

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. CB(1)1964/08-09  
(These minutes have been seen  
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/PL/DEV/1

**Panel on Development**

**Minutes of meeting**  
**held on Tuesday, 31 March 2009, at 2:30 pm**  
**in Conference Room A of the Legislative Council Building**

**Members present** : Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBM, GBS, JP (Chairman)  
Prof Hon Patrick LAU Sau-shing, SBS, JP (Deputy Chairman)  
Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai, SBS, S.B.St.J., JP  
Hon James TO Kun-sun  
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP  
Hon Mrs Sophie LEUNG LAU Yau-fun, GBS, JP  
Dr Hon Philip WONG Yu-hong, GBS  
Hon WONG Yung-kan, SBS, JP  
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP  
Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, GBS, JP  
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, SBS, JP  
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip  
Hon LEE Wing-tat  
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC  
Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming, SBS, JP  
Hon KAM Nai-wai, MH  
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan  
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king  
Hon Tanya CHAN  
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun  
Hon IP Kwok-him, GBS, JP  
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-ye, GBS, JP  
Dr Hon Samson TAM Wai-ho, JP

**Members attending :** Hon Frederick FUNG Kin-kee, SBS, JP  
Hon WONG Kwok-hing, MH  
Hon WONG Kwok-kin, BBS

**Member absent :** Hon Albert HO Chun-yan

**Public officers attending :** **Agenda item IV**

Mrs Carrie LAM CHENG Yuet-ngor, JP  
Secretary for Development

Mr Tommy YUEN Man-chung, JP  
Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands) 2

Mr Paul PANG Tat-choi  
Assistant Director of Buildings/Existing Buildings 1

**Agenda item V**

Mrs Carrie LAM CHENG Yuet-ngor, JP  
Secretary for Development

Mr Enoch LAM Tin-sing, JP  
Deputy Secretary for Development (Works) 2

Mr KWONG Hing-ip, JP  
Project Manager (Kowloon)  
Civil Engineering and Development Department

Mr Norman HEUNG Yuk-sai  
Deputy Project Manager (Kowloon)  
Civil Engineering and Development Department

**Agenda item VI**

Mrs Carrie LAM CHENG Yuet-ngor, JP  
Secretary for Development

Mr Alan AU Yuk-lun  
Acting Principal Assistant Secretary for Development  
(Works) 1

Mr YIP Sai-chor, JP  
Head of Civil Engineering Office  
Civil Engineering and Development Department

Ms Kathy NG Tze-kwun  
Senior Landscape Architect/Land Works 1  
Civil Engineering and Development Department

**Attendance by Invitation : Agenda item IV**

Mr WONG Kit-loong  
Deputy Chief Executive Officer  
Hong Kong Housing Society

Ir Calvin LAM Che-leung  
Executive Director (Operation and Project Control)  
Urban Renewal Authority

**Clerk in attendance :** Ms Anita SIT  
Chief Council Secretary (1)4

**Staff in attendance :** Mr WONG Siu-yee  
Senior Council Secretary (1)7

Ms Christina SHIU  
Legislative Assistant (1)7

---

Action

- I Confirmation of minutes and matters arising**  
(LC Paper No. CB(1)993/08-09 -- Minutes of special meeting  
on 3 February 2009)

The minutes of the special meeting held on 3 February 2009 were confirmed.

- II Information papers issued since last meeting**

- (LC Papers No. CB(1)929/08-09(01) -- Correspondence between the  
and (02) Panel Clerk and the  
Administration in relation to  
Hopewell Centre II
- LC Papers No. CB(1)935/08-09(01) -- Issues raised at the meeting  
and (02) between Legislative Council  
Members and Heung Yee  
Kuk Councillors on 8  
January 2009 on "Rural  
development strategy and  
policy on minor works in  
rural areas in the New  
Territories" and "Village  
removal compensation  
relating to removal of  
isolated village houses due to  
public works"
- LC Paper No. CB(1)996/08-09(01) -- Administration's response to  
the referral from the Panel on  
Home Affairs on issues  
relating to clearance of  
unauthorized building works  
(LC Paper No.  
CB(1)869/08-09(01))
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1069/08-09(01) -- Submission dated 12 March  
2009 on lowering the  
compulsory sale threshold  
under the Land (Compulsory  
Sale for Redevelopment)  
Ordinance from Mr CHAN  
Choi-hi, member of the  
Central and Western District  
Council
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1070/08-09(01) -- Submission dated 11 March  
2009 on small house policy  
from a member of the public
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1107/08-09(01) -- Letter dated 19 March 2009  
from Hon CHEUNG  
Hok-ming in relation to a  
submission on small house  
policy (LC Paper No.  
CB(1)1070/08-09(01))
- LC Papers No. -- Administration's paper on the  
CB(1)1113/08-09(01) 2009-2010 Application List  
and (02) and the relevant press release

LC Paper No. CB(1)1129/08-09(01) -- Administration's paper on 334WF – Expansion of Tai Po water treatment works and ancillary raw water and fresh water transfer facilities)

2. Members noted that the above information papers had been issued since the last meeting.

### **III Items for discussion at the next meeting**

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1125/08-09(01) -- List of outstanding items for discussion

LC Paper No. CB(1)1125/08-09(02) -- List of follow-up actions

LC Paper No. CB(1)1159/08-09(01) -- Issues raised at the meeting between Legislative Council Members and Tuen Mun District Council members on 12 March 2009 on "Tuen Mun's overall planning and construction of noxious facilities in the district"

LC Paper No. CB(1)1159/08-09(02) -- Letter dated 26 March 2009 from the Secretary of the Tuen Mun District Council providing updated information on "Tuen Mun's overall planning and construction of noxious facilities in the district")

3. Members noted the letter dated 30 March 2009 from Prof Patrick LAU on flood prevention in Tai O tabled at the meeting.

*(Post-meeting note: the letter (LC Paper No. CB(1)1204/08-09(01)) was issued to members on 2 April 2009.)*

4. Members agreed that the following items would be discussed at the regular meeting scheduled for 28 April 2009 and that the meeting would be extended to 6:30 pm to allow sufficient time for discussion --

(a) PWP Item No. 7259RS "Cycle Tracks Connecting North West New Territories with North East New Territories";

- (b) Proposed creation of two supernumerary posts of Head and Deputy Head of the Development Opportunities Office in the Development Bureau;
- (c) Revitalization scheme -- conversion of old Tai O Police Station into Tai O Heritage Hotel; and
- (d) Progress report on heritage conservation initiatives.

5. Members further agreed that the Panel should request the Administration to provide information on the proposed riverwall at Yat Chung, Tai O in the first instance and there was no need to discuss the subject at the next meeting unless there was urgency. Members also noted the updated information on Tuen Mun's overall planning and construction of noxious facilities in the district provided by the Secretary of the Tuen Mun District Council, and agreed that in view of the new developments, the Panel would not arrange to discuss the relevant issues for the time being.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration has subsequently provided an information paper on the proposed riverwall at Yat Chung, Tai O (LC Paper No. CB(1)1393/08-09(01)), which was issued to members on 23 April 2009.)*

#### **IV Operation Building Bright**

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1125/08-09(03) No. -- Administration's paper on Operation Building Bright)

6. The Secretary for Development (SDEV) briefed members on the details of the Administration's proposal on the Operation Building Bright (the Operation).

*(Post-meeting note: SDEV's speaking note, the flowchart on the Operation and the leaflet on the Operation tabled at the meeting (LC Papers No. CB(1)1204/08-09(02) to (04) respectively) were issued to members on 2 April 2009.)*

#### General issues

7. Mr IP Kwok-him asked whether the Operation was a one-off measure. Mr LEE Wing-tat suggested that the Administration should consider increasing the financial provision for the Operation because it was a highly cost-effective method of creating job opportunities.

8. SDEV responded that in face of the financial tsunami, the Administration needed to implement special measures to create job opportunities

and the Operation was proposed as a one-off measure under this premise. The Operation should not become a long-term measure because building owners had the responsibility to maintain their buildings. Otherwise, taxpayers would have to bear the costs for the maintenance of private buildings indirectly. The Administration did not want to create an impression that owners could refrain from carrying out building maintenance and wait for another round of the Operation. The Administration would launch the minor works control regime, the Mandatory Building Inspection Scheme and the Mandatory Window Inspection Scheme to further enhance building safety in the community.

Implementation arrangements

9. Mr CHAN Kam-lam expressed support for the Operation because more buildings would be better maintained. He asked whether the Administration would consider increasing the target number of old buildings if the number of applications was large and funds were still available after carrying out repair works for the target buildings.

10. SDEV responded that it was estimated that about 500 buildings with owners' corporations (OCs) and another 500 buildings having difficulties in coordinating repair works, such as those without OCs, would be included in the Operation. The Administration would not impose an upper limit on the number of buildings as long as the total expenditure of the Operation would not exceed \$1 billion. The Administration would consider approving applications beyond the target of 1 000 buildings if funds were still available. The exact number of buildings that could be included would depend on factors such as the number of flats in the selected buildings.

11. Mr Alan LEONG said that as the actual number of buildings that could benefit from the Operation depended on the amount of funds available, he asked whether the Administration would approve applications more leniently during the initial stage and tighten up approval later, taking into consideration the amount of funds remaining. He considered that OCs were anxious to know whether their buildings would have a chance of being included in the Operation.

12. SDEV advised that depending on the actual situation, if there were too many applications, the Administration would consider whether it was necessary to inform the OCs about their chance of being included in the Operation.

13. Mr Frederick FUNG suggested that in addition to implementing the Operation on a building basis, the Administration could make use of the opportunity to require or encourage owners to form OCs, or owners' committees which could later evolve into OCs. He considered that the Administration should be vigilant on the possibility of tender rigging by some OCs to ensure that public funds would be well spent.

14. Mr Albert CHAN expressed support for the Operation in principle. He considered that the Administration should enhance the relevant guidelines and step up monitoring of the tender exercises to prevent tender rigging.

15. Prof Patrick LAU expressed support for the Operation because it would be conducive to environmental protection by prolonging the life of buildings. He enquired about the reason for conducting computer ballot and whether additional enhancement works could be carried out after the priority repair works had been completed. He suggested that when replacing pipes, instead of replacing individual sections, the whole length of the pipes should be replaced.

16. SDEV responded that requiring owners under Category II to form OCs as a criterion for the Operation might hinder the progress of carrying out building repair works under the Operation, and thus defeating the purpose of early creation of jobs. Owners could be encouraged to form OCs as far as possible but this should not become a prerequisite for joining the Operation. She concurred that the Administration should be prudent in implementing the Operation. As regards building enhancement works, the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) also offered assistance schemes such as the Building Rehabilitation Materials Incentive Scheme for carrying out such works.

17. On the concern about tender rigging, Mr WONG Kit-loong, Deputy Chief Executive Officer, Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS), said that HKHS had consulted the Independent Commission Against Corruption on the tender procedures to be adopted by OCs, which would have to adhere to the requirements under the relevant legislation. HKHS would play a monitoring role in the tendering process. OCs would be required to properly invite tenders and the possibility of tender rigging would be reduced as far as possible. DS(P&L)2 added that HKHS and URA would monitor whether the tender prices obtained by OCs were reasonable before disbursing the necessary grants.

18. As regards computer ballot, DS(P&L)2 clarified that it was used to determine the priorities of the eligible target buildings, not to determine whether to approve or reject an application. Touch-up and finishing works associated with building repair works could also be covered under the Operation. The extent of the repair works required would be based on the professional decisions of the authorized persons.

19. Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming expressed support for the Operation because it would enhance public safety and create job opportunities. He sought clarification on whether all 18 District Councils would be invited to nominate buildings for the Operation. SDEV responded that all 18 District Councils had been invited to nominate buildings.



20. Miss Tanya CHAN asked whether there were criteria for nomination by District Councils, and whether there was a quota for each District Council. She asked whether there were methods other than conducting computer ballot to determine the priorities of eligible target buildings, and whether priority could be given to those buildings with greater urgency for repair works. She further asked whether the progress reports and audit reports to be prepared by HKHS and URA would be submitted to the Development Bureau. Mr IP Kwok-him shared the view that urgency of repair works should be a factor in determining the priorities of the eligible target buildings.

21. SDEV advised that the Administration had invited nominations from all District Councils, and she believed that they had information on which buildings in their districts should become target buildings. No quota would be imposed on the number of buildings to be nominated by each District Council. Some of the nominated buildings might also be target buildings that were subject to statutory repair orders and were therefore covered under the Buildings Department's list. As the intention was to implement the Operation as soon as possible, the Administration would not have sufficient time to take the extent of dilapidation as an additional factor to fine-tune the priorities of the eligible target buildings. As regards the progress reports and audit reports, DS(P&L)2 said that they would be submitted to the Development Bureau.

22. Mr WONG Kwok-kin expressed support for the Operation because it would enhance the living environment. He urged the Administration to implement the Operation expeditiously to create job opportunities for the construction sector. He considered that the timeframe for carrying out repair works for buildings with OCs was too slow and sought explanation on why the timeframe for buildings without OCs was faster.

23. Mr LEE Wing-tat expressed concern on how the Administration would handle old buildings without OCs or owners' committees.

24. SDEV concurred that the Administration should implement the Operation as soon as possible. To achieve this purpose, there would be two categories of target buildings. For target buildings with OCs, the necessary procedures applicable to the respective OCs for carrying out repair works would have to be completed, such as consulting the owners and convening owners' meetings under the Building Management Ordinance (Cap. 344). For target buildings without OCs but subject to statutory repair orders, the Buildings Department could exercise its statutory powers and carry out the necessary works expeditiously without the need to go through the above procedures.

25. Mr James TO expressed concern on whether under the current timeframe for submission of applications, OCs had sufficient time to convene meetings to pass a resolution before they could submit their applications.

26. Mr Alan LEONG asked how OCs of buildings under Category 1 could have obtained assistance from HKHS or URA and secured "approval-in-principle" before the implementation of the Operation. He also asked whether the Administration would set an upper limit on the legal costs and auditor's fees to be incurred.

27. SDEV clarified that the timeframe shown in the flowchart was for reference only and it was not meant to be the deadline for completing a certain procedure. HKHS and URA had been providing technical assistance to OCs on building repair proposals in the past. Some of those yet-to-be implemented proposals could be implemented expeditiously under the Operation based on the previous preparation work done.

28. Mr WONG Kit-loong, Deputy Chief Executive Officer, HKHS, said that in making initial applications under the Operation, approval by the management committees of OCs would suffice. Upon successful application, OCs would have sufficient time to carry out the subsequent procedures, such as convening owners' meetings, appointing authorized persons and conducting tender exercises. Ir Calvin LAM Che-leung, Executive Director (Operation and Project Control), URA, said that URA had already been discussing with some OCs on the details of the preliminary preparation work for repairing their buildings and making possible applications under the Operation. DS(P&L)2 added that in order to expedite the process and allow OCs to carry out preliminary preparation work, the Administration had already mailed relevant information to OCs of potential target buildings before the implementation of the Operation. As regards legal costs and auditor's fees, they would be incurred and paid by HKHS and URA during the implementation of the Operation, and would be reimbursed by the Administration later. Although the Administration had not set an upper limit on those fees, it was envisaged that those fees would only account for a very small percentage of the total expenses of the Operation.

29. Ir Dr Raymond HO asked whether the Administration would award term contracts for the repair works under the Operation. He suggested that the Administration should award multiple contracts with a lower contract sum so that more contractors could participate.

30. The Assistant Director of Buildings/Existing Buildings 1 (ADB) said that the Administration had engaged two term contractors at present for building repair works, each with a contract sum limit of about \$20 million. As the number of target buildings concerned was 500, the Administration would have to engage more contractors to carry out the repair works.

31. Dr Priscilla LEUNG welcomed the Operation and commended that no asset or income means test was required for the Operation. She asked how the

Administration would recover the costs for carrying out repair works in cases of default. SDEV responded that the Administration would issue statutory repair orders to owners concerned and if they refused to carry out the required works, the Buildings Department could carry out the required works and recover the costs from those owners. If they refused to bear the costs, the Buildings Department could register a charge against the land titles concerned.

#### Priority repair works items

32. Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming noted that removal of unauthorized building works (UBWs) would be one of the repair and maintenance works which could be carried out if there were remaining funds after carrying out works relating to improvement of building structural safety and sanitary facilities. He enquired about the priority of removing UBWs and asked how they would be handled during the implementation of the Operation. Expressing a similar concern, Mr James TO asked why removal of UBWs in public areas was not included as a priority repair item in paragraph 14 of the Administration's paper. He considered that if owners wanted to remove UBWs themselves, the removal works concerned should be given priority under the Operation.

33. ADB responded that owners' progress of repair works in the Operation would be affected if removal of UBWs became a mandatory requirement under the Operation. If UBWs in common areas had to be removed first, it would affect the progress of other repair works of a higher priority under the Operation. Efforts should therefore be concentrated on general repair first followed by other works located in common areas. UBWs would generally be handled according to the existing policy. SDEV added that for buildings under Category 1, while OCs would not be required to remove UBWs under the Operation, they could do so on their own initiative and the Administration would coordinate with them as far as possible. However, if the UBW was in such a dangerous condition that warranted an order, it should be followed up accordingly.

34. Mr KAM Nai-wai considered that the Administration should carefully consider what repairs works should be considered as priority items in using the grants under the Operation. He considered that works relating to fire safety of buildings should be a priority repair works item and many owners in the past had difficulty in carrying out such repair works as they were relatively costly. SDEV said that in determining what repair works should be considered as priority items, the Administration had taken into account the building structural safety factor. The Administration would revisit this issue before the relevant meeting of the Finance Committee.

Eligibility criteria

35. Mr KAM Nai-wai asked whether the Administration would consider allowing buildings of 29 years of age at present to be included in the Operation because they would become 30 years of age by the time the Operation was implemented. In this regard, he asked whether urgency for carrying out repair works should also be considered.

36. SDEV responded that clear and precise eligibility criteria were required for every financial assistance scheme. The criterion of buildings aged 30 years or above covered buildings which were comparatively old. If the total number of target buildings was not so great and sufficient funds were still available after carrying out repair works for selected buildings under the currently proposed eligibility criteria, the Administration could consider reviewing the criterion. Apart from the building age criterion, another criterion was that the buildings lacked maintenance or were in dilapidated conditions, requiring maintenance or repair works.

Other comments

37. Mr WONG Kwok-hing expressed support for implementing the Operation as soon as possible. He suggested the Administration could coordinate with work unions to implement matching between unemployed workers and contractors. He asked how the Administration would handle hidden or aged owners when implementing the Operation. SDEV responded that as the Operation would be implemented on a building basis, hidden or aged owners would not pose any problem. For the suggestion of providing matching between unemployed workers and contractors, careful consideration would be required. Workers in the construction sector should benefit from the Operation as the number of job opportunities in the sector increased. Contractors would have to employ more workers in order to cope with the additional number of works projects during the period.

38. Mr KAM Nai-wai asked whether the Administration would consider consolidating different building maintenance and renovation assistance schemes or providing one-stop application services for those schemes. Mr CHAN Kam-lam expressed a similar view and said that as building maintenance was owners' responsibility, the Administration should provide additional staffing to the Buildings Department so that it could step up enforcement by issuing repair orders promptly. SDEV responded that different assistance schemes could cater for the different needs of owners in a people-oriented manner. Owners would be able to obtain detailed information about each scheme and they could apply for more than one scheme if they met the relevant eligibility criteria. There were practical

difficulties in consolidating different schemes and doing so would lead to inflexibility.

39. Ir Dr Raymond HO said that the Operation was an innovative scheme and SDEV was proactive in her work. He considered offering different assistance schemes a merit because they could cater for different situations. He urged the Administration to properly maintain and renovate dilapidated Government buildings. SDEV responded that the Administration had designated funds for maintaining and renovating Government buildings and Ir Dr Raymond HO could provide the relevant information for the Administration's follow-up work.

40. Mr Alan LEONG asked whether the additional 50 staff members to be employed by HKHS and URA would be authorized persons or other types of staff, such as site supervisors. Mr WONG Kit-loong, Deputy Chief Executive Officer, HKHS, responded that the additional staff members would be professionals for monitoring the vetting and approval processes under the Operation to ensure that they would be up to the required standard. Those staff members would not carry out on-site supervision, which would be the responsibility of the authorized persons.

41. Mr Albert CHAN said that the Administration should fine-tune the Operation so that owners of well-maintained buildings could also benefit from the Operation. While expressing support for the Operation, Mr IP Kwok-him said that the Operation might create an impression that it would benefit owners who were unwilling to maintain their buildings and penalize those who maintained their buildings well. Mr KAM Nai-wai shared the view that responsible owners of well-maintained buildings would be penalized by the Operation. SDEV responded that the Administration had no intention to penalize owners who had maintained their buildings well. Through setting eligibility criteria in building age and condition as well as the average rateable values of the residential flats of the target buildings, the Operation could assist those less well-off owners who were in genuine need.

**V Implementation of Kai Tak Development -- infrastructure and environmental improvement to Kai Tak Approach Channel**

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1125/08-09(04) -- Administration's paper on implementation of Kai Tak Development - infrastructure and environmental improvement to Kai Tak Approach Channel

LC Paper No. CB(1)570/08-09(03) -- Administration's paper on the implementation plan for the Kai Tak Development

- LC Paper No. CB(1)570/08-09(04) -- Paper on Kai Tak Development prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat (Background brief)
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1121/08-09(01) -- Administration's supplementary information on the implementation plan for the Kai Tak Development)

42. SDEV said that the Administration had given a general introduction on the implementation of the Kai Tak Development (KTD) at the Panel meeting on 20 January 2009. At members' request, the Administration had subsequently provided a supplementary information paper on the various proposed measures for tackling the environmental problems at the Kai Tak Approach Channel (KTAC) and the planned facilities to be developed on the Government, Institution or Community (GIC) sites in KTD. A few Members participated in the site visit to KTAC on 26 February 2009 during which the Administration introduced and demonstrated the bio-remediation treatment for tackling the environmental problems at KTAC. The Administration also arranged a site visit for the Kowloon City District Council to KTAC on 17 March 2009. She welcomed members' views on the four proposed works items to be implemented in KTD.

#### Odour problem

43. Mr CHAN Kam-lam said that members of the Kowloon City District Council still had concerns on the odour problem at KTAC. Furthermore, they were worried that the water quality at To Kwa Wan Typhoon Shelter (TKWTS) would deteriorate after creating the 600-metre wide opening because of the contaminated sediments at KTAC. Even with the opening created, the water at KTAC would still remain stagnant. He suggested that the length of one of the existing breakwaters be reduced so as to enhance the water flow into and out of KTAC.

44. The Project Manager (Kowloon), Civil Engineering and Development Department (PM(K)) explained that the treated sediments at KTAC would not flow into TKWTS through the opening. As regards the suggestion of enhancing the water flow at KTAC, he said the Administration had conducted detailed analyses which showed that with the opening in place, a large volume of water would flow into and out of KTAC during daily tidal changes. Water of comparatively better quality from Victoria Harbour would improve the water quality at TKWTS and KTAC.

45. Mr LEE Wing-tat expressed doubt that bio-remediation treatment and tidal flush would be effective to eliminate the odour problem at KTAC, which would affect the health of the residents and have an adverse impact on the tourists using the Cruise Terminal. The odour problem also occurred at other locations such as Yau Ma Tei Typhoon Shelter. He asked whether the current option was proposed because its cost was lower and whether there were better but more expensive options.

46. Expressing a similar concern, Mr WONG Yung-kan asked how the Administration would tackle the odour problem at KTAC if tidal flush could not carry away the sediments. He said that the odour problem would still remain if the contaminated sediments were not removed and the odour problem at Yau Ma Tei Typhoon Shelter could illustrate this point. He considered that the sediments should be removed. Bio-remediation treatment was adopted for treating the moats surrounding the Palace Museum in Beijing with satisfactory results and the Administration could communicate with the relevant authorities in this regard. Bio-remediation treatment might alleviate the odour problem at KTAC but he was concerned about the time required for the treatment. The consultants should provide more options for consideration. Although the Administration had been working to alleviate the odour problem, it should further step up its efforts in this regard. The Administration should also have long-term solutions to tackle the odour problem at various nullahs.

47. The Deputy Project Manager (Kowloon), Civil Engineering and Development Department (DPM(K)) said that the Environmental Impact Assessment report elaborated on how to tackle the contaminated sediments and the odour problem at KTAC and Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter. Rather than depending on tidal flush alone, the report recommended a three-pronged approach to tackle the problem. In the short-term, bio-remediation treatment, which was relatively expensive, would be adopted to change the nature of the sediments so as to eliminate the odour. The sediments would be treated in-situ and there was no need to remove them from KTAC. In the long-term, the bottom dissolved oxygen level of the water at KTAC would be increased by creating the 600-metre wide opening, through which water of comparatively better quality from Victoria Harbour could be brought into KTAC by tidal flush. Another long-term measure was to intercept polluted discharges from the hinterland from entering KTAC.

48. The Deputy Secretary for Development (Works) 2 (DS(W)2) added that the Administration had engaged consultants involving experts from local universities including The University of Hong Kong to study the various treatment options adopted in other places including the currently proposed bio-remediation option. For instance, the Administration had considered the feasibility of solidifying; removing, washing and drying the sediments; and other possible options during the planning stage. The Administration had also conducted field trials on site and experts had ascertained the effectiveness of the bio-remediation

treatment. Shing Mun River was treated in a similar way and the monitoring results demonstrated the effectiveness of the treatment. The current option was a balanced approach after taking into account all relevant factors covering technical, environmental and cost considerations. The Administration would conduct further detailed studies on the application of the bio-remediation treatment to KTAC at the design stage.

49. Ms Starry LEE said that she and members of the Kowloon City District Council still had some reservations on creating the 600-metre wide opening. The Administration should consult the Kowloon City District Council and the public, in particular residents of To Kwa Wan, specifically on the proposal to create the opening and provide them with detailed explanation. The Administration should also report the progress of the proposal to the Kowloon City District Council on a regular basis. The odour problem at TKWTS should be tackled first to increase the confidence of the residents in the proposal. She urged the Administration not to create the opening before obtaining the agreement of the Kowloon City District Council and the residents concerned.

50. Mr IP Kwok-him said that he did not have much confidence that the Administration could solve the odour problem because the odour problem at other locations such as Belcher Bay Park remained unsolved. The Administration should treat the odour problem at Belcher Bay Park. There were illegal drains which had not been handled. Creating the opening at KTAC would be too risky because it might aggravate the odour problem at TKWTS. The Administration should provide successful experience to demonstrate the effectiveness of the bio-remediation treatment. He asked whether SDEV had confidence in treating the odour problem. The Administration should provide a clear pledge that its proposal could solve the odour problem at KTAC.

51. DS(W)2 responded that the Administration had consulted the Wong Tai Sin District Council and Kwun Tong District Council on 6 January 2009 and the Kowloon City District Council on 22 January 2009 on the proposal of creating the opening. It would provide further detailed information and regular reports to the relevant District Councils. The Administration would assess the water quality at KTAC before creating the opening so that it would not cause any environmental problems. The Environmental Protection Department had found that polluted discharges from illegal connections were one of the causes of the odour problem at TKWTS. It had taken action and would continue to tackle the problem if further cases were discovered in future. The Civil Engineering and Development Department would study the feasibility of removing some sediments at TKWTS. The Drainage Services Department was also improving the sewerage systems in the hinterland. All these measures would help alleviate the odour problem at TKWTS.



52. DS(W)2 further said that the Environmental Protection Department and the Advisory Committee on the Environment had considered the effectiveness of the bio-remediation treatment before accepting the Environmental Impact Assessment report for KTD. DPM(K) added that the proposal to adopt the bio-remediation treatment was based on the successful experience of treating Shing Mun River and Sam Ka Tsuen. The Administration had also conducted site trials covering a total area of about 4.5 hectares at KTAC. The results showed that the amount of Acid Volatile Sulphides was reduced by over 95%, which demonstrated that the bio-remediation treatment was an effective option for tackling the odour problem. The Administration would ensure that the water quality at KTAC would be up to the required standard before creating the opening. Therefore, the proposal of creating the opening would not be risky. The measures to be adopted to tackle the odour problem at any particular location had to be studied individually because each location had its own circumstances. SDEV said that she had confidence in the works departments and the Administration would study the feasibility of alleviating the odour problem at Belcher Bay Park.

53. Dr Priscilla LEUNG also expressed concern on the odour problem at Tai Kok Tsui and TKWTS. She suggested the Administration draw reference from the successful experience of Taiwan and Singapore in tackling the odour problem at KTAC and brief members of the Kowloon City District Council on such overseas experience to enhance their understanding on how to tackle the odour problem.

54. DS(W)2 responded that the Administration had consulted the Kowloon City District Council on 22 January 2009 and organized a site visit for it on 17 March 2009 to provide detailed explanation on and demonstrate the bio-remediation treatment. The Administration would continue to brief the Kowloon City District Council on the progress of treating KTAC. The Administration had confidence in the proposed option which was supported by university experts. Together with other measures such as creating an opening to enhance water flow, KTAC would become fresh and new. The Administration had considered the experience of overseas places and each place would adopt an option which would cater for their particular circumstances. In Hong Kong, the odour problem at KTAC was caused by smelly hydrogen sulphides under anaerobic condition and injecting calcium nitrate solution into the upper layer of the sediments to oxidize the sulphides would alleviate the odour problem.

55. Mrs Sophie LEUNG considered that members should have an entrepreneurial mindset and spirit in furthering Hong Kong's development. She had been proposing not to reclaim KTAC over the past two years. She urged the public to care for the harbour and considered the odour problem a relatively minor issue. She had confidence that the Administration would continue to tackle the odour problem at KTAC and other locations in future. She expressed support for beautifying KTAC and other harbourfront areas.

Road infrastructure, waterfront promenades and Government offices

56. Miss Tanya CHAN expressed concern that some planned roads in KTD were near the harbourfront. As KTD was planned from scratch in a comprehensive manner, she asked whether it was possible to locate those roads further away from the harbourfront and the pedestrian footpaths. Roads should be located along the central part of the former runway and trees should be planted to serve as a barrier to enhance the environment. The Administration should draw reference from Singapore and Sydney in planning for harbourfront areas in KTD. There could be facilities such as restaurants, cafes, food kiosks and cycle tracks along the harbourfront areas on both sides of the former runway if KTAC could be successfully treated. Sufficient space should be reserved for such facilities to provide leisure activities for the public.

57. Dr Priscilla LEUNG urged the Administration to implement short-term, medium-term and long-term planning for creating continuous waterfront promenades. There should be boulevards lined with trees leading to the waterfront promenades.

58. DPM(K) responded that except for certain isolated sections, the waterfront promenades in KTD would not have any adjoining major roads. The four proposed works items at this stage were necessary infrastructure projects for supporting future developments in KTD. There would be a landscaped deck along the runway to provide a relaxing walking environment and to shield the adjacent residential developments from traffic noise. If roads were located along the central part of the former runway, residential developments would be affected by traffic noise. Space had been reserved for waterfront promenades on both sides of the former runway and depending on the exact location, the width of the waterfront promenades would generally be about 20 metres. The kinds of facilities and activities to be accommodated in each section of the waterfront promenades could be considered at the detailed design stage.

59. In addition to planning for road infrastructure in KTD, Mr CHAN Kam-lam considered that the Administration should plan for road infrastructure at the opposite bank of KTAC. As regards the proposed Kai Tak Government Offices, he strongly urged that more Government departments should be accommodated there so as to provide one-stop services to citizens.

60. PM(K) responded that the road infrastructure in peripheral areas of KTD would be considered at the next stage of the implementation of KTD. The Administration would continue to brief the public and District Councils concerned. SDEV said that KTD was a large and long-term project and the Administration would continue to gauge Members' views in future because some implementation details had yet to be studied and handled. The Development Bureau would coordinate with other Government bureaux and departments in

implementing the developments in KTD, such as the proposed Kai Tak Government Offices.

61. Mr Alan LEONG and Mrs Sophie LEUNG enquired about the proposed works relating to the bridges spanning across KTAC and expressed concern on whether the works would be in breach of the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance. Mr Alan LEONG was worried that vessel access to KTAC would be blocked.

62. DS(W)2 clarified that the bridge spanning across KTAC was an existing taxiway bridge connecting the former runway with the former south apron area. Roadworks would be carried out on the bridge to provide a connection from Kwun Tong to the Cruise Terminal before the completion of other road infrastructure in KTD. Two footbridges would be constructed across KTAC to facilitate pedestrian access. Although KTAC was within the boundary of Victoria Harbour, there were currently no vessels navigating in KTAC. The Department of Justice had been consulted on the matter in regard to the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance and there should be no major problem of constructing the two footbridges. The Administration would continue to solicit the views of the District Councils and parties concerned during the design stage.

#### Other issues

63. As the implementation of KTD would span over 10 years, Mr Alan LEONG asked whether the Administration would consider making provisions for constructing facilities such as temporary parks in KTD, like what had been done in West Kowloon. He expressed concern on whether KTD would be implemented according to the planning objectives and parameters for the development, and asked whether the Administration would include the planning concepts and parameters in the relevant land leases. He also asked how the Administration would continue to conduct public engagement when implementing KTD, and whether the district cooling system would be designed with sufficient capacity for KTD.

64. DS(W)2 responded that as many infrastructure projects would be carried out in different parts of KTD and space would also be needed for works-related purposes such as loading and unloading of materials, no suitable vacant sites would be available for temporary public use. Nevertheless, a temporary waterfront promenade was under construction near the Kwun Tong Public Cargo Working Area and the project was expected to be completed by the end of 2009. As regards planning control, SDEV said that the relevant Outline Zoning Plan provided statutory regulation on the land uses and planning parameters for the developments in KTD. The Administration was exploring new modes of planning control for the West Kowloon Cultural District and would consider whether such new modes were applicable to KTD. The Administration would conduct public engagement as appropriate for individual projects such as the runway park and

monorail system. KTD would facilitate the revitalization of nearby old districts. The implementation of KTD would be an evolving and interactive process. As for the district cooling system, the Environment Bureau had consulted the Panel on Environmental Affairs on the project. DS(W)2 added that the district cooling system would be implemented in phases and it would have sufficient capacity for the relevant developments in KTD.

65. Ir Dr Raymond HO welcomed the implementation of KTD. Referring to Enclosure 2 to the Administration's paper, he said that the apparently high consultants' fees for items 469CL and 711CL were due to the fact that resident site staff costs were included in the calculation of consultants' fees. He asked whether the Administration would consider presenting the costs for consultants and resident site staff separately.

66. DS(W)2 responded that all the Administration's funding proposals for works projects were presented in the same standard format. He would solicit the views of the Financial Services and the Treasury Bureau on whether and how the standard presentation format could be changed.

**VI PWP items no. 5035CG -- Greening Master Plan for Kowloon West -- studies and works, 5036CG -- Greening Master Plan for Hong Kong Island -- studies and works; and 5040CG -- Greening Master Plan for Kowloon East -- studies and works**

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1125/08-09(05) -- Administration's paper on implementation of greening works of Greening Master Plans for remaining urban areas

LC Paper No. CB(1)1125/08-09(06) -- Paper on Greening Master Plans prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat (Background brief)

67. SDEV said that the Administration's proposal covered the greening works for remaining urban areas and subject to funding approval, the Administration would implement the works through seven contracts in response to Members' earlier requests to facilitate participation by small and medium contractors in the tender exercises. As regards the New Territories, the Administration intended to consult the District Councils and other stakeholders in the New Territories in mid-2009 on the development of Greening Master Plans for the New Territories.

68. Miss Tanya CHAN noted that the Leisure and Cultural Services Department was responsible for maintaining the majority of the planted greenery in Hong Kong. In this regard, she asked how the Administration would facilitate the department's work, such as providing appropriate equipment, if the department was responsible for maintaining the greenery to be planted under the proposed greening works.

69. The Head of Civil Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department, said that the Civil Engineering and Development Department was discussing with the Leisure and Cultural Services Department on the plant maintenance arrangements after the one-year establishment period for short-term greening. The Administration would consider the feasibility of including appropriate equipment, such as automatic water sprinklers for watering the greenery, during the design stage if the topology and environment allowed the installation of such equipment to facilitate future plant maintenance.

70. As members did not raise further questions, the Chairman said that the above views would be reported to the Public Works Subcommittee when it considered the relevant funding proposal.

## **VII Any other business**

71. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 5:30 pm.