

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. CB(1) 352/00-01  
(These minutes have been seen  
by the Administration)

Ref: CB1/PL/PLW/1

**LegCo Panel on Planning, Lands and Works**

**Minutes of meeting**  
**held on Monday, 6 November 2000, at 8:30 am**  
**in Conference A of the Legislative Council Building**

**Members present** : Dr Hon TANG Siu-tong, JP (Chairman)  
Hon LAU Ping-cheung (Deputy Chairman)  
Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai, JP  
Hon James TO Kun-sun  
Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, SBS, JP  
Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP  
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, JP  
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip  
Hon IP Kwok-him, JP

**Non-Panel members attending** : Hon Fred LI Wah-ming, JP  
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP

**Members absent** : Hon WONG Yung-kan  
Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBS, JP

**Public officers attending** : **Agenda Item IV**

Mr Stephen FISHER  
Deputy Secretary for Planning and Lands  
(Urban Renewal & Buildings)

Ms Olivia NIP  
Principal Assistant Secretary for Planning and Lands  
(Urban Renewal)

**Agenda Item V**

Mr Stephen FISHER  
Deputy Secretary for Planning and Lands  
(Urban Renewal & Buildings)

Mr Daniel CHENG  
Principal Assistant Secretary for Planning and Lands  
(Planning)

Mr M L WAN  
Principal Assistant Secretary for Transport

Mr K K LING  
District Planning Officer / Hong Kong  
Planning Department

Mr T Y CHEUNG  
Project Manager / Hong Kong Island  
Islands Development Office  
Territory Development Department

**Agenda Item VI**

Mr LAM Hon  
Acting Principal Assistant Secretary for Works  
(Works Policy & Safety)

Mr Gary YEUNG  
Principal Assistant Secretary for Planning and  
Lands (Lands)

Mr C S WAI  
Assistant Director (Headquarters)  
Highways Department

Mr LAU Chi-ming  
Chief Estate Surveyor (Estate Management)  
Lands Department

**Agenda Item VII**

Mr W S CHAN  
Deputy Secretary for Works

Mr Helius NG Kai-ming

Chief Assistant Secretary for Works

**Clerk in attendance :** Miss Odelia LEUNG  
Chief Assistant Secretary (1)1

**Staff in attendance :** Mrs Mary TANG  
Senior Assistant Secretary (1)2

---

**I Confirmation of minutes of meeting**  
(LC Paper No. CB(1) 67/00-01)

The minutes of meeting held on 10 October 2000 were confirmed.

**II Information papers issued since last meeting**

2. Members noted that an information paper on “Land Registration Ordinance (Cap 128) - Land Registration (Amendment) Bill 2000” was circulated under LC Paper No. CB(1)52/00-01.

**III Date of next meeting and items for discussion**  
(LC Paper No. CB(1)115/00-01(01) - List of follow-up actions  
LC Paper No. CB(1)115/00-01(02) - List of outstanding items for discussion)

Special meeting

3. Members agreed to hold a special meeting on 21 November 2000 to discuss the following items -

- (a) Building safety and timely maintenance : *to promote timely maintenance;*
- (b) Green buildings : *a proposal to enhance the quality of our living; and*
- (c) Interest rates for provisional payment, redemption money and compensation payable under various ordinances.

Regular meeting

4. Members also agreed that the following items would be discussed at the next

regular meeting on 4 December 2000 at 8:30 am -

- (a) South East Kowloon Development ; and
- (b) Control on advertisement signboards.

*(Post meeting note: At the request of the Administration, the discussion on the Land Registration (Amendment) Bill 2000 was added on to the agenda for the meeting after consultation with the Chairman.)*

Overseas duty visit

5. The Chairman informed members that every year the Legislative Council Commission reserved funds for overseas duty visits by Panels. He asked if members had any plans for such visits for the current legislative session. Mr Albert CHAN said that he considered it useful to compare and observe the urban renewal mechanism in overseas places, for example Singapore and the city of Baltimore in the United States of America. Members agreed to consider the need for overseas duty visit later when Mr CHAN had made a concrete proposal.

*(Post-meeting note: to facilitate Mr CHAN's understanding of urban renewal undertaken by overseas countries, the Clerk sent to the member a list of reference materials on the subject submitted by the Centre of Urban Planning and Environmental Management, University of Hong Kong to the then Bills Committee on Urban Renewal Authority Bill.)*

**IV Progress of work following the enactment of the Urban Renewal Authority Ordinance**  
(LC Paper No. CB(1)115/00-01(03) )

6. The Deputy Secretary for Planning and Lands (Urban Renewal and Buildings) (DSPL) briefed members on the progress on the establishment of the Urban Renewal Authority (URA), highlighting the salient points of the information paper. He informed members that as the Administration had made a commitment to review the current ex gratia allowances for property owners and tenants before bringing the URA Ordinance into operation, it was reviewing the allowances and collecting views from LegCo Members and affected parties. The Administration intended to make a submission to the Finance Committee for approval of the proposals by the end of this year and to set up the URA early next year. Meanwhile, the urban renewal strategy was being drafted and would be issued for public consultation after the URA Ordinance had come into operation.

7. Mr Albert CHAN was concerned about the problems and disputes arising from compensation arrangements for land resumption for urban renewal projects. He enquired how the Administration proposed to deal with these problems so that the

affected parties would be fairly and timely compensated. DSPL said in response that a review on the ex gratia allowances for property owners and tenants was underway. The review would cover the following aspects -

*Domestic premises*

- (a) Under the existing arrangement, a statutory compensation based on the fair market value of the resumed properties would be payable to owners of domestic premises. On top of the statutory compensation, a Home Purchase Allowance (HPA) would be payable to owner-occupiers to enable them to purchase a ten-year old flat comparable to the size of the resumed property in the same locality. When members scrutinized the URA Bill in the last legislative term, the Administration proposed to enhance the compensation such that the basis for calculating the HPA would be revised from a replacement flat of 10 years' old to about 8 to 10 years' old. Since the then Bills Committee on Urban Renewal Authority Bill considered the Administration's proposal unsatisfactory, the Administration was asked to review the HPA based on a fixed age instead of a range of age of a replacement flat.
- (b) To address members' concern over the possible difficulties faced by affected owners who lived on the rentals of resumed premises, the Administration would also review the need to relax the limit of awarding no more than two HPA payments to an owner in a resumption exercise.

*Non-domestic premises*

- (c) Under the Lands Resumption Ordinance (LRO) (Cap. 124), owner-occupiers of non-domestic properties were offered the fair market value of their properties, plus an ex gratia allowance, or the option to claim business loss and disturbance payment, if substantiated. Since the amount of business loss and disturbance payment was often subject to dispute, the Administration was exploring the feasibility of determining the amount of this ex gratia allowance on the basis of the rateable value of the resumed premises. This would more accurately reflect the commercial value of the properties.

*Industrial premises*

- (d) The existing compensation package for industrial premises included the fair market value of the resumed properties plus an ex gratia allowance for removal. The Administration was considering the viability of introducing different packages of ex gratia allowance to

meet the needs of factory operators who might choose to cease, relocate, or change their business. Consideration would also be given to providing loans to facilitate operators to re-provision their factories.

8. Responding to Mr Albert CHAN's further enquiry on the compensation arrangements for partly-rented domestic flats, DSPL said that at present these owners were entitled to the full amount of HPA for the area they occupied and 50% of the full amount for the area which was rented out. The Administration was reviewing whether the percentage of HPA for the rented portion should exceed 50%.

Admin

9. Mr Abraham SHEK said that it would be useful if the Administration could provide a table comparing the compensation arrangements offered by the Land Development Corporation (LDC), to be offered by URA and under LRO. DSPL agreed but pointed out that the compensation packages to be offered by URA were proposals only and had yet to be finalized. He also stressed that compensation for acquisition of land by negotiation by LDC and resumption of land by Government under LRO was different. As regards the suggestion of providing flat-for-flat in lieu of cash compensation, DSPL said that the Administration had held several meetings with the affected residents and was aware that some elderly persons would prefer the option of flat-for-flat. Offering flats comparable to the Sandwich Class Housing Scheme flats might be a possible option. After its establishment, URA would consider conducting a trial scheme of flat-for-flat, starting with owner-occupiers.

10. As to Mr SHEK's further enquiry about the compensation for non-domestic premises used for domestic purpose, DSPL said that this had been a cause for great concern to owners of these premises as the compensation package for non-domestic premises did not include HPA. Whether the compensation would be payable on the basis of domestic or non-domestic premises would hinge on the land lease of the relevant property. If the land lease did not impose any restriction on land use, compensation would be calculated on the basis of the actual use of the premises. However, if the Government lease had clearly stipulated that the land should not be used for domestic purpose but was so used, the owners would not be paid the HPA. These owners would be advised to sell their premises by agreement to URA, prior to the resumption exercise. This would help resolve the problem. Mr SHEK pointed out that the problem could not be resolved as the offer of URA would be based on the existing value of the premises which would be insufficient to enable them to buy a domestic flat. He requested the Administration to give further thought to the compensation arrangements for such premises.

11. Mr Fred LI sought the Administration's clarification on a media report on 1 November 2000 that it would soon release the compensation proposals. He considered that the Administration should consult the Panel before submitting the compensation proposals to the Finance Committee. DSPL said that the Administration wished to collect more views from Members and the affected parties before finalising the compensation proposals. There were differences which had yet

to be resolved. The affected owners were asking for an enhanced HPA which would enable them to purchase a 5-year old flat. The Administration was reviewing the HPA with a view to providing an enhancement to what was proposed previously, (the previous proposal was a HPA which would enable them to purchase a replacement flat of 8 to 10 years' old). He informed members that the differences were being narrowed. The Administration hoped to submit the proposals to the Finance Committee in December 2000 and would consult the Panel before that.

12. Noting the difficulties encountered in resuming Wah Kai Industrial Centre, Miss Emily LAU opined that the compensation package to be offered by URA should be sufficient to enable the affected factory operators to relocate their business. DSPL said in response that section 12 of the URA Ordinance empowered URA to lend money to meet the needs of affected persons. The URA could also provide a guarantee in respect of a certain percentage of loans borrowed by such persons from lending institutions. Miss Emily LAU stressed that the Administration should assist the affected operators to continue their business because the resumption was initiated by the Administration. DSPL said that the Administration was reviewing the ex gratia allowance offered to affected factory operators. At present in addition to the fair market value of their factory premises, these operators were provided with an ex gratia allowance which would assist them in reprovisioning their operation. The affected factory operators would be reimbursed for removal expenses and other expenses incidental to the reprovisioning. The compensation package should be sufficient to allow them to reprovision their operation, but it might not be sufficient to pay for the upgrading of machinery or the enlargement of the scale of operation. Operators might apply for loans from URA to meet the purpose.

13. Mr Albert CHAN was of the view that the loans, if provided, should be given on a timely basis so that the affected operators could restart their business. Mr Abraham SHEK pointed out that it might not be easy for the affected factory operators to locate a suitable and affordable place to reprovision their operation. In view of the wide implications of the URA strategy, Mr SHEK said that the Administration should allow sufficient time for members to study the strategy. Members agreed to hold a special meeting upon receipt of the Administration's compensation proposals and/or the draft urban renewal strategy.

Clerk to  
note

## **V Western District Development Strategy** (LC Paper No. CB(1)115/00-01(04))

14. With the aid of a computer power point, the District Planning Officer/Hong Kong, Planning Department (DPO/HK) gave a presentation on the planning concepts of the Western District Development Strategy (WDDS), making reference to the Consultation Digest prepared by the Planning Department.

15. While supporting the proposals of WDDS, Mr Abraham SHEK was concerned that the developments in the old urban area were discordant with the greener

and better modern design of the new reclamation area. He considered it necessary to integrate developments of the entire Western District, both old and new, to ensure compatibility. He also enquired whether the WDDS had taken into account the concept of an environmentally friendly design.

16. The Principal Assistant Secretary for Planning and Lands (Planning) (PAS/PL(P)) said that integration of the new reclamation area with the old urban area was one of the key objectives of WDDS and a main concern of members of the public. The Administration aimed to rejuvenate the Western District with urban renewal and restructuring in Kennedy Town and Sai Ying Pun. The extension of the Mass Transit Railway (MTR) service to the Western District would provide impetus to the redevelopment of the area, either by the future URA or private developers. A piece of land in the reclamation area would be allocated to URA for rehousing purpose. The reclamation area would provide space to address the shortfall of community facilities and open space in the old urban area. In the detailed design stage of WDDS, the Administration would work out measures to facilitate the integration between the new reclamation area and the old urban area through the provision of convenient access links and shared use of community facilities and open space. Together with the waterfront promenade and modern urban design, the living environment of the Western District would be greatly improved.

17. On the environmental side, PAS/PL(P) said that the concept of environmentally friendly design had been adopted in the WDDS. The construction and use of roads would be minimized and where possible, the roads would be submerged. The development would be primarily served by the future MTR West Island Line. There would be integrated open space and pedestrian network in the area. The feasibility of introducing travellers and other environmentally friendly facilities such as central water cooling system and the use of more environmentally friendly mode of transport would be explored in the next stage of detailed design and engineering feasibility study.

18. Ir Dr Raymond HO welcomed the proposed reduction in the scale of reclamation and the improved planning design as provided in the WDDS. However, he opined that integration between the new reclamation area and old urban area was easier said than done. He was also concerned that the construction of submerged roads would cause disturbance to the existing road network in the old urban area. In response, PAS/PL(P) referred members to page 2 of the Consultation Digest which indicated the possible escalator links at the MTR stations connecting the new reclamation area with the uphill areas of the old urban area. He said that together with a series of pedestrian walkways and footbridges, these would provide pedestrians with an easy access to the open space and community facilities in the new reclamation area. The impact of the construction of submerged roads on the existing road network in the area would be taken into account in the Environmental Impact Assessment study to be conducted at a later stage.

19. Mr Albert CHAN made the following comments on the WDDS -

- (a) In implementing reclamation projects, the Administration always stressed that one of the objectives was to facilitate urban renewal. However, how this objective would be materialized in the reclaimed area was seldom elaborated. To justify the need for reclamation,

the Administration should specify the amount of land/building space that would be reserved for rehousing residents affected by urban renewal;

- (b) The greening concept should be implemented on a fuller and more comprehensive scale, particularly at the waterfront promenade;
- (c) The Administration should use resources to plan and develop the land reserved for Routes 7 and 10 so that the public could widely make use of it in the interim;
- (d) More in-depth study on the pedestrian flow should be made before deciding on the choice of site for the MTR station; and
- (e) The Administration should review whether the areas marked “Other Specified Uses” (OU) on page 2 of the Consultation Digest which were designated as the site for the possible new wholesale market and godowns would be compatible with the surrounding environment at the waterfront.

20. In response, DSPL said that the WDDS had made reference to the West Kowloon Reclamation Development Strategy in the provision of land reserved for rehousing of residents affected by nearby urban renewal projects. As regards the areas designated as OU, DPO/HK said that more than half of the area would be needed for the reprovisioning of the existing wholesale market operations located to its immediate east on the waterfront. The remaining space would provide for the reprovisioning of the China Merchants Godown which would continue to provide essential warehousing facilities for rice storage. The Administration was aware of the non-compatibility of these facilities with the aesthetics of the waterfront promenade. To address this problem, it was proposed that the waterfront promenade near the areas marked OU would be elevated. In this way, the wholesale and godown activities could be operated underneath the promenade.

21. Mr LAU Ping-cheung was concerned about navigation safety which might be affected as the Sulphur Channel would be narrowed as a result of the proposed reclamation. PAS/PL(P) said in response that the hydraulic study conducted earlier on the impact of reclamation on navigation safety of the Sulphur Channel had concluded that the impact would be acceptable. With the proposed reduction in the scale of reclamation, navigation safety should not be a cause for concern. At present, only smaller vessels used the Sulphur Channel and larger vessels often used the channel at the north of Green Island. Another study on navigation safety would be performed at a later stage.

22. Miss Emily LAU stressed the need for an overall planning concept. Although the scale of reclamation had now been reduced, she still considered it necessary to invite views from professional bodies and affected parties. She also

considered the consultation period too short. PAS/PL(P) said that for the past weeks, the Administration had consulted the District Council and environmental groups as well as residents groups on the WDDS and a public consultation forum was held on 4 November 2000. There was general support for the WDDS, in particular its plans on urban renewal and the provision of the MTR West Island Line. There were however divergent views on the alignment of the MTR line and the provision for Routes 7 and 10. The Administration had an open mind and would be prepared to review the WDDS in the light of views gathered in the consultation exercise. Members requested the Administration to provide a paper to explain the outcome of the consultation exercise after its completion. The Panel would then consider the need to hold a special meeting to receive deputations.

## **VI Proposed charging and penalty system for road opening works** (LC Paper No. CB(1) 115/00-01(05))

23. The Acting Principal Assistant Secretary for Works (Works Policy and Safety) (PAS/W) highlighted the main points of the proposed charging and penalty system for road opening works as detailed in the information paper.

24. Mr Albert CHAN enquired about the liability in situations where a construction worker on site failed to carry out the instruction given by the contractor, thereby breaching the Excavation Permit (EP) conditions. PAS/W said in response that under the proposed charging and penalty system, an EP issued to the promoter (e.g. a utility undertaker) was deemed to be issued to any independent contractor employed by the promoter for carrying out the road excavation works. The contractor was responsible for supervising his workers and to identify problems at an early stage. Under the proposed amendments to the Land (Miscellaneous Provisions) Ordinance, the contractor could be prosecuted for failure to comply with EP conditions.

25. Mr CHAN further enquired how the proposed system could address the problem of unattended sites owing to disputes between the promoter and the contractor. The Assistant Director of Highways (Headquarters) (AD/HyD) said that under the proposed system, the permittee would have to pay a daily charge for the extension of the EP. This would provide the incentive for an permittee to employ another contractor to resume and complete the excavation works in accordance with EP conditions. To tighten control over idle/inactive sites, a condition had been included in EP to the effect that the permittee would be required to ensure that the excavation was not left open without being actively worked on during any working day. If it was necessary on technical grounds for the excavation to be left open and not be worked on during any working day, the permittee should cover the excavation by steel plate or other suitable means to facilitate vehicular/pedestrian traffic. As for Government works which were to be carried out by an independent contractor, AD/HyD advised that the contractor, rather than the Government department as the promoter, was required to obtain an EP direct for road excavation works. Mr CHAN considered it unfair that Government departments would not be held responsible for breach of EP

conditions given that Government works accounted for a majority of works, according to the figures provided at Appendix A to the paper. AD/HyD said that the figures for road opening works included orders for very minor works such as repair of traffic signs and railings. Taking out these figures, the number of EPs issued to private utility undertakers and Government departments was similar.

26. Mr Abraham SHEK questioned the purpose of introducing the proposed charging and penalty system. He opined that the system should not be meant to penalize the utility undertakers. He considered it necessary to consult the utility companies and that the Administration should not push ahead the proposed system despite their objection. PAS/W said in response that the proposed system was introduced in response to the Director of Audit's report in 1991 and 1995 regarding the need to reduce delays in the completion of utility works and for the implementation of EP fees based on an user-pays principle. The objective of the proposed system was to reduce incidents of delays in the completion of excavation works and to minimize disturbance to the public. PAS/W stressed that the utility undertakers had been consulted on the original and the revised proposals but they maintained their stance of objection against the introduction of EP fees. AD/HyD added that the proposed system was not meant to penalize utility undertakers. In fact, there had all along been good cooperation between the Administration and the utility undertakers. However, in view of the uniqueness of Hong Kong situation, there was a need to introduce a series of measures to minimize traffic disruption and the proposed system would be one of these measures. The proposed system would provide an incentive for utility undertakers to assess more accurately the time needed to complete their excavation works and to make better coordination at an earlier stage. The proposed system would also ensure that the works would be completed on time and in compliance with EP conditions, failing which both the promoters and contractors could be held responsible.

27. Ir Dr Raymond HO declared that his company had been engaged by some utility undertakers in planning traffic diversion works but it had not been involved in execution of the works. Referring to paragraph (b) of Appendix A to the information paper, he enquired whether, in the event that prosecution action was taken, the prosecution figures for contravention of EP conditions by Government contractors and private undertakers were comparable. He also considered it necessary to invite the utility undertakers to express views on the proposed system. AD/HyD said that the Highways Department had been monitoring the road excavation works and keeping statistics on the contravention of EP conditions. The incidence of contravention of EP conditions by Government contractors and private utility undertakers was roughly the same. These figures had been made available to the utility undertakers. Whether prosecution actions would be taken upon the implementation of the proposed system would be based on the circumstances of each case and there would not be any leniency towards Government contractors.

28. As regards consultation with the utility undertakers, AD/HyD said that the Industry Promotion Unit of the Commerce and Industry Bureau had commissioned a

“Regulatory Impact Assessment” study on “Introduction of Permit Fee and Finance Disincentive Scheme for road opening works” and had invited the utility undertakers to participate in a two-day workshop. The purpose of the workshop was to collect and collate views from utility undertakers on whether further improvements could be made to the proposed legislation on the charging and penalty system. During the first workshop, the utility undertakers had raised strong objection against the imposition of a fee for road excavation. In view of their objection and the fact that no further amendments were made to the proposal, the Administration did not consider it fruitful to hold a second workshop and decided to present the proposal for the Panel’s consideration. Ir Dr HO opined that in view of the complexity of underground works, delays in their completion were inevitable in many circumstances. He further pointed out that since the charging system was based on a user-pays principle, whether the promoter or members of the public should be regarded as the user was arguable. Moreover, the utility undertakers found it unacceptable that as promoters of the works, Government departments would not be held responsible under the proposed system. The Chairman shared this view and said that the Administration need to devise a more equitable arrangement so that Government departments, in their capacity as promoters, would have the same responsibility as the utility undertakers under the proposed system.

29. Following up this issue, Mr James TO said that while agreeing the proposed system, he was concerned whether there were incentives for Government departments, in their capacity as promoters, to complete excavation works on time. He pointed out that instead of taking prosecution actions for contravention of EP conditions, consideration could be given to introducing a scale of fines in lieu of prosecution, similar to what was adopted by the Inland Revenue Department. The Administration would also need to consider whether the proposed system would achieve the intended effect, otherwise the system would turn out to be a revenue raising measure only.

30. On monitoring of Government works, AD/HyD said that the works undertaken by the Highways Department would be monitored by the Works Bureau. The Highways Department, in turn, would closely monitor the performance of its contractors. In 1999, Government contractors had been penalized for more than 900 times for delays in completion of road opening works. PAS/W added that prior to the commencement of works, the contractor undertaking Government works would be required to submit the plans on the road opening works to the supervising department for scrutiny. The Works Bureau would also carry out regular inspection to assess the performance of individual departments in carrying out maintenance works and would inform and request the relevant department heads for rectification should irregularities be found. He stressed that the proposed system was not a revenue raising measure. The proposed fee structure was intended to recover the costs incurred in vetting EP application, issuing EPs and carrying out inspections to ensure compliance with EP conditions. The effect of the system could be assessed after its implementation. Mr TO’s proposal of introducing a scale of fines in lieu of prosecution could be put forward to the Department of Justice for consideration. AD/HyD supplemented that the maximum penalty for contravention of EP conditions was proposed to be raised

from \$5,000 to \$50,000 to increase the deterrence effect.

31. The Chairman said that the Administration should introduce incentives to encourage expeditious completion of road opening works instead of resorting to punitive measures. Mr LAU Ping-cheung agreed and said that there were practical needs to carry out road excavation works and their frequency would not be decreased as a result of the imposition of EP fees. To resolve the problems arising from road excavation works, the Administration should explore the feasibility of using a common trench for all underground utilities in new towns as adopted by some overseas countries. AD/HyD agreed that road excavation works were necessary in Hong Kong as there were over 60,000 km of utility pipes spreading over 1,900 km of roads, serving a population of over six million people. The frequency of road opening works was more frequent in Hong Kong than in other countries because the local road network and the underground utility system served a much higher population density. Although the imposition of EP fees might not reduce the frequency of road works, it would help shorten the duration of the works. The Highways Department had examined the feasibility of constructing common trenches for all underground utilities some 20 years ago. The common trench concept was also considered in planning the Central and Western Reclamation project and the King's Road Redevelopment project. The conclusion was that this approach was difficult to implement because the size of such a common trench would be larger than the MTR tunnel. Its construction would cause more inconvenience to the public. Moreover, the cost of construction and maintenance would be extremely high. Whether and how these costs should be shared by the undertakers would be a complicated issue. In fact, in overseas countries where a common trench was used, it would be for the sections connecting two large areas. In local districts, the conventional approach of laying utility pipes would still be adopted. Nevertheless, in planning newly developed areas, the Administration would consider housing underground utilities in purpose-built utility services road if space could be made available, such as in the case of the North Lantau Highway and the future road to Penny's Bay.

**VII Upgrading of the Chief Assistant Secretary (Professional Services) post from Chief Engineer (D1) to Government Engineer (D2) for the promotion of the construction services industry of Hong Kong in the Mainland of China**  
(LC Paper No. CB(1)115/00-01/00))

32. Mr LAU Ping-cheung, Mr Abraham SHEK and Ir Dr Raymond HO expressed support for the proposed upgrading of post.

**VIII Any other business**

Discussion on the proposed terms of reference of the Panel  
(LC Paper No. CB(1) 115/00-01(07))

33. Members endorsed the proposed terms of reference of the Panel.
34. The meeting ended at 10:30am.

Legislative Council Secretariat

20 December 2000