

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. PWSC91/16-17
(These minutes have been
seen by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/F/2/1(8)B

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

**Minutes of the 7th meeting
held in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex
on Friday, 3 February 2017, at 10:45 am**

Members present:

Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, SBS, MH, JP (Chairman)
Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP
Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, GBS, JP
Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, GBS, JP
Hon WONG Ting-kwong, SBS, JP
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, SBS, JP
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, BBS, JP
Hon WONG Kwok-kin, SBS, JP
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung
Hon Claudia MO
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, JP
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH
Hon YIU Si-wing, BBS
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen
Hon CHAN Han-pan, JP
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, BBS, MH, JP
Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP

Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
Hon KWOK Wai-keung
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan
Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, JP
Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, JP
Hon Alvin YEUNG
Hon CHU Hoi-dick
Hon Jimmy NG Wing-ka, JP
Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP
Hon HO Kai-ming
Hon LAM Cheuk-ting
Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding
Hon SHIU Ka-chun
Hon Wilson OR Chong-shing, MH
Hon CHAN Chun-ying
Hon Tanya CHAN
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, JP
Hon HUI Chi-fung
Hon LAU Kwok-fan, MH
Hon KWONG Chun-yu
Hon Jeremy TAM Man-ho
Hon Nathan LAW Kwun-chung
Dr Hon YIU Chung-yim
Dr Hon LAU Siu-lai

Members absent:

Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP
Hon Steven HO Chun-yin, BBS
Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP
Hon Andrew WAN Siu-kin
Hon Kenneth LAU Ip-keung, MH, JP

Public officers attending:

Mr Raistlin LAU Chun, JP	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) ³
Mr HON Chi-keung, JP	Permanent Secretary for Development (Works)
Mr Michael WONG Wai-lun, JP	Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)
Mr Donald TONG Chi-keung, JP	Permanent Secretary for the Environment
Ms Jasmine CHOI Suet-yung	Principal Assistant Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) (Works)
Ms Joyce NG Suet-ye	Assistant Director of Lands (Acquisition)(Acting)
Ms Sylvia LAM YU Ka-wai	Director of Architectural Services (Acting)
Mr HUI Chiu-kin	Assistant Director of Architectural Services (Property Services)
Mr Edwin TONG Ka-hung, JP	Director of Drainage Services
Mr LAM Sai-hung, JP	Director of Civil Engineering and Development
Mr Ricky LAU Chun-kit, JP	Head of Civil Engineering Office Civil Engineering and Development Department
Ms Betty CHEUNG Miu-han	Assistant Director of Environmental Protection (Environmental Infrastructure)
Mr Samson LAI Yiu-kei	Assistant Director of Environmental Protection (Waste Management Policy)
Mr CHUI Wing-wah	Deputy Director of Highways
Mr Raymond KONG Tai-wing	Deputy Project Manager (Major Works) ¹ Highways Department

Miss Charmaine WONG Hoi-wan, JP	Assistant Director of Home Affairs (2)
Mr Martin KWAN Wai-cheong	Chief Engineer (Works) Home Affairs Department
Miss Winnie WONG Ming-wai	Deputy Secretary-General (1) University Grants Committee Secretariat
Mr LEE Kam-yuen	Chief Maintenance Surveyor (School Premises Maintenance) Education Bureau
Ms PING Tak-wai	Senior Maintenance Surveyor (School Premises Maintenance) Education Bureau
Mr KOK Che-leung	Assistant Director of Social Welfare (Subventions)
Ms PANG Kit-ling	Assistant Director of Social Welfare (Elderly)
Mr Kenneth WOO Chi-man	Chief Executive Officer (Subventions/ Planning) Social Welfare Department
Mr WONG Chung-leung, JP	Deputy Director of Water Supplies
Mr Dominic KWONG Kam-keung	Chief Systems Manager (Governance and Resources) Office of the Government Chief Information Officer
Mr Kenneth LEUNG Tak-yan	Chief Civil Engineer (Public Works Programme) Transport and Housing Bureau
Mr IP Shing-tim	Chief Civil Engineer (2) Housing Department
Clerk in attendance:	
Ms Sharon CHUNG	Chief Council Secretary (1)2

Staff in attendance:

Miss Rita YUNG	Senior Council Secretary (1)2
Mr Raymond CHOW	Senior Council Secretary (1)6
Ms Mandy LI	Council Secretary (1)2
Ms Christy YAU	Legislative Assistant (1)7
Ms Clara LO	Legislative Assistant (1)8
Miss Joey LAW	Clerical Assistant (1)2

Action

The Chairman advised that in the 2016-2017 legislative session, the Subcommittee had completed the scrutiny of one item up to the last meeting, involving a total funding allocation of \$1,146.8 million. There were seven funding proposals on the agenda for the meeting. All of them were items carried over from the last meeting of the Subcommittee on 25 January 2017. Having taken into account the Administration's plan to submit a total of 43 items for the Subcommittee's examination in the current legislative session, he considered that the current progress of examination by the Subcommittee was very slow.

2. The Chairman reminded members that in accordance with Rule 83A of the Rules of Procedure ("RoP") of the Legislative Council ("LegCo"), they should disclose the nature of any direct or indirect pecuniary interests relating to the funding proposals under discussion at the meeting before they spoke on the proposals. He also drew members' attention to Rule 84 of RoP on voting in case of direct pecuniary interest.

Capital Works Reserve Fund Block Allocations

PWSC(2016-17)37

**Block allocations for Heads 701 to 711
under the Capital Works Reserve Fund**

3. The Chairman advised that the proposal, i.e. PWSC(2016-17)37, was to seek the approval for an allocation of \$12,420.2 million for 2017-2018 for the block allocations under the Capital Works Reserve Fund ("CWRF"), the increase of the approved allocation for Subhead 9100WX under Head 709 for 2016-2017 by \$68.2 million, and revising the ambit of Subhead 6101TX under Head 706 with effect from 2017-2018. The Subcommittee had commenced deliberation on the proposal at the meeting on 25 January 2017.

Background information on Capital Works Reserve Fund Block Allocations

4. At the invitation of the Chairman, Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury)3 ("DSFST(T)3") briefed members on the background information on CWRP block allocations. He said that in general, expenditure items under CWRP must be approved by the Finance Committee ("FC") on a project-by-project basis in accordance with the resolution pertaining to CWRP. To enable a more efficient operation of FC and the Subcommittee, so that they might concentrate on the more important and higher-value projects, FC had authorized the Financial Secretary to approve expenditure on individual projects under CWRP block allocation subheads, subject to the authorized ceiling of estimated project costs and the projects meeting the ambit of the relevant subheads. Pursuant to established practice, the Administration sought FC's funding approval for each block allocation subhead once every year. To enhance transparency and accountability, the Administration would deposit with the LegCo Secretariat a full list setting out all the items proposed to be funded in the relevant year under each block allocation subhead when seeking funding approval for block allocations. In addition, the Administration had been providing quarterly reports and year-end reports to the Subcommittee on the updated expenditure profile.

5. DSFST(T)3 further said that block allocations facilitated the delivery of capital works by the Government. The funds enabled works departments to conduct technical feasibility studies, prepare tender documents, etc. for major capital works projects. The advance work was important to members' future scrutiny of the funding proposals of the major works concerned. Moreover, the works departments could use the funds to carry out standalone minor improvement works items of a smaller scale or at the district level (e.g. minor building works for schools and public facilities, local roadworks and drainage improvements) in a more efficient manner.

6. DSFST(T)3 added that the proposed block allocations subheads comprised over 9 000 projects, among which more than 8 000 had been created and were underway. For example, Subhead 7017CX - Pre-construction works, consultancy fee and study for construction of music fountains at Kwun Tong Promenade (Annex 7C to PWSC(2016-17)37) under Head 707 - New Towns and Urban Area Development was one of the on-going projects.

Proposal to take out individual projects under the proposed block allocations for separate deliberation and voting

7. Regarding Mr CHU Hoi-dick's letter to the Chairman (LC Paper No. PWSC61/16-17(01)) requesting for taking out 26 projects from the proposed block allocations for suspended implementation or separate deliberation and voting, DSFST(T)3 said that more than 20 projects among those mentioned by Mr CHU had already commenced. The termination of such projects by the Administration might constitute breach of contract and affect the confidence of the industry and operation of small and medium enterprises.

8. The Chairman noted some members' request for taking out controversial projects under the proposed block allocations for separate deliberation and voting by the Subcommittee. He was of the view that the deliberation process would be endless if the Subcommittee took out individual projects for deliberation and voting one by one. Having considered the Administration's explanation for the delegation of power by FC regarding the expenditure of small-scale projects, and the decision he made when presiding over the Subcommittee's meetings in the previous term that proposed block allocations should be dealt with in accordance with the Subcommittee's established practice, the Chairman found it inappropriate for the Subcommittee to deliberate and vote on individual projects separately. FC also voted against making changes to the established practice in 2016. The Chairman stressed that the Subcommittee's terms of reference were to consider funding proposals submitted by the Administration, and as appropriate, to recommend to FC. FC might refer to the minutes of meetings of the Subcommittee to learn about the views of Subcommittee members, so as to decide whether the relevant funding proposal should be approved. The Subcommittee might request to vote on such funding proposal separately at the FC meeting.

9. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung criticized that many public works projects implemented by the Administration in recent years had experienced severe cost overruns. The Administration had the responsibility to provide the Subcommittee with detailed explanation for each project. He concurred with Mr CHU Hoi-dick that works items under the Wang Chau Development Project and the approval for land acquisition expenses should be put on hold. He stressed that LegCo Members should exercise their functions and powers pursuant to Article 73 of the Basic Law, which included approving public expenditure and monitoring the work of the Government.

10. Ms Claudia MO said that the explanation given by the Administration for its refusal to take out controversial items from the proposed block allocations was self-contradictory. Moreover, the bundling of the proposed

block allocations was hardly acceptable. She also disagreed with the Chairman that the Subcommittee had to adhere to its established practice in dealing with proposed block allocations in the past. She considered that the funding proposal covered a number of highly controversial projects (e.g. studies or works related to the Wang Chau Development Project, Development of Lok Ma Chau Loop, and Lam Tsuen Wishing Square) and members should not proceed to voting before going through them one by one.

11. The Chairman said that the public works projects currently covered by the proposed block allocations each involved funding of less than \$30 million (except for the Universal Accessibility Programme, compensation for land resumptions and landslip preventive measures). Such an arrangement provided flexibility for the Administration to implement projects of a smaller scale. For public works projects (including those mentioned by Ms Claudia MO) which needed to be upgraded to Category A and incurred an expenditure over \$30 million, the Administration was required to submit the relevant funding proposals to Panel(s) and the Subcommittee for discussion and to FC for consideration.

12. Dr YIU Chung-yim declared interest that during his employment with the Chinese University of Hong Kong, he had participated in the consultancy study for the project 5H73CL (Study on the technical issues related to the potential reclamation site at Ma Liu Shui) under Head 705 Subhead 5101CX - Civil engineering works, studies and investigations for items in Category D of the Public Works Programme. As he was no longer an employee of the Chinese University of Hong Kong, he did not have any direct pecuniary interests in the project. Dr YIU said that before the block allocations proposal FCR(2013-2014)48 was discussed by FC in 2014, the Administration had decided to take out the controversial projects from the block allocations proposal before the meeting as it expected that there would not be sufficient members to support the proposal. He urged the Administration to take out immediately the 26 more controversial projects from the block allocations proposal, thus allowing the Subcommittee to first deal with the remaining non-controversial projects. He also enquired whether the Administration would refuse to take out a project from the block allocations proposal if the consultant involved had breached the contract (e.g. the consultant's unauthorized use of internal confidential information of the Government).

13. DSFST(T)3 replied that the Administration submitted the block allocations proposal to the Subcommittee to seek its support for recommendation to FC for funding approval to provide funds for various subheads under CWRP block allocations for 2017-2018. The proposed projects were created with the power delegated by FC and were not part of

the funding proposal for which FC's approval was to be sought. He further said that members could provide the Administration with information on the consultant's alleged breach of contract for follow-up actions. The Chairman said that if the consultant of a project was found to have breached the contract, the Administration should take appropriate follow-up actions even if funding was approved. DSFST(T)3 added that if irregularities were identified in any projects, the Administration would pursue responsibility with the persons concerned in accordance with the contract terms.

Motion to adjourn further proceedings of the Subcommittee

14. At 11:18 am, Dr YIU Chung-yim, when speaking on the item, moved a motion pursuant to paragraph 33 of the Public Works Subcommittee Procedure to adjourn further proceedings of the Subcommittee.

15. The Chairman said that the Subcommittee would proceed forthwith to deal with the motion proposed by Dr YIU Chung-yim. Each member could speak once on the motion, and the speaking time should not be more than three minutes.

16. Dr YIU Chung-yim expressed dissatisfaction that the Administration had failed to respond to members' request for taking out the controversial projects from the proposed block allocations. He criticized that the submission of funding proposals involving several thousand projects in a bundled manner had made it difficult for members to monitor issues that might be involved in individual projects, such as conflict of interests and breach of contract. He proposed that further proceedings of the Subcommittee be adjourned, so as to allow members to make best use of one week's time to grasp the details of individual projects through meeting with relevant bureaux/departments before holding further meeting to examine the funding proposal.

17. Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Jeremy TAM, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr LAU Siu-lai, Mr Nathan LAW, Ms Claudia MO, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr KWONG Chun-yu, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr HUI Chi-fung, Mr SHIU Ka-chun and Mr James TO spoke in support of the motion proposed by Dr YIU Chung-yim.

18. Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr Nathan LAW, Mr CHU Hoi-dick and Mr SHIU Ka-chun said that in general, they supported the some 9 000 non-controversial projects under the block allocations proposal. However, as far as the paper on the proposed block allocations provided by the Administration was concerned, information on some of the

more controversial individual projects was scanty. They requested the Administration to take out the 26 controversial projects (including those related to the development of Wang Chau) from the proposal so that non-controversial projects could be endorsed first. Mr HUI Chi-fung expressed dissatisfaction that the Chairman did not respond to some members' request for the Subcommittee to examine and vote on some projects separately.

19. Dr LAU Siu-lai and Dr Fernando CHEUNG found it incomprehensible for the Administration to say that block allocations would not turn projects into "fait accompli" while claiming that some projects had already commenced and the Government could not breach the contracts. Dr Fernando CHEUNG and Mr KWONG Chun-yu considered that the Subcommittee had the responsibility to examine the funding proposals submitted by the Administration. Given that the controversial projects made up a very small portion of the some 9 000 projects under the block allocations proposal, the Administration should take out those controversial ones for in-depth discussion by the Subcommittee before their submission.

20. Mr James TO said that members belonging to the Democratic Party were not opposed to any development projects/studies and those development projects involving Hong Kong and the Mainland. However, they had written to the Chairman requesting for separate voting of four projects under the block allocations proposal. He expressed anger at the Administration's submission of the block allocations proposal in a bundled manner so that members were unable to vote for/against or abstain from voting in respect of individual projects.

21. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen commented that the mechanism established in the past for the examination of proposed block allocations was built on the previous consensus among the former LegCo, LegCo Members and FC members. Now that the circumstances had changed and LegCo/FC should establish a new mechanism to examine block allocations proposals. Mr CHU Hoi-dick also took the view that the mechanism needed to be revamped.

22. Mr KWONG Chun-yu raised criticisms and found it unacceptable for the Administration to include controversial projects under the block allocations proposal, without properly addressing the requests raised in the two motions passed by the Panel on Development. He pointed out that the projects related to Moreton Terrace Activities Centre, the music fountains at Kwun Tong Promenade and Lam Tsuen Wishing Square under the block allocations proposal should not commence as they were not supported by local residents. Mr Jeremy TAM said that some members of Kwun Tong

District Council were opposed to the music fountains project at Kwun Tong Promenade and considered that the resources should instead be allocated to the provision of mobile dental services.

23. The Chairman advised that the project estimate under the block allocations for 2017-2018 for the improvement works of Lam Tsuen Wishing Square was \$500,000 (Annex 7C to PWSC(2016-17)37). As FC had not yet voted on the funding proposal for the main works of the item by the end of the last legislative session of the previous LegCo term, funding approval from FC still had to be sought. The project estimate under the block allocations for 2017-2018 for the music fountains at Kwun Tong Promenade was \$300,000, which would mainly be spent on pre-construction works, consultancy fee and study (Annex 7C to PWSC(2016-17)37). If the expenditure of a public works project exceeded \$30 million, the Administration was required to submit the relevant funding proposal to FC for consideration.

24. Dr KWOK Ka-ki was concerned about the proper rehousing arrangement for residents affected by the Wang Chau Development Project and the handling of compensation matters. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung said that he would not support projects related to the Wang Chau Development Project. Mr SHIU Ka-chun was dissatisfied with the Administration's failure to properly address the issues on the Wang Chau Development Project raised by members at the relevant Panel meetings.

25. Mr Holden CHOW, Mr LAU Kwok-fan, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Mr CHAN Han-pan and Dr Elizabeth QUAT spoke against the motion proposed by Dr YIU Chung-yim.

26. Mr Holden CHOW considered it necessary to implement projects such as engineering feasibility studies and site investigations under the block allocations proposal despite the controversy. Otherwise, members would not have any concrete information for discussion of the main works in future. Mr LAU Kwok-fan commented that members should make best use of the meeting time to raise questions on projects under the block allocations proposal. He further said that members should not object to projects related to Lam Tsuen Wishing Square and the music fountains at Kwun Tong Promenade, which were supported by the District Councils. Dr CHIANG Lai-wan said that the Subcommittee's terms of reference did not include taking out projects from block allocations proposals for separate voting. Moreover, many projects under the proposal were related to people's livelihood, e.g. slope improvement works, improvement works at the district level, etc., and should not be delayed. Mr CHAN Han-pan considered that members should discuss the matters relating to compensation

and rehousing for people affected by land resumptions at the meetings of the Panel on Development.

27. Taking RoP as an example, which would not be re-established with the change of LegCo term, Mr CHAN Hak-kan disagreed that LegCo/FC needed a new mechanism for the examination of block allocations proposals. Mr CHAN and Dr Elizabeth QUAT criticized some members for using filibustering tactics to delay the examination of the block allocations proposal PWSC(2016-17)37, which was a waste of public money and meeting time. Dr QUAT said that the Subcommittee had endorsed only one works item since the beginning of the current LegCo term. With the gradual completion of many on-going infrastructural projects, a lot of people engaging in the engineering and construction sectors would face unemployment. Mr CHAN Han-pan and Dr QUAT commented that among the 26 projects that were considered controversial, many were engineering feasibility studies which were related to the long-term development of Hong Kong and should not be obstructed.

[When Dr Elizabeth QUAT was speaking, Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung spoke loudly in his seat. The Chairman asked Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung not to speak loudly or make any noise when others were speaking.]

28. At the invitation of the Chairman, DSFST(T)3 responded to the motion proposed by Dr YIU Chung-yim. He said that it had been an effective and well-established practice to fund the preliminary site investigations and necessary preparatory work (including feasibility studies) of public works projects under block allocations. Funding for such work came from the provision of the subheads of various heads of expenditure under block allocations. The Administration would engage consultants to conduct the aforesaid investigations and feasibility studies. Due to the contractual relationship with the consultants, projects that had commenced could not be taken out from the funding proposal at will. Moreover, the study findings were very important in facilitating members' discussion when the funding proposals for the main construction works were later submitted to FC for consideration. Furthermore, the conduct of feasibility studies did not mean that the related main works must get the go-ahead. The Administration was more than willing to answer members' enquiries on each project under the block allocations proposal and would provide supplementary information when necessary.

29. Dr YIU Chung-yim reiterated that the Subcommittee needed more time to seek detailed information from the Administration on the controversial projects under the block allocations proposal (including the

progress of advance work, the handling of breaches of contracts by consultants, etc.) for detailed examination. As such, the proposal to adjourn the meeting was considered appropriate.

30. The Chairman put to vote the question that further proceedings of the Subcommittee be adjourned. As requested by Mr CHU Hoi-dick, the Chairman ordered a division and the division bell was rung for five minutes. Eighteen members voted for, 22 members voted against the motion and no one abstained. The votes of individual members were as follows:

For:

Mr James TO	Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung
Ms Claudia MO	Mr WU Chi-wai
Mr CHAN Chi-chuen	Dr KWOK Ka-ki
Dr Fernando CHEUNG	Dr Helena WONG
Mr Alvin YEUNG	Mr CHU Hoi-dick
Mr LAM Cheuk-ting	Mr SHIU Ka-chun
Mr HUI Chi-fung	Mr KWONG Chun-yu
Mr Jeremy TAM	Mr Nathan LAW
Dr YIU Chung-yim	Dr LAU Siu-lai

(18 members)

Against:

Mr Abraham SHEK	Mr Tommy CHEUNG
Mr Jeffrey LAM	Mr WONG Ting-kwong
Ms Starry LEE	Mr CHAN Hak-kan
Mr WONG Kwok-kin	Mr Paul TSE
Mr YIU Si-wing	Mr CHAN Han-pan
Mr LEUNG Che-cheung	Ms Alice MAK
Mr KWOK Wai-keung	Dr Elizabeth QUAT
Dr CHIANG Lai-wan	Mr Jimmy NG
Mr HO Kai-ming	Mr Holden CHOW
Mr Wilson OR	Mr CHAN Chun-ying
Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan	Mr LAU Kwok-fan

(22 members)

Abstain:

(0 member)

31. The Chairman declared that the motion was negatived. The Subcommittee resumed discussion on PWSC(2016-17)37.

Head 707 New Towns and Urban Area Development Subhead 7100CX - New towns and urban area works, studies and investigations for items in Category D of the Public Works Programme

Ground decontamination works at the site of ex-Kennedy Town Incineration Plant/Abattoir and adjoining area

32. Dr LAU Siu-lai said that local residents were opposed to the demolition of the Cadogan Street Temporary Garden, which would deprive them of the open space. She criticized the Administration for being sloppy by determining the contamination level of the underground soil in the site of the ex-incineration plant, abattoir and adjoining area (including the Cadogan Street Temporary Garden) merely on the basis of the Environmental Impact Assessment ("EIA") report and site investigation findings published 12 years ago. In addition, the decontamination works would generate fugitive dust, which would affect the residents. Mr HUI Chi-fung commented that the demolition of the Cadogan Street Temporary Garden was only to make way for the development of luxury flats while its implications on the residents were ignored.

33. Director of Civil Engineering and Development ("DCED") responded that the site investigation findings and EIA report confirmed the presence of pollutants under the ground of the site of the ex-incineration plant, abattoir and adjoining area (including the Cadogan Street Temporary Garden) which needed to be cleared.

Engineering works for Ha Mei San Tsuen Village Expansion Area

34. Mr Nathan LAW enquired whether the Administration had come up with a new policy on small houses which led to the implementation of the above project. If not, he wondered why the Administration implemented the above project before the completion of the review of the Small House Policy.

35. DCED replied that the Administration had explained to the former LegCo Panel on Planning, Lands and Works in 2002 that given the various issues involved in village expansion areas ("VEAs"), it would not be appropriate to commence new VEA projects before the completion of the review of the Small House Policy. As for VEAs which had proceeded to an advanced stage of planning, consideration would be given on a case-by-case basis. Since Ha Mei San Tsuen VEA had proceeded to an advanced stage of planning and villagers had strong demand for VEA sites, the Administration decided to re-commence the design review and site investigations of the infrastructure works in the VEA, so as to restore the site to its original planned use. Mr Nathan LAW considered that the Administration's

justifications for implementing the new VEA programme were not convincing.

[During the meeting, some observers spoke loudly in the public gallery and an applause was heard. The Chairman reminded observers that they must behave themselves, and must not shout or applaud. Moreover, Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung asked the Chairman whether members could take pictures in the conference room. The Chairman reminded members that taking pictures was not allowed in the conference room.]

36. The Chairman advised that the Subcommittee would continue to discuss the item (PWSC(2016-17)37) at the next meeting. The meeting ended at 12:44 pm.