in view the latest development of vehicle noise emission standards overseas.

54. The Chairman enquired whether the traffic noise level of residential premises referred to the noise level measured inside a dwelling or outside the window. AD(EA)(Atg)/EPD said that the relevant traffic noise level under the planning standards referred to the noise level measured outside the window.

55. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen noted from Enclosure 4 to the discussion paper that among the 545 dwellings exposed to traffic noise level exceeding 70 dB(A), only 172 would enjoy a reduced traffic noise level of 70 dB(A) or below, and among the 440 benefitted dwellings, 273 showed a reduction of merely 1 to 3 dB(A) in the traffic noise level. He enquired whether the Administration had established any cost-effectiveness indicator for the proposed noise barrier project, so as to assess whether it was worth implementing; if not, whether such indicator could be drawn up, and whether information could be provided on the cost effectiveness of similar noise barrier projects for comparison.

56. AD(EA)(Atg)/EPD replied that the average cost required for each benefitted dwelling under the proposed project was comparable to those of similar noise barrier projects implemented in the past few years. Moreover, the Administration had not established any cost-effectiveness indicator for the proposed project.

57. Mr WU Chi-wai enquired whether noise mitigation measures would have been incorporated in the designs of Parkside Villa, Scenic Gardens and Park Royale to ensure the dwellings' compliance with the traffic noise requirements under HKPSG if Long Tin Road was constructed earlier than these housing estates. Conversely, if Long Tin Road was constructed after the completion of these housing estates, whether the Administration should ensure that the road would not have any adverse impact on such housing estates. Mr Gary FAN and Mr Chu Hoi-dick also asked whether the

developers of those housing estates had complied with the relevant planning requirements for reducing the traffic noise impact on such housing estates, and whether new residential developments would be required to comply with the specified noise mitigation requirements, so as to obviate the need to retrofit noise barriers by the Government in future.

58. AD(EA)(Atg)/EPD advised that in the planning of new highways or major improvement works to existing highways, the Administration would consider the traffic noise impact caused by the concerned projects on nearby residents and put forward noise mitigation measures. Furthermore, the Town Planning Board might impose conditions when approving new residential developments while the Administration might include clauses in the relevant land lease, requiring developers to carry out noise impact assessment to ensure that the traffic noise mitigation measures adopted complied with the guidelines under HKPSG. With regard to Parkside Villa, Scenic Gardens and Park Royale which were completed in the 1990s, the noise mitigation measures adopted were in compliance with the prevailing guidelines under HKPSG, such as refraining from putting ventilation windows on the front side of residential units that faced Long Tin Road, and installing suitable insulated windows for dwellings in the relevant housing estates that were still subject to the noise impact, so that residents could shut their windows during peak traffic hours to reduce the vehicle noise entering indoors.

59. With the traffic noise levels in many dwellings at Parkside Villa, Scenic Gardens and Park Royale exceeding 70 dB(A) at present, Mr WU Chi-wai doubted whether this had revealed the ineffectiveness of the noise mitigation measures adopted in these housing estates. He enquired whether the Administration would stop using those measures and implement other alternatives to address the noise problem. Mr Jeremy TAM said that he supported the proposed noise barrier project because the developers of these housing estates had already introduced noise mitigation measures in accordance with the prevailing legislation and planning requirements. However, he was dissatisfied with the Administration's failure to provide a clear explanation as to whether there was any change to the legislation and planning requirements which necessitated the retrofitting of noise barriers now. In this connection, Mr WU and Mr TAM requested the Administration to provide supplementary information to illustrate in detail the occupation time of Parkside Villa, Scenic Gardens and Park Royale and whether Long Tin Road had already come into operation (please specify the commissioning time of Long Tin Road); whether the developers of these housing estates had followed the then relevant legislation and planning requirements (e.g. the traffic noise standard for residential premises in HKPSG) to implement noise mitigation designs and measures (please specify

the details of the relevant designs and measures); whether there had been any factor or any change to the legislative and planning requirements so far, which made it incumbent on the Government to take up the responsibility to retrofit noise barriers on the relevant road sections at present, so as to mitigate the current road traffic noise impact on the residents of these housing estates.

60. Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands) replied that in general, if private developers or the Housing Department planned to carry out residential development projects near existing roads, the relevant projects would be required to introduce noise mitigation measures as required by the relevant professional departments, so as to meet the prevailing environmental requirements. With respect to private residential developments, the Administration would include in the land leases clauses on environmental requirements which the developers should comply with before they could obtain Certificates of Compliance for their residential development projects. As regards the questions raised by Mr WU and Mr TAM in respect of the specific details of Parkside Villa, Scenic Gardens and Park Royale, the department(s) concerned would provide the relevant information after the meeting. PM(MW)/HyD and AD(EA)(Atg)/EPD added that the traffic noise standard for residential premises in HKPSG had been adopted for years, and at the time when the three housing estates were ready for occupation, the traffic conditions were different from those at present. The increase in traffic flow would also aggravate the noise problem.

(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC264/18-19\(01\)](#) on 11 July 2019.)

61. Mr LUK Chung-hung expressed support for the proposed noise barrier project. He enquired whether the Administration would, at an early stage, consider constructing noise barriers along Long Tin Road near the ex-Long Bin Interim Housing site, so as to ensure that residents moving into the public housing redeveloped after the demolition of the above interim housing ("the proposed public housing project") would not be affected by the traffic noise from Long Tin Road. Mr LUK further said that if it was decided only later that noise barriers should be retrofitted at that location, the Administration should be responsible for the resultant increase in the project cost. Mr Tony TSE also opined that retrofitting noise barriers at the location of existing developments would not only increase the project cost and the duration of construction, but the noise barriers so retrofitted would also be difficult to harmonize with the surrounding environment. Therefore, the

Administration should be forward-looking in its town planning in order to avoid retrofitting noise barriers again in future.

62. Ms Alice MAK said that she was supportive of the proposed noise barrier project. She was concerned whether the Administration had considered the possibility that some previously unaffected residential units might otherwise be exposed to traffic noise after the retrofitting of noise barriers; and whether the design of the proposed public housing project would undermine the effectiveness of the noise barriers on Long Tin Road in reducing traffic noise.

63. PM(MW)/HyD and CE(3)(MW)/HyD responded that the proposed noise barrier project would enter the construction stage, whereas the proposed public housing project was still at the planning stage. As the most effective way to tackle traffic noise was to avoid exposing the dwellings to noise through appropriate designs (e.g. building setback) at the planning stage, the Housing Department would consider various noise mitigation measures while planning the proposed public housing project. AD(EA)(Atg)/EPD added that having regard to the environmental constraints of the site concerned, the Administration had decided the types of noise barriers to be constructed on Long Tin Road. Furthermore, though dwellings on higher floors were less likely to benefit from the proposed noise barrier project, the project would not increase the noise level in these dwellings.

Works Arrangements

64. Mr Gary FAN noted that the proposed noise barrier project would generate a total of about 17 300 tonnes of construction waste, and 29% of the inert construction waste would be reused on site. He enquired whether the percentage of inert construction waste from public works being reused on site roughly remained at this level; and whether the Administration would include any clauses in the works contract to encourage the contractor to deliver construction waste generated from other construction sites for reuse in the site of the proposed project.

65. PM(MW)/HyD replied that the Administration would include clauses in the works contract to encourage the contractor to transport the construction waste to different sites for reuse. However, the relevant arrangements should tie in with the schedules of different projects in using the inert construction waste. Otherwise, the construction waste would be transported to public fill reception facilities for subsequent use. Moreover, the percentage of construction waste being reused on site depended on the nature of the projects concerned. Taking the proposed noise barrier project as an example, the reuse percentage was not high and the construction waste

generated during the construction of foundation was mainly used for backfilling.

66. Mr LUK Chung-hung enquired about the traffic impact on Long Tin Road when the proposed noise barrier project was in progress. PM(MW)/HyD responded that the Administration would specify in the works contract that the contractor should not close Long Tin Road to traffic for works implementation during peak traffic hours, with a view to minimizing the traffic impact caused by the project.

67. Mr Jeremy TAM said that as it was the Government's prevailing policy that noise barriers would only be retrofitted on government land, private land would not be acquired for the relevant works. Thus, even with the consent of the owners' corporation of a housing estate, the Administration would not retrofit noise barriers in the common area owned by the owners' corporation. Mr TAM opined that this policy was questionable, and he requested the relevant government departments to follow it up after the meeting.

Voting on PWSC(2019-20)4

68. There being no further questions on the item from members, the Chairman put [PWSC\(2019-20\)4](#) to vote. At the request of members, the Chairman ordered a division. Sixteen members voted for the proposal, no member voted against it, and six members abstained. The votes of individual members were as follows:

For:

Mr Charles Peter MOK (Deputy Chairman)	Ms Starry LEE
Mr Frankie YICK	Mr MA Fung-kwok
Mr CHAN Chi-chuen	Mr CHAN Han-pan
Mr LEUNG Che-cheung	Ms Alice MAK
Mr Alvin YEUNG	Mr HO Kai-ming
Mr Holden CHOW	Dr CHENG Chung-tai
Mr Jeremy TAM	Mr Gary FAN
Mr Vincent CHENG	Ms CHAN Hoi-yan

(16 members)

Against:

(0 member)

Abstained:

Mr WU Chi-wai	Dr Fernando CHEUNG
Dr Helena WONG	Mr CHU Hoi-dick
Mr KWONG Chun-yu	Mr AU Nok-hin

(6 members)

69. The Chairman declared that the item was endorsed by the Subcommittee. The Chairman consulted members on whether this item would require separate voting at the relevant FC meeting. Mr Jeremy TAM requested that this item, i.e. [PWSC\(2019-20\)4](#), be voted on separately at the relevant FC meeting.

Head 704 — Drainage

PWSC(2019-20)8	118CD	Drainage improvement in Northern New Territories - package B (remaining works)
	144CD	Drainage improvement in Southern Hong Kong Island - package 2
	163CD	Drainage improvement works at Ngong Ping
	166CD	Drainage improvement works at Yuen Long

70. The Chairman advised that the proposal, i.e. [PWSC\(2019-20\)8](#), sought to upgrade 118CD, part of 144CD, 163CD and part of 166CD to Category A at the estimated costs of \$65.5 million, \$134.7 million, \$216 million and \$256.2 million in MOD prices respectively for taking forward the drainage improvement works at Tsung Yuen (Kwu Tung North), Pok Fu Lam, Ngong Ping and Yuen Long. The Government consulted the Panel on Development on the proposed works on 26 February 2019. Members of the Panel 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.

144CD — Drainage improvement in Southern Hong Kong Island - package 2

71. Dr Helena WONG urged the Drainage Services Department ("DSD") to consider providing rainwater harvesting facilities in the stormwater drainage system. However, Dr WONG noted that according to the supplementary information paper ([LC Paper No. CB\(1\)901/18-19\(01\)](#)) presented by the Administration to the Panel on Development, apart from the stormwater drainage system at Ngong Ping which would discharge the stormwater collected into Shek Pik Reservoir, the remaining three projects set out in this paper would not be provided with rainwater harvesting facilities. She asked the Administration to explain the reasons for implementing the drainage system in Southern Hong Kong Island. She also asked about the difference in cost between providing the relevant facilities and discharging the stormwater collected to the sea.

72. Director of Drainage Services ("D of DS") advised that DSD would actively consider providing rainwater harvesting facilities at suitable locations. Taking the stormwater drainage system at Ngong Ping as an example, since the system was located within the water gathering grounds, it was cost effective to provide rainwater harvesting facilities there. Conversely, the stormwater drainage system in Southern Hong Kong Island was not located within the water gathering grounds, the water quality of the surface runoff running through these areas was likely to be affected by the pollutants nearby. The amount of rainwater collected, which would be subject to seasonal fluctuations, was rather unstable. In addition, pumping stations would have to be constructed to convey the stormwater collected by the stormwater drainage system to Pok Fu Lam Reservoir, and the costs for operating the pumping stations and other facilities would be enormous in future. Therefore, DSD was of the view that the provision of rainwater harvesting facilities in the area was not cost effective and it had not prepared any cost estimates for the provision of the relevant facilities.

73. Mr AU Nok-hin hoped that the Administration would take forward the drainage improvement works in Southern Hong Kong Island expeditiously. He was concerned whether the Administration had assessed the impact of stormwater discharging to downstream areas of Wah Fu after the construction of stormwater drains under the improvement works. Citing the plan in Annex to Enclosure 2 to the discussion paper showing the location of the proposed stormwater drains under the drainage improvement works in Southern Hong Kong Island, Mr Gary FAN asked the Administration about the reasons for constructing several stormwater drains along the hill, instead of one stormwater drain conveying upstream stormwater directly to Pok Fu Lam Nullah, so as to shorten the length of the proposed stormwater drains.

74. D of DS responded that under the drainage improvement in Southern Hong Kong Island (Package 2), DSD would construct stormwater drains along the horse trail and walking trail located uphill of Pok Fu Lam Village and along Chi Fu Road, so that stormwater would flow downstream via Pok Fu Lam Nullah eventually. The stormwater drains to be constructed following the topography in the uphill areas of Pok Fu Lam Village would be used to collect the stormwater upstream, in order to prevent flooding when stormwater flew into Pok Fu Lam Village. Given that large-scale slope cutting was not required under this approach, the volume of works could be reduced and local ecology be protected. As for the stormwater drains to be constructed along Chi Fu Road, they would be used to solve the problem of inadequate drainage capacity of the existing stormwater drainage system at Pok Fu Lam Village. DSD had conducted computational simulation with

regard to the above improvement works and the findings had revealed that the downstream areas would be not affected.

163CD – Drainage Improvement Works at Ngong Ping

75. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen asked, among the four drainage improvement works mentioned in the paper, why the cost for implementing the environmental mitigation measures under the drainage improvement works at Ngong Ping (\$5.2 million) as well as the proportion of the relevant amount in the entire works were the highest; the details of the above measures and whether funds had been earmarked in the funding proposal for the relevant works to meet the expenditure required for implementing additional environmental mitigation measures (if any).

76. D of DS explained that as the drainage improvement works at Ngong Ping was a designated project under Schedule 2 to the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (Cap. 499), and was required to undergo environmental impact assessment ("EIA") and implement environmental mitigation measures recommended in the approved EIA report, its project cost was thus higher than those of the other three drainage improvement works as set out in the paper, which were not designated projects under Cap. 499.

77. D of DS also advised that a minimum of 200 metres would be maintained between the site for drainage improvement works and areas of Ngong Ping that were zoned sites of special scientific interest. According to the EIA report, the environmental impact of the proposed works could be controlled to within the criteria stated in Cap. 499. However, DSD would still implement environmental mitigation measures which included requesting contractors to engage ecological experts to conduct ecological assessment on the aforesaid sites of special scientific interest before works commencement, so as to ensure species of high ecological values in the areas concerned would not be affected by the works. If ecological assessment revealed that the relevant species might be affected, DSD would consider implementing the necessary environmental mitigation measures (e.g. using quiet-powered mechanical equipment) and the cost for the relevant measures had been included in the funding proposal for the project.

78. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen further asked why DSD would request contractors to conduct an ecological assessment if the EIA report had already confirmed that the environmental impact of the proposed project was manageable and whether there would be a duplication of work processes. D of DS pointed out that while DSD had conducted EIA in accordance with Cap. 499, contractors still had the responsibility to conduct ecological

assessment based on the actual construction arrangement. Other public works projects also adopted the same arrangement.

79. Dr Helena WONG asked whether the Administration had changed the scope of the drainage improvement works at Ngong Ping in order to collect the stormwater for recycling, and whether the cost for the proposed project would be different in light of the change in project scope.

80. D of DS responded that DSD did not change the scope of the drainage improvement works at Ngong Ping. As the stormwater drainage system was located within the water gathering grounds of Shek Pik Reservoir, DSD had planned long ago to use the catchwaters there for discharging stormwater to Shek Pik Reservoir.

81. Mr Holden CHOW expressed his support for the drainage improvement works at Ngong Ping. He relayed the concerns of Island District Council members that a rainstorm in June 2008 had caused serious flooding in areas around Ngong Ping, thus rendering it necessary to carry out the improvement works as soon as possible. However, the project was not commenced until 2019. The drainage improvement works at Yuen Long mentioned in the paper had similarly experienced prolonged delay before works commencement. In this connection, Mr CHOW urged the Administration to take forward other drainage improvement works expeditiously.

82. Principal Assistant Secretary for Development (Works) 5 said that when taking forward drainage improvement works, the Administration would adopt the approach of launching initiatives once they were ready, and he undertook to implement the relevant works as soon as possible.

Other drainage improvement works

83. Mr CHU Hoi-dick asked for a list of drainage improvement works which DSD had planned to carry out in the rural areas throughout the territory, and the basis on which the priorities of the relevant works (including those of smaller scales and incurring lower cost) were determined.

84. D of DS replied that DSD regularly conducted drainage master plan studies for all districts across the territory. Based on the study findings and the established practice of implementing public works projects, DSD was currently considering launching 19 drainage improvement works. As the implementation of improvement works in rural areas involved, among others, land resumption and negotiation with relevant parties, DSD would adopt the

approach of launching initiatives once they were ready when taking forward the projects, and seek funding approval from FC upon consolidating works of similar nature.

85. The Chairman and Mr CHU Hoi-dick asked respectively whether the aforesaid 19 drainage improvement works had already included the four items under the current funding proposal, and whether the cost for each of the 19 projects exceeded \$30 million and hence requiring FC's approval. D of DS advised that the four items under the current funding proposal were not included in these 19 projects and the cost for each project exceeded \$30 million. Mr CHU requested the Administration to provide supplementary information on the 19 items mentioned above as well as their details.

(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC266/18-19\(01\)](#) on 11 July 2019.)

Voting on PWSC(2019-20)8

86. There being no further questions from members on the item, the Chairman put [PWSC\(2019-20\)8](#) to vote. At the request of members, the Chairman ordered a division. Twenty-one members voted for the proposal. No member voted against the proposal or abstained from voting. The votes of individual members were as follows:

For:

Mr Charles Peter MOK (Deputy Chairman)	Ms Starry LEE
Dr Priscilla LEUNG	Ms Claudia MO
Mr Frankie YICK	Mr WU Chi-wai
Mr MA Fung-kwok	Mr CHAN Han-pan
Mr LEUNG Che-cheung	Ms Alice MAK
Dr Helena WONG	Mr Alvin YEUNG
Mr Andrew WAN	Mr HO Kai-ming
Mr Holden CHOW	Dr CHENG Chung-tai
Mr Jeremy TAM	Mr Gary FAN
Mr AU Nok-hin	Mr Vincent CHENG
Ms CHAN Hoi-yan	
(21 members)	

Against:

(0 member)

Abstained:
(0 member)

87. The Chairman declared that the item was endorsed by the Subcommittee. The Chairman consulted members on whether the item would require separate voting at the relevant FC meeting. Mr Gary FAN requested that this item, i.e. [PWSC\(2019-20\)8](#), be voted on separately at the relevant FC meeting.

88. The meeting ended at 12:52 pm.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
2 October 2019