

Panel on Development

List of follow-up actions (Position as at 17 January 2013)

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|---|------------------|--|---|
| 1. Energizing Kowloon East (Development Bureau) | 19 December 2011 | Members opined that the Administration should formulate a long-term strategic plan for supply of office land in various districts in Hong Kong. In this connection, the Administration was requested to provide an analysis of demand and supply of office space by district in the past 10 years and, as far as possible, a projection of the same in the next five years. | The Administration's response was issued to members on 14 December 2012 vide LC Paper No. CB(1)319/12-13(01). |
| 2. PWP Item No. 111KA -- Government, institution or community facilities in the Kwun Tong Town Centre redevelopment -- additional medical and health facilities (Development Bureau) | 27 November 2012 | The Administration was requested to provide the following information to address members' concerns -- (a) plans/drawings of the layout design of the medical and health facilities (with proposed additional floor areas) to be reprovisioned at Yuet Wah Street, including the design of all no-barrier access facilities; (b) the construction cost per square foot that the | Administration's response awaited |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|--|------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| | | <p>Administration would reimburse the Urban Renewal Authority ("URA") for the provision of the additional floor space at the reprovisioned medical and health facilities; and</p> <p>(c) in respect of URA's funding responsibility for the one-for-one reprovisioning of the existing medical and health facilities at the Kwun Tong Jockey Club Health Centre:</p> <p>(i) the background for the one-for-one reprovisioning arrangement, including whether that is an existing policy, whether there are precedents and the consultation process;</p> <p>(ii) a comparison between URA's one-for-one reprovisioning arrangement for relocating Government facilities (as in the case mentioned above) and its compensation offered to shop owners affected by the Kwun Tong Town Centre ("KTTC") redevelopment project;</p> | |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|--|------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| | | <p>(iii) whether the Administration will review the Urban Renewal Authority Ordinance (Cap. 563) in respect of the compensation for shop owners, so that they would be entitled to the compensation arrangements for relocating Government facilities;</p> <p>(iv) the potential profits that URA would make by developing the site previously used as the Kwun Tong Government Offices and the site currently used by the Kwun Tong Jockey Club Health Centre, which are at excellent locations, in exchange for reprovisioning affected Government facilities on a one-for-one basis;</p> <p>(v) the reasons for not requiring URA to bear the costs for constructing the proposed additional floor space at the reprovisioned medical and health facilities, as in other cases where developers were required to provide additional facilities with the</p> | |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|---|------------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>development of a site previously used as Government facilities; and</p> <p>(vi) whether the one-for-one reprovisioning arrangement will be adopted in future projects on Government sites undertaken by URA or private developers.</p> | |
| <p>3. North East New Territories New Development Areas and Engineering Study (Development Bureau)</p> | <p>8 December 2012</p> | <p>Regarding the proposals under the Recommended Outline Development Plans to designate the core area of Long Valley within the Kwu Tung North New Development Area (NDA) (37 hectares) as a Nature Park for farmers to continue agricultural activities, in particular wet agriculture, and maintain two pieces of land to the north and south of the Nature Park (45 hectares) and an area in Fu Tei Au (9 hectares) as "Agriculture" zones, members noted some deputations were concerned that (LC Paper Nos. CB(1)243/12-13(11) to (13) & (15)) --</p> <p>(i) the proposal to convert the dry agricultural land in Long Valley into wetlands to compensate for the loss of existing wetlands</p> | <p>Administration's response awaited</p> |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|--|------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| | | <p>due to the NDAs development would not only reduce the ecological value of Long Valley and undermine the efforts of some farmers and organizations made in nature conservation, but also force some existing farmers to move out from Long Valley; and</p> <p>(ii) the proposal to designate the existing good-quality agricultural land in the three NDAs, including wet agricultural land and active agricultural land, as non-agricultural uses would deprive farmers of the opportunities to continue their farming practices in these areas.</p> <p>In this connection, the Administration was requested to provide information on --</p> <p>(a) its policies/plans to address the above concerns; and</p> <p>(b) whether the existing/affected farmers would be allowed to continue their current agricultural practices on the farmland mentioned in (ii) above and to build</p> | |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|---|------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| | | houses/structures on the land; if yes, the details. | |
| 4. North East New Territories New Development Areas Planning and Engineering Study (Development Bureau) | 15 December 2012 | <p>The Administration was requested to provide --</p> <p>(A) the following information to address members' and deputations' concerns --</p> <p><u>Visits by the Secretary for Development</u></p> <p>(a) whether the incumbent Secretary for Development ("SDEV") had visited the areas to be affected by the proposed North East New Territories New Development Areas ("NENT NDAs") project ("the proposed project") and listened to the views of residents in these areas; if yes, the date of each visit, the locations/villages visited and the major views collected during the visits;</p> <p><u>Land resumption</u></p> | Administration's response awaited |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|--|------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| | | <p>(b) the total area of land to be resumed by the Administration for the proposed project; the total estimated amount of funds required for the land resumption and compensation; and whether the Administration would handle claims for compensation for disturbance to "fung shui" arising from the NENT NDAs proposals, if yes, the estimated amount of funds to be involved;</p> <p><u>Land acquisition</u></p> <p>(c) the number of households who had been forced to move out from their homes in the proposed project areas as a result of land acquisition/resumption actions by private developers/land owners since the Administration had indicated that it would develop NENT; whether and in what way the Administration had offered assistance to these households;</p> <p><u>Agricultural activities</u></p> | |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|--|------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| | | <p>(d) the number of farmers in Hong Kong who were currently on the Administration's waiting list for agricultural rehabilitation; the total area and locations of arable land in Hong Kong that are suitable and ready for agricultural rehabilitation;</p> <p>(e) the number of farmers in the areas to be affected by the proposed project who would not be allowed to continue their agricultural practices in-situ following the implementation of the project; and, among these farmers, the number of them who had indicated their requests for agricultural rehabilitation;</p> <p>(f) among the 91 hectares of land (including the core area of Long Valley within the Kwu Tung North NDA (37 hectares) as well as two pieces of land to its north and south (45 hectares), and an area in Fu Tei Au (9 hectares))</p> | |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|--|------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| | | <p>reserved for agricultural rehabilitation, the respective proportion/size of the land which was currently (i) under cultivation, (ii) occupied by squatter huts, (iii) fish ponds; and (iv) brownfield sites;</p> <p><u>Expansion of Village-type Development Areas</u></p> <p>(g) whether the planning for the Kwu Tung North NDA included a proposal to provide land for indigenous villagers to expand the areas zoned for Village-type Development ("V"-Zones); if yes, the justifications for the expansion, and whether it was undertaken by the Administration in exchange for the support of indigenous villagers to the NENT NDAs proposals;</p> <p><u>Compensation issues</u></p> | |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|--|------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| | | <p>(h) regarding the connecting road for the proposed Liantang/Heung Yuen Wai Boundary Control Point, a comparison of the government funds that would have been needed to be committed for land resumption and compensation under each of the three alignment options; and the reasons for selecting the preferred option (the alignment leading to Tolo Highway); and</p> <p>(B) written response to the following views /requests of members and deputations --</p> <p><u>Rural living</u></p> <p>(i) that land resumption/clearance following the implementation of the NENT NDAs proposals should not disrupt the villagers' years of efforts in establishing their homes as well as their community networks; that it would be difficult for villagers, in particular the elderly, to adapt to living outside the village and they should be</p> | |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|--|------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| | | <p>allowed to continue their rural living in-situ;</p> <p><u>Agricultural activities</u></p> <p>(j) that the proposed NENT NDAs development should not lead to loss of agricultural land and adversely affect the livelihood of the existing farmers;</p> <p>(k) that the existing farmers should be allowed to continue their agricultural practices in-situ, in view of the difficulties for them, in particular the elder ones, to rehabilitate their agricultural practices in a new location;</p> <p>(l) that the Administration should formulate agricultural policies to support/promote local agriculture including urban agriculture, taking into account that local agricultural development would be beneficial to Hong Kong by providing job opportunities, avoiding over-reliance</p> | |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|--|------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| | | <p>on imported food supply and reducing carbon emission;</p> <p><u>Preservation of existing green belts</u></p> <p>(m) that the NENT NDAs should focus on green and sustainable development and the existing green belt areas should be retained;</p> <p><u>Damage of farmland</u></p> <p>(n) that the Administration should introduce measures to monitor/control the so-called "damaging the farmland and making it deserted" scenario arising from developers'/land owners' acts on the farmland in the areas to be covered by the proposed project;</p> <p><u>Housing development</u></p> <p>(o) that the proportion of the land allocated to public housing should not be much</p> | |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|--|------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| | | <p>smaller than that for private residential development in the proposed NENT NDAs;</p> <p>(p) that the proposed project should not mainly provide luxurious residential units which would only be affordable by the rich, including the Mainlanders, while the existing grassroot residents in the areas affected would be evicted and would not enjoy the benefits from the development at all;</p> <p>(q) that the Administration should provide land for constructing private residential units with limited floor areas in the proposed NENT NDAs and implement the policy of "Hong Kong property for Hong Kong residents" in the areas;</p> <p><u>Rehousing</u></p> <p>(r) that if the proposed project was to proceed, the Administration should adopt the "rehouse first, develop later"</p> | |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|--|------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| | | <p>approach so that the villagers, including those who were not eligible for public housing or interim housing, would not have to be worried about rehousing;</p> <p>(s) that, as the deputations said that developers/land owners had been forcing the existing residents to move out, the Administration should conduct surveys as early as possible to ascertain the actual number and the circumstances/requests of the affected households in the proposed development areas, and should not wait until the completion of the NENT NDAs planning stage or commencement of the implementation stage;</p> <p>(t) that public housing units should be provided in the Ping Che/Ta Kwu Ling NDA for rehousing the local residents;</p> <p><u>Use of land</u></p> | |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|--|------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| | | <p>(u) that Fu Tei Au should be designated as an "Agriculture" zone and conservation area, not to be reserved for building police training facilities (including the police driving training complex and weapon training field), taking into consideration that the provisioning of such facilities would disrupt the natural environment;</p> <p><u>Urban design</u></p> <p>(v) that, as regards urban design for NENT NDAs, the Administration should control building height and density to avoid the creation of "walled effects", and allow small food premises as well as street-level shops to serve the nearby residents;</p> <p><u>Job opportunities</u></p> <p>(w) that the employment opportunities offered by special industries in the proposed NENT NDAs might not be</p> | |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|--|------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| | | <p>suitable for residents with lower education or skills, and they might be required to pay high transport fares and commute a long way to work in urban areas;</p> <p><u>Wah Shan Tsuen</u></p> <p>(x) that the proposed project should exclude Wah Shan Tsuen, of which seven households would be singled out and affected by the latest plan for the project but the majority would not;</p> <p><u>Tin Ping Shan Tsuen</u></p> <p>(y) that the proposed project should cover Tin Ping Shan Tsuen, otherwise, the village would be surrounded by new tall buildings following the implementation of the project, thus giving rise to a "walled effect" in the village; land should be reserved for local reprovisioning of the village; and the proposed road</p> | |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|--|------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| | | <p>construction/improvement works in the vicinity of the village should not be carried out prior to the clearance of the village;</p> <p><u>Removal of ancestral graves</u></p> <p>(z) that the NENT NDAs proposals should not lead to removal of villagers' ancestral graves/urns in some of the areas to be affected;</p> <p><u>Consultation</u></p> <p>(aa) that, since SDEV had not attended the meetings of 8 and 15 December 2012, he should meet with villagers to be affected by the proposed project in person to listen and respond to their views/concerns; and the Administration should also send personnel to visit individual households in the areas to be affected to collect their views on the proposed project and see for themselves the</p> | |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|--|------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| | | <p>villagers' circumstances;</p> <p><u>Assessment of the benefits of the project</u></p> <p>(bb) that the Administration should clarify how it assessed the benefits of the proposed project to the overall interest of Hong Kong (question raised in a submission -- LC Paper No. CB(1)334/12-13(10));</p> <p><u>Impact on existing residents and businesses</u></p> <p>(cc) that in planning the proposed project, the Administration had put its focus on the integration between Hong Kong and Shenzhen and allowed the large consortia/major developers to benefit exclusively from the development at the expense of the interests of the existing squatters, farmers, as well as small-scale rural industries (such as soya source factories) which currently offered employment opportunities in the areas;</p> | |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|--|------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| | | <p><u>Golf course</u></p> <p>(dd) whether the Administration would take forward the suggestion of resuming part (say, one-third) of the golf course located to the south of Kwu Tung for the purpose of developing public housing, in view of the site's size and its proximity to the Sheung Shui railway station; if not, the justifications;</p> <p><u>Withdrawal of the project</u></p> <p>(ee) the request for "no removal, no demolition, withdrawal of the "bad" project";</p> <p>(ff) that there was no imminent need for developing NENT NDAs, taking into account that the projected Hong Kong resident population would not increase to 8.4 million until 2041 and vacant land was available in the developed</p> | |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|---|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>areas of Hong Kong for residential developments;</p> <p><u>Withdrawal of the Announcement of Public Interests</u></p> <p>(gg) whether and when the Administration would discontinue broadcasting the Announcement of Public Interests ("API") on the proposed project in view of some members' and deputations' requests made at the meeting; if not, the justifications.</p> | |
| <p>5. Progress report of Energizing Kowloon East Office and its continuing operation (Development Bureau)</p> | <p>7 January 2013</p> | <p>The Administration was requested to provide information about --</p> <p>(a) the floor area currently occupied by individuals/groups/establishments engaged in the operations of cultural & creative workshops (such as art/music/film studios) in the industrial buildings in Kowloon East; and</p> <p>(b) in the event that they had to move out because of the revitalization of industrial</p> | <p>Administration's response awaited</p> |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|--|------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>buildings or rising rents following the transformation of Kowloon East into a core business district, whether and in what ways the Administration would offer assistance to them (in particular, whether the Administration would reserve space in other parts of Kowloon East for them to continue their operations); if yes, the details.</p> | |
| <p>6. PWP Item No. 731CL -- Infrastructure works for housing sites adjacent to Lung Ping Road at Tai Wo Ping, Shek Kip Mei (Development Bureau)</p> | <p>7 January 2013</p> | <p>The Administration was requested to provide information about vacant private residential units of area over 100 square metres in the market, including the number and the vacancy rate.</p> <p>Moreover, to address members' concerns about the shortage in housing supply, the Administration was requested to --</p> <p>(a) review the land use, including the suitability for public housing development, and the development parameters, such as the plot ratio and development intensity, for the two concerned housing sites to make more efficient use of land resources; and</p> | <p>Administration's response awaited</p> |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|--|------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>(b) study whether potential sites without necessary infrastructure could be put up for sale to developers in order to expedite the supply of housing land to the market, and whether provisions requiring the successful developer to undertake the necessary infrastructural and road works could be incorporated in the land sale conditions to save public money.</p> | |
| <p>7. Enforcement strategy in relation to recent unauthorized building works cases with major public concerns (Development Bureau)</p> | <p>7 January 2013</p> | <p>In respect of the Administration's advice that to seal an unauthorized floor space with a wall was not an acceptable rectification action, the Administration was requested to provide details of approved rectification works for unauthorized floor space.</p> <p>As regards the unauthorized buildings works at Houses Nos. 4 and 5 at No. 4 Peel Rise, the Administration was requested to provide, with the consent of the owner of the houses if necessary, the following information --</p> <p>(a) details of the remedial proposal approved by the Buildings Department ("BD") in relation to the unauthorized floor space at the garden</p> | <p>Administration's response awaited</p> |

| Subject (Responsible Bureau/Office) | Date of meeting | Follow-up actions required | Administration's response |
|--|------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| | | <p>level beneath the parking space at House 5; and</p> <p>(b) correspondences between BD and the owner of the two houses (or the Authorized Person appointed by the owner ("the AP")) in relation to a wall on the lower ground floor of House 4, in particular whether the owner/the AP had informed BD that he would not respond, due to related judicial proceedings, to BD's letter issued on 27 June 2012 and the three subsequent reminders.</p> | |

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
17 January 2013