

**立法會**  
***Legislative Council***

LC Paper No. PWSC80/19-20  
(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 5<sup>th</sup> meeting  
held in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex  
on Wednesday, 20 November 2019, 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 CHAN Hak-kan, BBS, JP  
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP  
Hon Claudia MO  
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  
Hon Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung, SBS, JP  
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan  
Hon Alvin YEUNG  
Hon CHU Hoi-dick  
Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP  
Hon HO Kai-ming  
Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding

Hon Wilson OR Chong-shing, MH  
Hon Tanya CHAN  
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, JP  
Hon HUI Chi-fung  
Hon Jeremy TAM Man-ho  
Hon Gary FAN Kwok-wai  
Hon AU Nok-hin  
Hon Vincent CHENG Wing-shun, MH, JP  
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS  
Hon CHAN Hoi-yan

**Member attending:**

Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki

**Members absent:**

Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP  
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung  
Hon LUK Chung-hung, JP  
Hon LAU Kwok-fan, MH  
Dr Hon CHENG Chung-tai  
Hon KWONG Chun-yu

**Public officers attending:**

Mr Howard LEE Man-sing	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) <sup>3</sup>
Mr Vincent MAK Shing-cheung, JP	Deputy Secretary for Development (Works) <sup>2</sup>
Ms Doris HO Pui-ling, JP	Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands) <sup>1</sup>
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)
Mr Victor CHAN Fuk-yiu	Principal Assistant Secretary for Development (Works)2
Mr Wallace TANG Wing-keung	Assistant Secretary for Development (Works Policies 2)4
Mr Michael LEUNG Chung-lap, JP	Project Manager (East) Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr KAN Hon-shing	Chief Engineer (East)3 East Development Office Civil Engineering and Development Department
Miss Ida LAU Hoi-kun	Senior Engineer (East)5 East Development Office Civil Engineering and Development Department

**Clerk in attendance:**

Mr Derek LO	Chief Council Secretary (1)5
-------------	------------------------------

**Staff in attendance:**

Ms Anki NG	Council Secretary (1)5
Ms Michelle NIEN	Legislative Assistant (1)5
Ms Christy YAU	Legislative Assistant (1)8
Ms Clara LO	Legislative Assistant (1)9

---

Action

The Chairman advised that there were four papers for discussion on the agenda for the meeting, all of which were funding proposals carried over from the meetings on 19 June 2019, 6 November 2019 and 13 November 2019. The four funding proposals involved a total funding allocation of \$1,618.6 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 707 – New Towns and Urban Area Development**  
**PWSC(2019-20)19 702CL Kai Tak development – remaining**  
**infrastructure works for developments at**  
**the former runway and south apron**

2. The Chairman advised that the proposal, i.e. [PWSC\(2019-20\)19](#), sought to upgrade part of 702CL to Category A at an estimated cost of \$135.2 million in money-of-the-day ("MOD") prices. The Administration consulted the Panel on Development on the proposed works on 28 May 2019. Members of the Panel did not object 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.

Project cost and details

*Landscaping works and annual recurrent expenditure*

3. Mr Tony TSE expressed support for the proposed project. Referring to paragraphs 8(c) and 12 of [PWSC\(2019-20\)19](#), he enquired about the details of the landscape works, which would cost about \$2.7 million, and the annual recurrent expenditure arising from the proposed works, which was estimated to be about \$3.64 million.

4. Project Manager (East), Civil Engineering and Development Department ("PM(E)/CEDD") replied that Road L10 (Southern Section) and Road L10 (Northern Section), both about 300 metres long, would serve as a district road. As in the case of other infrastructure projects in Kai Tak Development ("KTD"), the recurrent expenditure would mainly be spent on the management, operation and maintenance to be undertaken by various departments. Regarding the landscaping works, as shown in the section (artist's impression) in Enclosure 1 to [PWSC\(2019-20\)19](#), a planting area with a width of about three metres would be provided between the carriageway and the footpath on Road L10 (Northern Section) for greening and landscaping purposes.

5. Principal Assistant Secretary for Development (Works)2 ("PAS(W)2/DEVB") added that the annual recurrent expenditure arising from

the proposed works would mainly be spent on the management, operation and maintenance. Taking the proposed project as an example, the recurrent expenditure would include the maintenance expenditures on roads, drainage, sewerage and water supply systems, as well as greening vegetation. The relevant departments for management and maintenance would review and update the expenditures concerned from time to time.

*Project cost*

6. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen enquired whether the tender exercise for the proposed project had been conducted, whether the present estimated project cost of \$135.2 million was the estimate made by the Administration in June 2019 or the tender price, and whether the project cost had to be re-estimated since half a year had elapsed.

7. PM(E)/CEDD replied that the project costs of Road L10 (Northern Section) and Road L10 (Southern Section) were more or less the same. Calculated in September 2019 prices, they would cost about \$160,000 per metre on average. The tender exercise for the proposed project had been conducted, and the tender price was around \$100 million, which was comparable to the estimated project cost set out in the paper. It was thus not necessary to revise the amount of the funding sought on this occasion.

8. Mr WU Chi-wai enquired whether the cost of the proposed project included that of the communal pipes for underground public utilities. PM(E)/CEDD replied that the conventional open-cut excavation method was usually adopted for carrying out underground utility installation in developed areas as they were subject to greater constraints. Regarding KTD, CEDD had laid the communal pipes for public utilities at some strategic locations such as Kai Tak Bridge, which spanned Kai Tak Approach Channel, with a view to minimizing the impact arising from future day-to-day maintenance on the traffic of major roads. The costs of the communal pipes for the underground public utilities along the proposed Road L10 (Northern Section) and across Route 6 had been included in that of the Trunk Road T2 project, for which funding approval had been obtained from the Finance Committee ("FC").

9. Mr WU Chi-wai also enquired whether the works of the proposed Road L10 (Northern Section) could be included in the coverage of the environmental mitigation measures implemented for the works of the southern section of Trunk Road T2, whether the cost savings could be used in the proposed project, and if the measures covered both projects, whether the problem of double accounting would arise.

10. PM(E)/CEDD replied that part of the works area of the proposed project overlapped with the temporary works area of the Trunk Road T2 project. Including these two projects under one works contract could better facilitate and coordinate their implementation in various aspects, including conducting environmental mitigation measures. The relevant costs required were covered in the funding application for the present project, and synergistic effect was also reflected in the tender price. As breakdown items were clearly set out in the contract for the Trunk Road T2 project and the proposed project, the problem of double accounting would not arise.

*Lump-sum contract*

11. Mr CHU Hoi-dick noted from paragraph 11 of [PWSC\(2019-20\)19](#) that the proposed works under the present project and those under 785TH would be delivered under one lump-sum contract. Pointing out that the funding application for the Trunk Road T2 project had been approved by FC, but that for the present project had not been approved, he enquired about the actual delivery of the proposed works and the reasons for delivering them under a lump-sum contract.

12. PM(E)/CEDD replied that the temporary works area of the Trunk Road T2 project overlapped with part of the works area of the proposed project. Including these two projects under one contract could better coordinate their implementation. After FC granted funding approval for the present project, the Administration would then instruct the contractor to carry out the relevant works. The main reasons for adopting a lump-sum contract were that the proposed works were relatively simple road and infrastructure works, and that since the relevant site investigation had been conducted during the design stage, unforeseen ground conditions were unlikely to be encountered. Given the high degree of certainty about the number of works items under the proposed project, it was appropriate to deliver the works under a lump-sum contract.

13. Referring to LC Paper No. CB(1)1157/18-19(01), Mr Gary FAN said that according to the supplementary information provided by the Administration after the meeting of the Panel on Development held on 28 May 2019, the Project Cost Management Office ("PCMO") had given views on the cost and design of the proposed project, and considered that the design and cost estimate of the proposed project were reasonable. Also, CEDD had adopted PCMO's suggestion to implement the proposed works together with the construction of Trunk Road T2 and Cha Kwo Ling Tunnel under a lump-sum contract in order to lower the costs of the relevant works. He enquired about the works items with reduced costs and the amount of cost savings, whether PCMO, in arriving at its views, had taken into account that

engaging one contractor for the two projects might result in transfer of costs between the projects and cost overruns, and how to monitor and eradicate such situations. Ms Claudia MO enquired whether the provision for contingencies could be used to cover cost overruns.

14. PM(E)/CEDD replied that part of the works area of the proposed project overlapped with the temporary works area of the Trunk Road T2 project. If the projects were not implemented under one works contract, the contractors of the two projects might have problems with coordinating and facilitating the works in future, which might increase the risk of works delay. Therefore, the present approach of including the two projects under one contract could better facilitate and coordinate their implementation. Since the relevant site investigation had been conducted for the proposed works during the design stage, the Administration, with a better grasp of the ground conditions, considered it appropriate to deliver the proposed works under a lump-sum contract.

15. PAS(W)2/DEVB added that under a lump-sum contract, funding for works was granted in a lump sum. In the contract for the proposed project and the Trunk Road T2 and Cha Kwo Ling Tunnel project, there were detailed plans setting out clearly the respective scopes and details of works under the two projects. The resident site staff ("RSS") would calculate and make payment of the relevant costs of the projects carefully according to the works plans and contract provisions to ensure that no costs would be double counted. RSS would be responsible for monitoring and supervising the works. They would also vigorously scrutinize works progress and arrange payment of the relevant project costs according to the works plans. Contingencies were set aside to cater for unforeseen situations arising during the construction stage. The Administration considered the estimated cost of the proposed project reasonable and sufficient to meet the relevant works costs under the contract.

16. Dr KWOK Ka-ki enquired whether the tender exercises for the proposed project and the Trunk Road T2 and Cha Kwo Ling Tunnel project were conducted one after another or concurrently; and if they were conducted one after another, whether the contractor who had won the bid for the first project could easily win the bid for the second project, rendering it unfair to other contractors. He also asked, in the event of delays or accidents, how the two projects under the lump-sum contract would be differentiated in terms of liabilities. Ms Claudia MO enquired about the procedure for separating the two projects.

17. PAS(W)2/DEVB replied that the lump-sum contract mentioned in the paper was one that covered the Trunk Road T2 project and the proposed

project. The proposed works, which fell within a section subject to excision under the contract, would not commence until the Administration issued clear instructions to the contractor upon funding approval. Members might also regard the contract as consisting of two parts, i.e. works relating to the Trunk Road T2 and Cha Kwo Ling Tunnel project, for which funding approval had been obtained from FC, and the proposed works under 702CL. Since both parts would be undertaken by the same contractor, the contractor would be liable for any accidents involved in and arising from the delivery of the works.

*Estimated consultants' fees and resident site staff costs*

18. Referring to Enclosure 2 to [PWSC\(2019-20\)19](#), Mr Jeremy TAM enquired why a multiplier of 1.6 was applied to the average Master Pay Scale ("MPS") salary point to arrive at the estimated RSS costs; whether the application of the multiplier had anything to do with, or the fees so arrived was comparable to, the benefits for civil servants, etc.; why the estimated RSS costs were not covered in other breakdown items such as contingencies; given that the estimated consultants' fees for contract administration were also broken down to the costs of professional and technical staff, why a multiplier of 1.6 was not applied to the average MPS salary point to arrive at the fees; and what the symbol "#" next to the estimated cost figures meant.

19. Chief Engineer (East)3, East Development Office, CEDD replied that the Administration applied a multiplier of 1.6 to the average MPS salary point (the average MPS salary points of professional and technical staff being 38 and 14 respectively) to arrive at the estimated costs of RSS to be provided by the consultants, which included indirect costs such as fringe benefits (including housing allowance and medical insurance) to be provided for the relevant RSS. The methods for estimating consultants' fees for contract administration and RSS costs were different. The former was estimated based on the tender price of the consultancy agreement relating to the project, and would cover the contract administration services to be provided by the consultants during the construction stage.

20. PAS(W)2/DEVB added that the consultants' fees for contract administration were determined according to the mechanism stipulated in the contract. Regarding works supervision, apart from management functions performed by the consultants, the involvement of RSS would also be required. In estimating RSS costs, the Administration would take into account their seniority and benefits, and adopt its usual practice, i.e. applying a multiplier to the average MPS salary point, where the multiplier served to reflect the relevant indirect costs.



21. PM(E)/CEDD advised that in Enclosure 2 to the paper, the symbol "#" next to the estimated cost figures meant that those figures were shown in constant prices. RSS costs were estimated to be \$11 million, comprising \$1 million for the consultants' fees for managing RSS, and \$10 million for the remuneration of RSS. The estimates in Enclosure 2 were calculated in September 2018 prices, while those in paragraph 8 of the paper were calculated in MOD prices. Therefore, the Administration tagged the relevant cost figures in Enclosure 2 with a symbol, supplemented by a remark to explain the difference for LegCo Members' reference.

22. At the request of Mr Jeremy TAM, the Administration would provide supplementary written information in the light of Mr TAM's enquiries.

*(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC50/19-20\(01\)](#) on 18 December 2019.)*

23. Ms Claudia MO enquired why the estimated consultants' fees included the consultants' fees for contract administration. PAS(W)2/DEVB replied that the consultants' fees for contract administration were the fees to be paid to engineering consultants for handling issues relating to the contract during the construction stage, such as providing recommendations and support on the design during the construction stage. RSS would be stationed on works sites to handle the daily work on the sites, and supervise the delivery of the works in accordance with contract requirements.

#### Works and project design

24. Referring to Enclosure 1 to [PWSC\(2019-20\)19](#), Mr Tony TSE enquired about the works concerning the proposed/re-construction of footpath and the footpath proposed to be improved as shown in the location plan of the project, and whether the Administration would have new ideas or considerations on the design of roadside railings in the light of the recent social movements.

25. PM(E)/CEDD replied that the improvement works near Lam Chak Street and Kai Hing Road were carried out to dovetail with the development of the planned commercial and residential sites in their vicinity. Moreover, the design of street furniture such as paving blocks of footpaths, streetlights and street name signs would incorporate features that would harmonize with the street design of KTD in order to enhance the walking environment nearby. At the request of Mr Tony TSE, the Administration would provide supplementary written information after the meeting on the considerations in designing roadside railings.

*(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC50/19-20\(01\)](#) on 18 December 2019.)*

26. In respect of the commercial and residential development sites adjacent to the proposed Road L10 and on both sides of Kai Hing Road, Ms Tanya CHAN and Ms Claudia MO enquired about their estimated construction floor area, the number of units to be built, the total pedestrian volume and traffic volume to be accommodated, and the number of parking spaces to be provided. Ms CHAN also enquired whether the provision of additional parking spaces in KTD would be dealt with comprehensively under the whole development project or under individual proposed projects.

27. PM(E)/CEDD replied that the commercial site to the south of the proposed Road L10 (Northern Section) as marked in Enclosure 1 was planned in accordance with the Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan ("OZP"). As the site had an area of about 2.8 hectares and a plot ratio of about 5.8, the permissible floor areas for office and retail uses were estimated to be about 148 000 square metres and 14 000 square metres respectively. To the west of the southern end of Kai Hing Road was a residential site, while to the east were a commercial site and an open space site. The proposed works on Kai Hing Road could dovetail with the surrounding residential and commercial developments. Based on the planning and plot ratios for the sites concerned under OZP, it was estimated that around 1 100 residential units could be built on the site to the west of Kai Hing Road, and the permissible commercial floor area of the commercial site to the east would be around 187 000 square metres. However, since part of the commercial site had been approved by the Town Planning Board ("TPB") for residential development, its future development would be subject to the decision of the relevant developer.

28. Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)<sup>1</sup> added that under OZP, the two commercial sites would have a total area of about 3.2 hectares and a maximum plot ratio of 9.5. Their total floor area was estimated to be about 300 000 square metres, subject to whether their development scale would be limited by the height restriction imposed on them. As regards the provision of additional parking spaces, when the owners of the commercial sites concerned made an application to TPB for redevelopment, the Transport Department would request for the provision of additional parking spaces in the light of the development scale, so as to cope with the additional demand.

Traffic implications of the proposed works

29. Ms Tanya CHAN enquired whether the proposed Road L10 (Northern Section) would provide access to the Hong Kong Children's Hospital ("HKCH") and the large New Acute Hospital ("NAH"), and given that the proposed Road L10 would also be connected with the Central Kowloon Route, whether the Administration had taken into account the relevant traffic load and transport arrangements.

30. PAS(W)2/DEVB replied that the proposed Road L10 (Southern Section) would be located in front of NAH, and its foundation construction works were underway. Road 10 (Southern Section) would provide pedestrian and vehicle access to NAH to cater for the development of NAH. Road L10 (Northern Section) would dovetail with the future development of the surrounding commercial sites. The relevant traffic impact assessment had been conducted under the review study on the proposed increase in the development intensity of KTD. The assessment findings showed that the capacity of the proposed project would be sufficient to cope with the additional traffic needs arising from the full development of KTD, including HKCH and NAH.

Environmental implications of the proposed works

31. Referring to paragraph 8(d) of [PWSC\(2019-20\)19](#), Mr Tony TSE enquired whether the environmental mitigation measures, which would cost around \$2.8 million, were for mitigating the environmental impact during the construction stage. At the request of Mr TSE, the Administration would provide supplementary written information after the meeting.

*(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC50/19-20\(01\)](#) on 18 December 2019.)*

32. Referring to paragraph 20 of [PWSC\(2019-20\)19](#), Mr CHAN Chi-chuen enquired why the proposed works would generate a large quantity (about 57 400 tonnes) of construction waste; given that, among such waste, only about 11 300 tonnes (20%) of inert construction waste would be reused, whether the remaining some 40 000 tonnes of inert construction waste would be disposed of at landfills; and whether transporting a large quantity of construction waste would have impact on the traffic flow and environmental hygiene of the nearby areas. Referring to paragraph 18 of [PWSC\(2019-20\)19](#), Mr Jeremy TAM enquired about the Administration's measures to encourage the contractor to maximize the use of non-timber

formwork, such as whether this would be reflected by the scores of the relevant tenders.

33. PM(E)/CEDD replied that the proposed works would entail the provision of drainage and sewerage systems, water supplies pipes, etc. under the ground. The inert construction waste to be generated from the works would not be disposed of at landfills. Some 40 000 tonnes of it would be delivered to public fill reception facilities for use in future projects when necessary. It was expected that there would not be many dump trucks, and they would avoid using the roads outside HKCH, such as Shing Cheong Road and Cheung Yip Street, as far as possible. The dump trucks would also have their wheels washed before leaving works sites to avoid debris being brought onto nearby roads. The Administration would encourage the contractor to use non-timber formwork. For example, if the contractor used the relevant materials in the proposed works, this would be considered and reflected in the contractor performance assessment to be conducted by the relevant departments.

34. Noting that the Administration often used shrubs for amenity planting, but they were not easy to maintain in the long term and caused nuisance to the environment, Mr WU Chi-wai urged the Administration to use suitable trees or plants for amenity planting under the proposed project and future projects, and consider roadside greening works in the light of the standards prescribed in CEDD's Greening Master Plan.

35. PM(E)/CEDD replied that since Kai Tak was a coastal area, the plants to be grown there should be wind-tolerant and suitable for coastal environment. The Administration proposed to grow *Elaeocarpus balansae* within the boundary of the proposed works, and would continue to refine the design of the landscaping works in KTD with reference to the guidelines updated from time to time. PAS(W)2/DEVB added that the greening works would be considered in the light of the guidelines updated by the Development Bureau from time to time. The guidelines set out the species and distribution of the plants to be grown in different areas. For example, besides shrubs, consideration could also be given to growing other plants in KTD to cater for the environmental needs on both sides of the harbour. Moreover, the Administration would consider factors such as the care and maintenance of local plants in choosing which plants to be grown.

36. Mr WU Chi-wai enquired about the work involved in the environmental mitigation measures and the purposes of erecting movable noise barriers and enclosures. PM(E)/CEDD replied that the environmental mitigation measures mainly covered noise, dust and sewage mitigation. The temporary noise barriers were erected to reduce the noise impact on the

sensitive facilities nearby such as HKCH. Regular watering would be performed on works sites and dump trucks would have their wheels washed before leaving the sites to minimize dust generation. As the proposed works would be carried out near Kai Tak Approach Channel, the relevant departments would use temporary drains to discharge the surface runoff of the works sites, which would be properly treated before discharging into the public stormwater collection system.

*[At 10:27 am, the Chairman asked members whether they agreed to extend the meeting by 15 minutes to 10:45 am. No member raised any objection.]*

#### Concerns over the withdrawal of 29EK (PWSC(2019-20)20)

37. Regarding the Administration's withdrawal of the item 29EK (PWSC(2019-20)20), i.e. Library extension and revitalization of The Hong Kong Polytechnic University ("PolyU"), from the agenda for the meeting on 20 November 2019, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen and Mr CHU Hoi-dick noted from the Administration's letter to the Chairman on the withdrawal of the item (LC Paper No. PWSC27/19-20(01)) that PolyU would need to review the timetable of the project, and the Administration would determine the timing of the re-submission of the item to the Subcommittee when the outcome of the review was available. Mr CHAN enquired whether the Administration would temporarily withdraw all the public works projects which were affected by the social events, what the relevant principles were, and whether it would submit the PolyU funding application only after the events came to an end. Mr CHU enquired whether PolyU would directly provide a written response to the Subcommittee on how the social events affected the timetable of the project concerned, and when the funding application would be re-submitted.

38. Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury)3 ("DS(Tsy)3/FSTB") replied that the Administration needed to determine the timing of the funding application for a public works project having regard to the necessity and actual circumstances of the project. The Administration hoped to expeditiously implement the projects that were genuinely necessary and had undergone the relevant procedures. There was no rigid requirement that all projects which were affected by the social events would be temporarily withdrawn. Regarding certain projects such as the PolyU project, after discussion between the relevant policy bureau and PolyU, the latter indicated that it had to review the timetable of the project concerned so that it could consider the logistical arrangements for various works and the impact on its operation. As a result, the Administration decided to temporarily withdraw the item. It would expeditiously re-submit the

funding proposal to the Subcommittee for consideration after the review and further discussion with PolyU.

39. To address the concern of LegCo Members, the Administration would, in consultation with PolyU, provide a written response to explain the withdrawal of the library extension and revitalization of PolyU.

*(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC61/19-20\(01\)](#) on 2 January 2020.)*

Motion to adjourn the discussion on PWSC(2019-20)19

40. At 9:31 am, Mr Jeremy TAM, when speaking on the agenda item, moved without notice under paragraph 33 of the Public Works Subcommittee Procedure that the discussion on [PWSC\(2019-20\)19](#) be adjourned. The Chairman proposed the question on the motion, and directed that each member might speak once on the motion for not more than three minutes.

41. Mr Jeremy TAM expressed dissatisfaction with the manner in which the Chairman presided over the Subcommittee meeting and the Administration's temporary withdrawal of the library extension and revitalization of PolyU. Therefore, he moved the motion to adjourn the discussion on this agenda item.

42. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Ms Tanya CHAN, Mr Gary FAN and Mr WU Chi-wai spoke in support of Mr Jeremy TAM's motion. These members said that when the Administration provided PolyU's response on the temporary withdrawal of the item, they would know whether it had withdrawn the item on political grounds. They also expressed dissatisfaction that the proposal for PolyU's campus expansion at Ho Man Tin Slope had not been put to vote and approved probably on political grounds at the FC meeting on the previous Friday, and took the view that the Administration and the pro-establishment Members had withdrawn the item with the aim of punishing PolyU and its students. Regarding Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's enquiry, the Clerk to the Subcommittee responded that if the motion to adjourn the discussion on this agenda item was passed, the subsequent items on the agenda would be dealt with at this meeting according to their order on the agenda. The Administration could subsequently re-submit the proposed project to the Subcommittee, with sufficient notice and in a timely manner, for consideration at another meeting.

43. Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr Junius HO, Ms CHAN Hoi-yan and Mr Vincent CHENG spoke against Mr Jeremy

TAM's motion. These members considered that members should return to a rational discussion and endorse the funding proposal for the proposed project because failing to do so would render the works unable to commence, undermining the livelihood of construction workers. They also opined that the Administration's temporary withdrawal of the PolyU funding proposal enabled PolyU to review the extent of damage to the campus and the necessary arrangements to be made. Since this matter was not related to the funding proposals for KTD projects, it should not affect the funding applications for and the progress of KTD projects and other projects.

44. DS(Tsy)3/FSTB responded that the Administration temporarily withdrew the funding proposal for the PolyU library because PolyU needed more time to review the operation of the works, and it had nothing to do with political grounds. After the review and further discussion with PolyU, the Administration would expeditiously re-submit the funding application for the project to the Subcommittee for consideration. PAS(W)2/DEVB also advised that since the proposed project had to dovetail with other projects under the KTD scheme, the Administration hoped that the funding application for the project could be approved as soon as possible.

45. Mr Jeremy TAM gave his reply. The Chairman put to vote the motion to adjourn discussion. Five members voted for, and nine members voted against the motion. The motion was negatived.

Voting on PWSC(2019-20)19

46. There being no further questions from members on the item, the Chairman put PWSC(2019-20)19 to vote. At the request of members, the Chairman ordered a division. 21 members voted for, and no member voted against the proposal. Five members abstained from voting. The votes of individual members were as follows:

*For:*

Mr Charles MOK (Deputy Chairman)	Mr Tommy CHEUNG
Mr CHAN Hak-kan	Dr Priscilla LEUNG
Mr Frankie YICK	Mr WU Chi-wai
Mr MA Fung-kwok	Mr CHAN Han-pan
Mr Christopher CHEUNG	Dr Helena WONG
Mr Junius HO	Mr HO Kai-ming
Mr Holden CHOW	Mr Wilson OR
Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan	Mr HUI Chi-fung
Mr Gary FAN	Mr AU Nok-hin
Mr Vincent CHENG	Mr Tony TSE
Mr CHAN Hoi-yan	
(21 members)	



*Against:*  
(0 member)

*Abstained:*  
Ms Claudia MO  
Mr Alvin YEUNG  
Mr Jeremy TAM  
(5 members)

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen  
Ms Tanya CHAN

47. The Chairman declared that the item was endorsed by the Subcommittee. When the Chairman asked members whether the item needed to be voted on separately at the relevant FC meeting, no member raised this request. After the Chairman had declared the end of the meeting, Mr Jeremy TAM requested that the item, i.e. [PWSC\(2019-20\)19](#), be voted on separately at the relevant FC meeting.

48. The meeting ended at 10:45 am.

Council Business Division 1  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
23 January 2020