

**立法會**  
***Legislative Council***

LC Paper No. PWSC147/20-21  
(These minutes have been seen  
by the Administration)

Ref: CB1/F/2/1(18)B

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

**Minutes of the 18<sup>th</sup> meeting  
held in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex  
on Wednesday, 2 June 2021, at 8:30 am**

**Members present:**

Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS, JP (Chairman)  
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, SBS, MH, JP (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP  
Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, GBS, JP  
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP  
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP  
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, SBS, JP  
Hon MA Fung-kwok, GBS, JP  
Hon CHAN Han-pan, BBS, JP  
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, SBS, MH, JP  
Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP  
Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP  
Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding  
Hon Wilson OR Chong-shing, MH  
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, JP  
Hon LUK Chung-hung, JP  
Hon LAU Kwok-fan, MH  
Dr Hon CHENG Chung-tai  
Hon Vincent CHENG Wing-shun, MH, JP

**Member attending:**

Hon SHIU Ka-fai, JP

**Public officers attending:**

Mr Howard LEE Man-sing	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) <sup>3</sup>
Mr LAM Sai-hung, JP	Permanent Secretary for Development (Works)
Mr Vic YAU Cheuk-hang, JP	Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands) (Acting)
Ms Maisie CHENG Mei-sze, JP	Permanent Secretary for the Environment
Ms Margaret HSIA Mai-chi	Principal Assistant Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) (Works)
Mrs Millie NG KIANG Mei-nei, JP	Deputy Secretary for the Environment
Mr Andy CHAN Siu-wing	Assistant Director of Environmental Protection (Environmental Infrastructure)
Mr Jemuel NG Kwok-fai	Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Waste Transfer and Development) Environmental Protection Department
Ms Mable CHAN Mei-ho	Senior Environmental Protection Officer (Landfill Restoration and Afteruse) <sup>2</sup> Environmental Protection Department

Mr Stephen IP Shing-tak	Chief Technical Adviser (Subvented Projects) Architectural Services Department
Dr CHUI Tak-yi, JP	Under Secretary for Food and Health
Ms Maisie HO Mei-chi	Principal Assistant Secretary for Food and Health (Health) <sup>5</sup>
Dr Cissy CHOI Yu-sze	Head (Primary Healthcare Office) Food and Health Bureau
Ms Winnie HO Wing-yin, JP	Director of Architectural Services
Ms Athena FUNG Chi-shan	Chief Project Manager 101 Architectural Services Department
Dr Teresa LI Mun-pik	Assistant Director of Health (Health Administration and Planning)
Mr CHEN Che-kong, JP	Assistant Director of Environmental Protection (Water Policy)
Ms Katherine KOH Kai-han	Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Sewerage Infrastructure) (Acting) Environmental Protection Department
Ms Alice PANG, JP	Director of Drainage Services
Ms Carol HO Ka-yee	Chief Engineer (Consultants Management) Drainage Services Department
Mr CHOI Chun-ming	Principal Project Coordinator (Special Duty) Drainage Services Department

**Attendance by invitation:**

Mr Albert SU Yau-on	Chief Executive Tung Wah Group of Hospitals
---------------------	--

Mr Bernard FUNG Tak-kei	Head of Property Division Tung Wah Group of Hospitals
Ms Alice LEUNG Bick-king	Head of Community Services Division Tung Wah Group of Hospitals
Mr Michael SIN Ka-chung	Executive Director Spence Robinson Limited
Mr Anderson CHAN Man-hong	Director Rider Levett Bucknall Limited

**Clerk in attendance:**

Mr Daniel SIN	Chief Council Secretary (1)6
---------------	------------------------------

**Staff in attendance:**

Mr Keith WONG	Senior Council Secretary (1)2
Ms Mandy LI	Senior Council Secretary (1)6
Miss Judy YEE	Council Secretary (1)6
Ms Christina SHIU	Legislative Assistant (1)2
Ms Christy YAU	Legislative Assistant (1)8
Ms Clara LO	Legislative Assistant (1)9

---

Action

The Chairman advised that there were five papers for discussion on the agenda for the meeting. The first to third funding proposals were items carried over from the last meeting held on 20 May 2021, while the fourth and fifth proposals were new submissions from the Administration. The five funding proposals involved a total funding allocation of \$2,504.4 million. He reminded members that in accordance with Rule 83A of the Rules of Procedure ("RoP") of the Legislative Council, 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 708 — Capital Subventions

### **PWSC(2021-22)16 2QE Restored Landfill Revitalisation Funding Scheme — E-Co Village at Lot B of Tseung Kwan O Stage I Landfill**

2. The Chairman advised that the proposal (i.e. [PWSC\(2021-22\)16](#)) sought to upgrade 2QE to Category A at an estimated cost of \$92.6 million in money-of-the-day ("MOD") prices. The Administration consulted the Panel on Environmental Affairs on the proposed works on 23 November 2020. 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.

#### Facilities and activities planned for the camp site-cum-green education ground

3. Mr Vincent CHENG expressed support for the proposal. He commented that to increase the attractiveness of the camp site-cum-green education ground ("E-Co Village"), consideration could be given to promoting selected environmental protection themes to provide diverse information for the public. Mr CHENG suggested that the successful model adopted by T-Park in Tuen Mun should be drawn as a reference for E-Co Village.

4. Chief Executive, Tung Wah Group of Hospitals ("CE/TWGHs"), replied that E-Co Village, expected to be commissioned in 2023, adopted the theme of zero carbon lifestyles. Different types of energy conservation features (such as photovoltaic system and mobile chargers) and recycling systems (such as using grey water recycling system for landscape irrigation) would be adopted in E-Co Village, while upcycling activities would be held to give users first-hand experience in zero carbon lifestyles. Moreover, Tung Wah Group of Hospitals ("TWGHs") planned to plant local species of trees and flowering plants in E-Co Village for public appreciation. The team responsible for activity planning in E-Co Village was still in the process of devising the activities to be organized there.

5. Dr CHENG Chung-tai sought details of the land licensing terms for operating E-Co Village, including the operation period of E-Co Village and the points to note about the use of facilities therein. In particular, Dr CHENG expressed concern as to whether naked flame would be allowed in E-Co Village. He considered that banning of naked flame would limit the variety of activities that could be carried out in the camping areas and asked why the rules on the use of naked flame varied from one restored landfill to another. For example, naked flame was allowed in Ma Tso Lung Campsite.

6. Mr LEUNG Che-cheung supported the Administration's development of a camp site and green education at a restored landfill. As land was precious in Hong Kong, he considered that in future the Administration should consider whether land should be handed to non-governmental organizations for operation again, since the revenue generated by such operation was relatively low. Mr LEUNG sought details of the activities planned to be organized in E-Co Village, in particular whether the use of naked flame by visitors would be restricted. He held the view that banning of naked flame would limit the variety of activities that could be carried out in E-Co Village.

7. Noting that E-Co Village would be built at Tseung Kwan O Stage I Landfill, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok expressed concern about the progress of removing the odour and landfill gas at the location.

8. Deputy Secretary for the Environment ("DSEN") responded that the site of Tseung Kwan O Stage I Landfill was allocated to the Environmental Protection Department ("EPD") by the Lands Department ("LandsD") for restoration and afteruse until 2028. Under the Restored Landfill Revitalisation Funding Scheme ("the Funding Scheme"), EPD planned to grant a land licence to TWGHs for a licensing period of about seven years (with expiry date in 2028) for development and operation of E-Co Village. The Administration would discuss with TWGHs about the extension of the land licence before its expiry if the operation was satisfactory.

9. Regarding the odour and landfill gas in E-Co Village, DSEN said that EPD normally kept monitoring each restored landfill for 20 to 30 years to ensure the proper operation of the aftercare works, such as the landfill gas management system and the surface water drainage system. After Tseung Kwan O Stage I Landfill had ceased operation, EPD carried out comprehensive restoration works (e.g. provision of landfill gas and leachate management systems) there and conducted environmental monitoring (e.g. measuring the concentration of methane, a landfill gas) to confirm its safety for beneficial afteruses. Currently, there was no odour at the landfill. Moreover, according to the Administration's latest measurement, the annual average concentration of methane at the surface of the site was 3 parts per million ("ppm"), which was far lower than the safety standard of 10 000 ppm. Nonetheless, for the safety of E-Co Village and of users, a series of conditions were stipulated under the land licence to govern the activities to be carried out at the restored landfill. For example, naked flame (including cooking with naked flame) and smoking were prohibited and space should be allowed between the erected structures and the landfill surface to help air circulation, so that good ventilation could be maintained and no danger would be posed to the users of E-Co Village even if a tiny amount of methane was released into the air. DSEN and CE/TWGHs added that E-Co Village would be provided

with green and energy conservation features in support of the drive towards "carbon neutrality". That included the photovoltaic system, solar hot water system and cooking equipment and solar-powered light fittings to give visitors first-hand experience in zero carbon lifestyles through using such facilities.

10. Assistant Director of Environmental Protection (Environmental Infrastructure) ("AD(EI)/EPD") supplemented that EPD granted land licences which stipulated the points to note that governed the use of restored landfill sites under the delegated authority from LandsD with regard to the conditions of individual sites. Under the other land licences that had been granted for the restored Tseung Kwan O Stage I Landfill, development of recreational facilities at the site was allowed by LandsD. If TWGHs came up with other innovative uses during its future operation of E-Co Village, the Administration would consider whether appropriate arrangements could be made accordingly under the land licence.

11. Regarding the activities planned to be organized in E-Co Village, CE/TWGHs responded that TWGHs planned to promote green education through a variety of activities. Apart from the provision of camping areas and adventure zones, activities aimed at driving home the message of environmental protection would be organized throughout the year, in addition to special activities for parents and children on holidays. The day-time activities currently planned included adventure training and zero carbon lifestyles experience while night-time activities would include stargazing. Since E-Co Village featured an environmental protection theme, the use of solar power in place of naked flame was in line with the points to note governing the use of the site and echoed with the theme of promoting harmony between humans and the environment.

12. Mr Wilson OR expressed support for the proposal. He remarked that camping was getting more and more popular in Hong Kong, but the camp site of E-Co Village had a capacity for just more than 200 people. Mr OR asked whether TWGHs would consider adjusting the capacity of the camp site and introduce information technology ("IT") facilities to E-Co Village.

13. CE/TWGHs replied that E-Co Village, built on a restored landfill, had a maximum capacity for 300 users at the same time. In designing the capacity of the camping areas and identifying the suitable activities there, TWGHs had considered the service capacities of the facilities in E-Co Village and decided that the number of campers should be capped at 216. He took note of Mr Wilson OR's view and would explore if it was possible to raise the maximum number of campers in the camping areas. As E-Co Village covered a large area and was divided into the upper platform and the lower platform,

TWGHs considered it necessary to adopt IT support facilities to facilitate the communication between users and staff when necessary. He said that TWGHs was also considering ways to step up the use of IT in E-Co Village.

14. Mr MA Fung-kwok expressed support for the proposal, but said that he was worried about the potential implication of the settlement problem at the landfill on the development of E-Co Village. He sought details of the Administration's handling of the settlement problem at the site.

15. AD(EI)/EPD responded that Tseung Kwan O Stage I Landfill had ceased operation for 26 years and settlement had persisted all along. However, the settlement rate had slowed down in recent years. EPD, which monitored the settlement rate at different locations in the area, found that the latest annual settlement rate was about 5 millimetres to 12 millimetres, with an average settlement of less than 1 centimetre per year. As most areas of E-Co Village would be used for open-air activities and camping, the Administration considered the implication of the current settlement rate on E-Co Village insignificant.

#### Operating expenditure of the camp site-cum-green education ground

16. Mr Holden CHOW expressed concern about the measures to be taken by the Administration and TWGHs (e.g. providing Government subsidies or adjusting the levels of various charges in E-Co Village to generate more income) to deal with the situation if E-Co Village was still unable to operate on a self-financing basis after the expiry of its first two years of operation in which funding support was provided by the Funding Scheme to cover its starting costs and operating deficits.

17. Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok expressed support for the proposal so as to utilize the restored landfill for promoting environmental protection. He expressed concern about how TWGHs would ensure that E-Co Village could break even and operate on a self-financing basis after the expiry of the funding support from the Funding Scheme.

18. Mr MA Fung-kwok enquired about the plans TWGHs had to generate more income for E-Co Village, so that it could operate on a self-financing basis.

19. DSEN responded that under the terms and conditions of the Funding Scheme, funding support subject to a ceiling of \$5 million was provided for approved projects to cover their starting costs and operating deficits in the first two years. The projects should operate on a self-financing basis afterwards.



20. CE/TWGHs responded that TWGHs currently operated Ma Tso Lung Campsite in Sheung Shui on a self-financing basis. The fees and charges there were set at an affordable and sustainable level, and could provide reference for the charging levels to be set for E-Co Village. For example, Ma Tso Lung Campsite charged \$120 for use of its vehicle parking spaces and about \$100 per person for use of the campsite. For fee-charging activities, the monthly charge for renting land for gardening and farming was set somewhere above \$100. TWGHs was also willing to support the disadvantaged who were in financial difficulties but interested in using E-Co Village. To ensure E-Co Village would break even, TWGHs planned to organize additional activities on weekends and public holidays there in addition to its regular activities in order to generate more income. Furthermore, TWGHs expected that the green education activities and adventure training provided in E-Co Village would attract group visitors from schools and companies.

21. Dr CHENG Chung-tai enquired whether the operating organization or the Government would be responsible for the repair expenses arising from damage to the erected structures or facilities in E-Co Village if such damage was attributed to defects in some of the Administration's restoration works when the funding support for the first two years had expired.

22. AD(EI)/EPD responded that E-Co Village was managed jointly by the Administration and the operating organization, while the land licence stipulated clearly the division of responsibilities and liabilities between the two parties. Should defects arise in the future in the restoration works and infrastructure, EPD would take up the repair responsibility on an ongoing basis.

23. Mr Wilson OR enquired about the progress of implementing the Funding Scheme (e.g. the restored landfill sites that had been granted to non-profit-making organizations for development and the projects to be operated). In particular, he was concerned about the development progress at the restored Ma Yau Tong Central Landfill.

24. Mr LUK Chung-hung expressed support for the proposal. He noted that a football training centre of the Hong Kong Football Association was also developed at the restored Tseung Kwan O Stage I Landfill with the funding support from the Hong Kong Jockey Club Charities Trust. Like E-Co Village, the football training centre also operated on a self-financing basis. He asked the Administration and TWGHs if they had plans to seek funding from other organizations for development of E-Co Village. Mr LUK also enquired about the progress of extending the Funding Scheme to other restored landfills.

25. DSEN replied that after the launch of Batch 1 of the Funding Scheme, proposals from a number of organizations had been received. After considering the ability and experience of the applicants in carrying out development projects at restored landfills, the Administration had selected TWGHs as the operating organization of Tseung Kwan O Stage I Landfill. She stressed that many technical constraints had to be addressed in carrying out development projects at restored landfills, such as the restrictions on the loading capacity of the landfill and the need of land formation. Neither could the landfill site be used for construction of buildings, so only light-weight facilities with simple structure could be developed there. Furthermore, the organization responsible for the development was also required to build infrastructure at the location, such as water supply, power supply, sewerage and roads. Upon review of the Funding Scheme, the Administration considered that there was a lack of infrastructure at some of the restored landfills that were not yet put to beneficial uses, including Ma Yau Tong Central Landfill and Ma Yau Tong West Landfill. The Administration took the view that a more viable option was to first provide the infrastructure required at the sites before discussing with organizations about the development approach. DSEN responded that while both the football training centre and E-Co Village were located at the restored landfill in Tseung Kwan O and operated by non-profit-making organizations on a self-financing basis, they were different projects. E-Co Village was a project of TWGHs approved under Batch 1 of the Funding Scheme after the scheme was launched in 2015. On the other hand, the football training centre had commenced operation on a self-financing basis well before the launch of the Funding Scheme.

26. CE/TWGHs supplemented that TWGHs had discussed with the Hong Kong Jockey Club about subsidizing part of E-Co Village's green facilities or some of its activities after its opening in 2023. As in other projects of TWGHs, donations from private individuals or organizations would be sought for the operation of E-Co Village if necessary.

#### Voting on PWSC(2021-22)16

27. There being no further questions from members on the item, the Chairman put [PWSC\(2021-22\)16](#) to vote.

28. The item was voted on and endorsed. The Chairman consulted members on whether the item would require separate voting at the relevant meeting of the Finance Committee ("FC"). No member raised such a request.

**Head 703 — Buildings**

**PWSC(2021-22)18 73MC Health Centre and Social Welfare Facilities Building in Siu Sai Wan**

29. The Chairman advised that the proposal (i.e. [PWSC\(2021-22\)18](#)) sought to upgrade 73MC to Category A at an estimated cost of \$616.8 million in MOD prices. The Administration consulted the Panel on Health Services on the proposed works on 9 April 2021. 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.

Location of and transport support for the District Health Centre ("DHC")

30. Mr Michael TIEN expressed objection to the proposed project. He pointed out that it took about half an hour to walk from the proposed Health Centre and Social Welfare Facilities Building ("the Building") to MTR Chai Wan Station, as opposed to the District Health Centres ("DHCs") already planned to be established in three districts (namely Kwai Tsing, Sham Shui Po and Wong Tai Sin) which were located adjacent to MTR stations and easier to access. Mr TIEN doubted if the location of the proposed Building was the best option and was easily accessible by residents in the Eastern District, especially the elderly, mentally handicapped persons and children. He took the view that accessibility was the foremost consideration in establishing DHCs, and enquired about the rationale for providing DHC next to Siu Sai Wan Complex.

31. Under Secretary for Food and Health ("USFH") responded that the Administration was committed to enhancing district-based primary healthcare services by setting up DHCs in 18 districts progressively. As some districts in Hong Kong had long history of development, it was by no means easy to identify suitable sites for establishment of DHCs in various districts across the territory. Internal review would be conducted within the Government to identify suitable government sites in various districts for establishment of DHCs. Generally speaking, stand-alone and permanent structures were the most preferred option for DHC establishment. USFH also said that Eastern DHC located at the Building would serve as the core centre acting as a service hub, complemented by six satellite centres to be set up in each of the sub-districts of the Eastern District. It would also be complemented by a healthcare network of medical and healthcare practitioners in the district with multiple service points. In response to Mr Michael TIEN's further enquiry, USFH said that in addition to the core centres, the Administration would also require the operators of DHCs to set up satellite centres and service points providing primary healthcare services in view of the demographic distribution

in the district. The Administration considered the location of the proposed Building appropriate.

32. In response to Mr Michael TIEN's enquiry about the number of DHCs in Hong Kong, Head (Primary Healthcare Office), Food and Health Bureau, said that Kwai Tsing DHC had commenced operation. Sham Shui Po DHC and Wong Tai Sin DHC were targeted for commencement in June 2021 and June 2022 respectively. Moreover, invitation to tender for the provision of services to operate Tuen Mun DHC was issued.

Admin

33. Mr Michael TIEN enquired about the number of DHCs that were planned to be established and had been granted funding approval by FC but the construction works or operation of which had not yet commenced, as well as the number of DHCs that were in operation and those that would commence operation shortly. He also asked how many DHCs among the above were built at locations that took half an hour to walk from MTR stations. USFH undertook to provide the relevant information after the meeting. He pointed out that the Administration had encountered difficulties in identifying the location for establishing the proposed DHC. The location currently proposed was the only option available in the district that would allow the establishment of a permanent DHC in the shortest possible time. Regarding accessibility, currently 24 bus routes and three public light bus routes were available for the public to access the proposed Building. The Chairman suggested that the Administration should seek to understand the concerns raised by Mr Michael TIEN after the meeting and provide members with the supplementary information to address those concerns before submitting the funding proposal to FC.

34. Dr Junius HO noted that Siu Sai Wan Complex was connected to Siu Sai Wan Plaza by a footbridge. He suggested that a footbridge be built to connect the first floor of the proposed Building to Siu Sai Wan Complex, so that a barrier-free passage would be provided for people to access the proposed DHC after getting off buses at the bus terminus. He also enquired about the provision of parking spaces at the proposed Building.

35. Director of Architectural Services ("DArchS") replied that the construction site of the proposed project was relatively small as it covered an area of only 1 805 square metres. The space on the ground floor level of the Building had been utilized to provide 15 parking spaces for use by private cars and Rehabuses. The Administration had explored the feasibility of constructing a basement at the Building to increase the number of parking spaces. However, the option was far from cost-effective as the small area of the site would mean that the vehicular access leading to the basement and the other supporting facilities would occupy most of the site area, leaving

relatively small area that could be used for parking. For enhancing pedestrian connectivity, the construction of a footbridge connecting to Siu Sai Wan Complex had been considered. However, it was found that no provision was made for such connection when Siu Sai Wan Complex was designed and built 10 years ago. The existing plant rooms and sports venues of Siu Sai Wan Complex were in the way of the access route to be provided by such a footbridge. The Administration had also considered connecting the existing footbridge to the proposed Building directly. However, as the footpaths outside the proposed Building were quite wide, the spot outside its vehicular ingress/egress on the side of Siu Sai Wan Road would become the main location for fire engines to approach, making the section of elevation at that spot important for rescue operation. Provision of a connecting footbridge cutting across that spot would obstruct the fire-fighting and rescue operations carried out there. The Administration gave an account of the various at-grade pedestrian crossing facilities already in place to provide access to the proposed Building.

#### Funding arrangement for the proposed project

36. The Deputy Chairman noted that the proposed scope of the project included a residential care home for the elderly ("RCHE"), a day care centre for the elderly ("DE"), a sub-base for neighbourhood elderly centre ("NEC sub-base") and a supported hostel for mentally handicapped persons ("SHOS(MH)") of the Social Welfare Department ("SWD"). Funding support would be provided by the Lotteries Fund ("LF") for their construction, internal fitting-out works and purchase of furniture and equipment. The Administration would seek funding approval from LF separately in accordance with the existing mechanism. The Deputy Chairman requested the Administration to clarify if the above arrangement was the reason why the construction cost of the proposed project exceeded \$616.8 million.

37. DArchS said that out of the estimated total capital cost of \$616.8 million, about \$217.9 million was the apportioned construction cost for the RCHE, DE, NEC sub-base and SHOS(MH) which would first be funded by the Capital Works Reserve Fund ("CWRF") and then be reimbursed from LF after project completion.

38. The Deputy Chairman expressed confusion about the arrangement of funding the proposed project by both CWRF and LF at the same time. In particular, the Chairman and the Deputy Chairman were concerned whether the funding of \$217.9 million would give rise to duplication of resources. The Deputy Chairman said that the Administration had sought FC's approval for injection into LF. However, the use of LF did not require the endorsement of FC, making it impossible for Members to monitor the use of the public

money. The Chairman requested the Administration to allay members' concern by giving a clear explanation.

39. DArchS said that the Lotteries Fund Advisory Committee granted its support for the funding application of \$217.9 million on 26 May. SWD would later seek approval for project funding from the Financial Services and the Treasury Bureau, which would in turn grant its approval within a month. The Administration would arrange reimbursement of the expenses paid out of CWRP from LF after project completion. DArchS also pointed out that LF was primarily used to meet the capital costs of works projects in connection with the welfare services provided by non-governmental organizations and the Government. As a usual practice, the cost of social welfare facilities involved in public works projects would first be funded by CWRP and then be reimbursed from LF after project completion.

40. Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury)<sup>3</sup> said that both the healthcare facilities and SWD's facilities were included in the proposed project programme to provide Members with comprehensive information about the total expenditure of the proposed project and the facilities provided thereunder. The construction cost of the social welfare facilities under the proposed project would first be funded by CWRP and then be reimbursed from LF after project completion. The controlling officers concerned would ensure the proper use of the funding and avoid any duplication of resources in the proposed project.

Admin

41. The Chairman requested the Administration to provide information to explain the arrangement by which the construction cost of the social welfare facilities under the proposed project was first funded by CWRP before reimbursement was sought separately from LF, so as to enable Members to better understand how the project was funded.

#### Voting arrangement for the item

42. Mr Michael TIEN said that while members had expressed different concerns about the proposed project (including ancillary transport facilities and arrangements), the Administration had not fully addressed their queries. He asked whether a decision should be made only after the Administration had provided the relevant information to explain to members the project details, or the item should be voted on forthwith for the issues to be discussed further at FC's meeting.

43. The Chairman reminded members that under paragraph 24 of the Public Works Subcommittee Procedure, at a meeting of the Public Works

Subcommittee ("the Subcommittee"), a Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) might withdraw an item at any time before it was put to the vote, or by unanimous consent of the Subcommittee after it had been put to the vote but the result was not yet declared by the Chairman.

44. The Deputy Chairman said that the Subcommittee was responsible for examining and making recommendations to FC on the Administration's expenditure proposals for building projects under CWRF. He disagreed that the proposed project should be withdrawn by the Administration. Neither was he convinced that the proposal should be objected to on account of the funding arrangement by which \$217.9 million of the project cost was to be reimbursed from LF to CWRF. The Deputy Chairman also said that as many Members had expressed concerns when the proposal to inject \$1.1 billion into LF was scrutinized at the meeting of FC, the Administration should provide a separate account of the operation of LF and its approval of project funding. The Chairman and the Deputy Chairman considered that the Administration had clarified the funding arrangement for the capital cost of the proposed project at the meeting.

45. The Chairman said that the Administration had not yet provided a thorough reply at the meeting to address Mr Michael TIEN's concerns about the proposed project. It should provide information afterwards for Mr TIEN's reference. Mr TIEN might decide to vote for or against the item if the proposed project was put to vote. Even if the item was endorsed by the Subcommittee, it would be voted on separately at the relevant FC meeting at Mr TIEN's request.

46. Ms Alice MAK pointed out that local residents had yearned for the setting up of the DHC in the community for many years. She urged the Administration to provide comprehensive information to address members' enquiries before submitting the funding proposal to FC. She also said that residents would be attracted to use the services provided at the proposed Building if the services provided therein could meet their needs. Members would also follow up with the Administration on the possible ways to improve the healthcare and welfare services provided at the proposed Building in a timely manner. Ms MAK commented that to cater for the needs of local residents, the Subcommittee should endorse the proposed project as expeditiously as possible, so that the proposed works would commence once the funding approval was granted by FC.

Voting on PWSC(2021-22)18

47. There being no further questions from members on the item, the Chairman put [PWSC\(2021-22\)18](#) to vote.

48. The item was voted on and endorsed. Mr Michael TIEN requested that the item (i.e. [PWSC\(2021-22\)18](#)) be voted on separately at the relevant FC meeting.

*[Post-meeting note: Members were informed vide PWSC137/20-21 on 8 June 2021 that Mr Michael TIEN informed the Secretariat on 7 June 2021 of his decision to withdraw the request that the above item be voted on separately at the relevant FC meeting.]*

**Head 704 — Drainage**

<b>PWSC(2021-22)19</b>	<b>409DS</b>	<b>North East New Territories sewerage system upgrade</b>
	<b>355DS</b>	<b>Outlying Islands sewerage stage 2 — Lamma village sewerage phase 2, package 2</b>
	<b>353DS</b>	<b>Outlying Islands sewerage, stage 2 — extension of sewerage system to other unsewered villages in Mui Wo</b>

49. The Chairman advised that the proposal (i.e. [PWSC\(2021-22\)19](#)) sought to upgrade 409DS, 355DS and 353DS to Category A at the respective estimated costs of \$825.8 million, \$502.9 million and \$135.7 million in MOD prices. The Administration consulted the Panel on Environment Affairs on the three projects on 22 March 2021. Members generally supported the submission of the three funding proposals to the Subcommittee for consideration. A report on the gist of the Panel's discussion was tabled at the meeting.

Cost-effectiveness of the proposed projects

50. Mr Michael TIEN expressed support for the proposed projects. However, he was concerned if they were cost-effective. He pointed out that (a) the reconstruction of two sewage pumping stations ("SPSs") at Sha Ling and Tong Fong under 409DS incurred a per capita cost of around \$7,500 for the reconstruction and demolition works given the approximate total cost of \$174 million and the estimated population of about 23 000 to be served; (b) the construction of Luk Tei Tong SPS under 353DS incurred a per capita cost of up to \$38,000, which was more than five-fold that of 409DS, given the



construction cost of \$42 million and the estimated population of about 1 100 to be served; and (c) the construction of two SPSs at Tai Wan To and Hung Shing Ye under 355DS incurred a per capita cost of up to \$73,000 given the approximate total cost of \$134 million and the estimated population of about 1 830 and the visitors to be served. Mr TIEN was concerned that the per capita cost under (c) was around ten-fold that of 409DS. He also enquired about the current number of visitors to Lamma Island.

51. In response, Director of Drainage Services ("DDS") said that the Administration completed the Review Study on Outlying Islands Sewerage Master Plan in 1994 and had reviewed the planning of village sewerage system on Lamma Island. A number of improvement projects to the sewerage system on Lamma Island had been carried out and completed in stages, including the development of sewage treatment works at Yung Shue Wan and Sok Kwu Wan on the island respectively and the planning of public sewerage system for different villages to promote the sustainable development of remote countryside. DDS pointed out that Hung Shing Yeh Beach had an attendance of more than 2 800 on weekends. Apart from improving the environmental hygiene conditions of the villages in the area, the Administration would also conduct overall planning for the sewerage infrastructure on Lamma Island to improve the water quality of the waters around the island.

52. Mr Michael TIEN reckoned that a per capita cost in the region of \$50,000 for 355DS given that the ultimate number of people to be served by the sewerage system would be around 2 600, taking into account the annual number of visitors to Lamma Island and the about 1 830 island residents. He enquired about the policy on developing village sewerage systems, including whether the Administration would provide public sewerage systems only if the number of beneficiaries could comply with the minimum requirement, and whether a limit would be set on the per capita cost of providing village sewerage systems. Mr TIEN requested the Administration to examine the cost and benefits (including the per capita cost) of projects when taking forward various sewerage projects and implementing the village sewerage programme in the future.

53. DDS reiterated that the Administration had conducted overall planning for improving the environment of Lamma Island to promote its sustainable development in the long run. The Administration also implemented the village sewerage programme progressively in view of its cost-effectiveness and the actual circumstances. For example, consideration was also given to installing dry weather flow interceptors in addition to expansion of the public sewerage system in view of the actual circumstances.

409DS — North East New Territories sewerage system upgrade

54. Dr Junius HO expressed support for the proposed project. As for the schedule of extending the sewerage system to the remaining unsewered villages in the Ta Kwu Ling area, he was pleased to note that the first batch of village sewerage works could be completed progressively in 2028 to 2029, which was soon after completion of the North East New Territories sewerage system upgrade works. In view of the progressive completion of major infrastructure and gradual population growth in the area, Dr HO called on the Administration to exercise prudence in designing the alignment of the sewers, so as not to affect other infrastructure projects there in the future.

55. DDS replied that the alignment of the proposed sewers was designed with reference to that of the existing sewers, which minimized the implications on the local area. Moreover, the Drainage Services Department ("DSD") had profound experience in laying sewers. It would coordinate with ongoing projects nearby and carry out works in stages to reduce the impact on the surrounding areas. As the current sewage flow in the North East New Territories sewerage system was about to reach its design capacity, the Administration intended to commence the proposed works as soon as possible to alleviate the pressure on the sewerage system in the area. If there were new infrastructure projects in the area, the Environmental Protection Department would conduct overall review of the planning of the sewerage system in the area and work closely with the relevant government departments for appropriate arrangements to be made.

56. Referring to [LC Paper No. CB\(1\)836/20-21\(02\)](#), Dr Junius HO asked the Administration why the numeral "4" was added before the project number 409DS. Assistant Director of Environmental Protection (Water Policy), replied that numerals were added to project numbers based on the specific head of expenditure for reference purpose in creating the expenditure account. In response to the Chairman's enquiry, DDS said that 409DS and 4409DS referred to the same project. As 409DS was under "Head 704—Drainage", the numeral "4" was added before it for identification. The Chairman and Dr HO commented that such a practice would cause confusion easily.

57. Mr LUK Chung-hung enquired whether the Administration would consider expanding the scope of the sewer laying works to increase the capacity of the sewerage system and reduce the per capita cost. He also said that some organizations had plans to build transitional housing on idle land in the countryside but gave up due to the cost and technical difficulties of building sewerage facilities. Mr LUK enquired whether the proposed project was useful in unleashing the development potential of land in the surrounding areas (e.g. for developing transitional housing) to accommodate more resident

population. He suggested that the Administration should inform the landowners and residents in the area of the new development potential of land in a timely manner.

58. DDS said that after completion of 409DS, the population served by the proposed sewerage system was expected to increase to 23 000 from the current number of around 4 000. Besides, the sewerage system would meet the sewerage needs of other public facilities, such as the columbarium and crematorium development at Sha Ling and North East New Territories Landfill Extension. Information on the completed sewage treatment facilities and expansion of the public sewerage system was uploaded on the departmental website for public access. Relevant information would also be made public in a timely manner. In response to further enquiry from Mr LUK Chung-hung, DDS said that the department would disseminate information about works projects in the countryside, and inform local stakeholders and Rural Committees of the project progress.

#### Village sewerage programme

59. The Deputy Chairman expressed support for the proposed projects. He enquired about the latest progress of the village sewerage programme, including the coverage of the public sewerage system already installed, the percentage of the remaining area not yet covered by the public sewerage system, and whether some villages would ultimately not be provided with public sewerage facilities. The Deputy Chairman considered that the Administration's effort to develop sewerage infrastructure and sewerage systems over the years had contributed to improvement in the water quality of Victoria Harbour. He expressed support for the programme.

60. DDS said that the programme to construct village sewerage systems started in the 1990s. The current village sewerage programme covered about 550 villages, of which the sewerage systems for 258 villages had been completed and that of 59 were under construction. The Administration would extend the public sewerage network to various villages progressively subject to the availability of resources and the actual circumstances.

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

#### Voting on PWSC(2021-22)19

61. There being no further questions from members on the item, the Chairman put [PWSC\(2021-22\)19](#) to vote.

62. The item was voted on and endorsed. The Chairman consulted members on whether the item would require separate voting at the relevant meeting of FC. No member raised such a request.

63. The meeting ended at 10:30 am.

Council Business Division 1  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
23 June 2021