

**立法會**  
***Legislative Council***

LC Paper No. CB(1)579/16-17  
(These minutes have been seen  
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/PL/DEV

**Panel on Development**

**Minutes of meeting**  
**held on Friday, 16 December 2016, at 8:45 am**  
**in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex**

**Members present** : Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, GBS, JP (Chairman)  
Hon Kenneth LAU Ip-keung, MH, JP (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon James TO Kun-sun  
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung  
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP  
Hon WONG Ting-kwong, SBS, JP  
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, BBS, JP  
Hon CHAN Kin-por, BBS, JP  
Hon WONG Kwok-kin, SBS, JP  
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yee, GBS, JP  
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP  
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung  
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP  
Hon Steven HO Chun-yin, BBS  
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, JP  
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH  
Hon YIU Si-wing, BBS  
Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP  
Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP  
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen  
Hon CHAN Han-pan, JP  
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, BBS, MH, JP  
Hon Kenneth LEUNG  
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  
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, SBS, MH, JP  
Hon Alvin YEUNG  
Hon Andrew WAN Siu-kin  
Hon CHU Hoi-dick  
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 Tanya CHAN  
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, JP  
Hon HUI Chi-fung  
Hon LUK Chung-hung  
Hon LAU Kwok-fan, MH  
Dr Hon CHENG Chung-tai  
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 Elizabeth QUAT, JP  
Hon Jimmy NG Wing-ka, JP  
Hon CHAN Chun-ying

**Members attending** : Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, GBS, JP  
Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, JP

**Public officers attending** : **Agenda item IV**  
  
Mr HON Chi-keung, JP  
Permanent Secretary for Development (Works)  
  
Mr Vincent MAK Shing-cheung, JP  
Deputy Secretary for Development (Works)2

Mr LAM Sai-hung, JP  
Director of Civil Engineering and Development

Mr Robin LEE Kui-biu, JP  
Project Manager (Hong Kong Island and Islands)  
Civil Engineering and Development Department

**Agenda item V**

Ms Brenda AU Kit-ying  
Head of Energizing Kowloon East Office  
Development Bureau

Mr Frank WONG Tak-choi  
Deputy Head of Energizing Kowloon East Office  
Development Bureau

Mr David TSANG Man-wai  
Chief Electrical and Mechanical Engineer/Vehicle  
Safety and Standards  
Transport Department

Mr Patrick HO Kwong-hang  
Senior Engineer/Kwai Tsing  
Transport Department

Ms Winnie HO Wing-yin  
Project Director 1  
Architectural Services Department

Ms Monica LAM Sau-lai  
Chief Project Manager 101  
Architectural Services Department

**Agenda item VII**

Mr Paul CHAN Mo-po, GBS, MH, JP  
Secretary for Development

Mr Thomas CHAN Chung-ching, JP  
Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning and  
Lands)1

Ms Phyllis LI Chi-miu, JP  
Deputy Director of Planning/Territorial

Miss Winnie LAU Bo-yee  
Chief Town Planner/Strategic Planning  
Planning 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 Christina SHIU  
Legislative Assistant (1)2

---

Action

- I Confirmation of minutes**  
(LC Paper No. CB(1)289/16-17 — Minutes of meeting on  
8 November 2016)

The minutes of the meeting on 8 November 2016 were confirmed.

- II Information papers issued since the last meeting**  
(LC Paper No. CB(1)165/16-17(01) — Letter dated 21 November  
2016 from Hon SHIU  
Ka-chun on the  
implementation and review  
of the Urban Renewal  
Strategy (Chinese version  
only)

LC Paper No. CB(1)248/16-17(01) — Administration's paper on completion report on the HKSAR's work in support of reconstruction in the Sichuan earthquake stricken areas (Chinese version only)

LC Paper No. CB(1)291/16-17(01) — Administration's paper on review of safety management system for public works contracts

LC Paper No. CB(1)307/16-17(01) — Letter dated 12 December 2016 from Dr Hon KWOK ka-ki proposing a site visit to Wang Chau (Chinese version only))

2. Members noted that the above information papers had been issued since the meeting on 22 November 2016.

3. The Chairman referred to the letter from Dr KWOK Ka-ki proposing a site visit to Wang Chau (LC Paper No. CB(1)307/16-17(01)) (Chinese version only). He said that there was no urgency in conducting a site visit to Wang Chau and, as a number of members were not present at the meeting, he would instruct the Clerk to issue a circular to collect members' views on whether they supported conducting the proposed visit.

4. Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Ms Tanya CHAN, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Dr LAU Siu-lai, and Dr Fernando CHEUNG said that a site visit to Wang Chau should be conducted so as to allow members to obtain first-hand information about the housing development at Wang Chau, the current situations at the concerned land sites, etc. Mr CHU Hoi-dick opined that, as the funding proposal "Capital Works Reserve Fund Block Allocations for 2017-2018", which included two items relating to the development at Wang Chau, would soon be discussed at a meeting of the Public Works Subcommittee ("PWSC"), a site visit to Wang Chau should be conducted as soon as possible.

5. Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok said that the agenda of the next PWSC meeting scheduled for 21 December 2016 did not include the funding proposal "Capital Works Reserve Fund Block Allocations for 2017-2018". Ir Dr LO, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and

Mr WONG Ting-kwong opined that there was no urgency in conducting a site visit to Wang Chau.

6. The Chairman instructed the Clerk to issue a circular to ask individual members whether they support Dr KWOK Ka-ki's proposal of conducting a site visit to Wang Chau.

*(Post-meeting note: Members were consulted on 19 December 2016 vide LC Paper No. CB(1)329/16-17 whether they supported Dr KWOK Ka-ki's proposal of conducting a site visit to Wang Chau. Having considered members' views, the Chairman has directed the Clerk to write to the Administration to request their arrangements for such a visit.)*

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

(LC Paper No. CB(1)288/16-17(01) — List of outstanding items for discussion

LC Paper No. CB(1)288/16-17(02) — List of follow-up actions)

7. Members agreed that the next regular meeting scheduled for Tuesday, 24 January 2017, at 2:30 pm would be extended to end at 6:30 pm to discuss the following items proposed by the Administration:

- (a) Briefing by the Secretary for Development on the Chief Executive's 2017 Policy Address and the overall land supply situation;
- (b) PWP Item No. 9357WF-1 — Design and Construction for First Stage of Desalination Plant at Tseung Kwan O — Mainlaying; and
- (c) Proposed amendments to the Waterworks Ordinance (Cap. 102) and the Waterworks Regulations (Cap. 102A).

8. Dr KWOK Ka-ki said that after the three joint meetings of the Panel on Development and the Panel on Housing, the Administration had yet to fully address members' concerns about the Wang Chau development project, in particular those about the utilization of land and handling of brownfield sites, etc. He suggested that the Panel should discuss how to tackle these issues at the meeting in January right after the site visit.

9. The Chairman said that there were already three discussion items for the January meeting and the meeting had been extended to four hours. He would consider carefully whether the meeting should be further extended to include other discussion items.

**IV Staffing proposal on establishment of the Sustainable Lantau Office and re-organization of the existing Development Offices of the Civil Engineering and Development Department**

(LC Paper No. CB(1)133/16-17(06) — Administration's paper on staffing proposal on establishment of the Sustainable Lantau Office and re-organization of the existing Development Offices of the Civil Engineering and Development Department

LC Paper No. CB(1)133/16-17(07) — Paper on the proposed establishment of a Lantau Development Office and re-organization of the existing Development Offices of the Civil Engineering and Development Department prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat (Background brief))

Other relevant papers

(LC Paper No. CB(1)147/16-17(01) — Submission from Save Lantau Alliance dated 17 November 2016

LC Paper No. CB(1)168/16-17(01) — Submission from The Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors dated 21 November 2016)

Motion on adjournment of discussion on the item

10. The Chairman said that at the previous meeting on 22 November 2016, Mr CHU Hoi-dick had moved a motion to adjourn the discussion on the agenda item. He advised that the Panel would continue to deal with Mr CHU's motion. Each member could speak once on the motion, and the speaking time should not be more than one minute.

11. Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Ms Tanya CHAN, Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Dr LAU Siu-lai, Dr CHENG Chung-tai, Dr YIU Chung-yim, Mr Nathan LAW, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen and Dr Fernando CHEUNG spoke in support of Mr CHU Hoi-dick's motion. The Deputy Chairman, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr LAU Kwok-fan, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Mr Michael TIEN and Mr YIU Si-wing spoke against the motion.

12. At the invitation of the Chairman, Permanent Secretary for Development (Works) ("PS/DEV(W)") responded to Mr CHU's motion. He said that the Administration had consulted the Panel on Development of the Fifth Legislative Council ("LegCo") on the staffing proposal for setting up a new Lantau Development Office. With the Panel's support, the Administration had submitted the staffing proposal to the Establishment Subcommittee, which had agreed in June 2016 to recommend the proposal to the Finance Committee ("FC") for approval. The proposal had been included in the agenda of FC but had not been reached at the last meeting of FC in the 2015-2016 legislative session.

13. PS/DEV(W) added that the development of Lantau would play a critical role in Hong Kong's sustainable development. The development would require undertaking a wide range of studies, planning and implementing projects of different natures in stages, conducting statutory procedures, etc. There was an urgent need to enhance the manpower and management steer by forming a new dedicated multi-disciplinary Sustainable Lantau Office ("SLO") so that the Administration could start the work immediately. In re-submitting the staffing proposal, the Administration had indicated more clearly the planning vision of balancing and enhancing development and conservation of Lantau, and had also strengthened the conservation aspect of the proposed SLO to address Members' concerns. He called for members' support for the proposed establishment of SLO.

14. Mr CHU Hoi-dick said given that SLO would be dedicated to taking forward and managing the development initiatives for Lantau, and



that one of these initiatives would be the development of the East Lantau Metropolis proposed under the Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030 ("HK2030+"), the Panel should not consider the proposal on the establishment of SLO until it had discussed HK2030+, which concerned the direction of land development in Hong Kong.

15. The Chairman put to vote the question that the discussion on the agenda item be then adjourned. At members' request, the Chairman ordered a division and the voting bell was rung for five minutes. Fifteen members voted for, 21 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  
Dr KWOK Ka-ki  
Mr Alvin YEUNG  
Mr CHU Hoi-dick  
Dr CHENG Chung-tai  
Mr Nathan LAW  
Dr LAU Siu-lai  
(15 members)

Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung  
Mr CHAN Chi-chuen  
Dr Fernando CHEUNG  
Mr Andrew WAN  
Ms Tanya CHAN  
Mr KWONG Chun-yu  
Dr YIU Chung-yim

*Against:*

Mr Kenneth LAU  
Mr CHAN Hak-kan  
Mr WONG Kwok-kin  
Mr Michael TIEN  
Mr Frankie YICK  
Mr CHAN Han-pan  
Ms Alice MAK  
Dr Junius HO  
Mr Holden CHOW  
Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan  
Mr LAU Kwok-fan  
(21 members)

Mr WONG Ting-kwong  
Mr CHAN Kin-por  
Mr Paul TSE  
Mr Steven HO  
Mr YIU Si-wing  
Mr LEUNG Che-cheung  
Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok  
Mr HO Kai-ming  
Mr Wilson OR  
Mr LUK Chung-hung

*Abstain:*

(0 member)

16. The Chairman declared that the motion was negatived. The Panel proceeded to the discussion on the agenda item.

Responsibilities of the proposed Sustainable Lantau Office

17. Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung and Mr CHU Hoi-dick said that they did not support the proposed establishment of SLO. They were concerned that the proposed SLO would not make great efforts in conserving the natural environment of Lantau, given that SLO would mainly be staffed by engineers. Although the Administration had claimed that it had strengthened the conservation aspect of the proposed SLO to address the concerns expressed by the Members of the Fifth LegCo, only a new post of Forestry Officer was proposed to be created to provide input on nature conservation initiatives. Referring to the projects and initiatives to be taken forward and/or coordinated by SLO as listed in paragraph 12 of the Administration's paper, these members commented that those initiatives were mainly development projects which were not related to conservation. In addition, Dr KWOK and Mr LEUNG said that many of those projects and initiatives were already being carried out by relevant staff of the Civil Engineering and Development Department, and the Silvermine Bay Music Festival was in fact organized by Heung Yee Kuk. They queried the justification for establishing SLO.

18. In response, PS/DEV(W) reiterated that the development and conservation of Lantau would require undertaking a wide range of initiatives and projects. A dedicated multi-disciplinary SLO would facilitate better coordination among the bureaux/departments and holistic planning. He said that development and conservation were not mutually exclusive. To pursue a good balance of development and conservation, enhancement of nature conservation and better utilization of natural resources would be two of the major directions for taking forward the conservation concepts in the planning of Lantau. All the professional staff in the proposed SLO would properly consider the conservation needs in taking forward the development proposals. He further said that organizing or providing support to local events in Lantau would be necessary for engaging the community as well as publicizing and promoting the sustainable development of Lantau.

19. Dr Fernando CHEUNG requested the Administration to provide the following information:

- (a) whether the Administration had conducted the following studies/work in respect of development of Lantau:
  - (i) strategic study on environmental assessment;

- (ii) baseline review;
- (iii) study on capacities for receiving visitors;
- (iv) traffic control measures;
- (v) preservation of history and culture, including rural culture;

if yes, the respective posts of the officers who were responsible for the above studies; if no, the respective posts of the officers in the proposed SLO who would be responsible for the above studies in future; and

- (b) a list of posts in SLO of which the main duties/responsibilities would be dedicated to the conservation of Lantau, and elaboration on these duties.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's supplementary information was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)515/16-17(01) on 1 February 2017.)*

20. Dr YIU Chung-yim said that the Head of SLO should be a landscape architect or town planner instead of an engineer, so as to ensure that SLO would accord priority to conservation during the planning and implementation of the development projects in Lantau. He also suggested that the staff of SLO should include a quantity surveyor to assist the Head of SLO in forecasting expenditure and exercising financial control on Public Works Programme projects. He said he could not support the proposal on setting up SLO unless the Administration accepted the aforesaid suggestions on the staffing of SLO.

21. In response, PS/DEV(W) said that the proposed SLO would be a multi-disciplinary office including engineers, town planners, surveyors, etc. A Government Town Planner would assume the post of Deputy Head of SLO, who would be responsible for the effective operation of SLO in the planning and implementation of development and conservation programmes to promote the sustainable development of Lantau. The Administration considered the proposed staffing arrangement for SLO appropriate. He further said that the staff of SLO would include a quantity surveyor to provide quantity surveying input during the planning and implementation stages of projects.

22. Mr CHU Hoi-dick asked whether the proposed SLO would review the loopholes of existing legislation/land use control measures so as to combat the problems of soil dumping at Lantau South, with a view to

conserving the natural resources in Lantau. PS/DEV(W) took note of Mr CHU's concern about the damage to the environment caused by soil dumping at Lantau South. He said that SLO would take forward initiatives for enhancing conservation of Lantau and promoting better utilization of natural resources. The opportunities of preservation of Pui O wetland ecology and Shui Hau Wan sandflat were being explored.

#### Public consultation on development of Lantau

23. Dr CHENG Chung-tai did not support the proposed establishment of SLO. He said that the public engagement exercise for HK2030+ was still ongoing and public views were being sought on some Lantau-related development proposals under HK2030+, such as reclamation at Sunny Bay and Siu Ho Wan, development of artificial islands in the central waters. Therefore it was not appropriate for the Administration to decide to establish SLO at this stage. Dr KWOK Ka-ki was concerned that the Administration would take forward the controversial proposal of developing an East Lantau Metropolis as soon as SLO was set up to provide manpower support.

24. Mr LUK Chung-hung supported the proposed establishment of SLO, which, in his view, would facilitate the improvement of the transport infrastructure and the provision of more local job opportunities in Lantau. He did not agree to the view that the Administration should not establish SLO before the conclusion of the public engagement exercise for HK2030+.

25. PS/DEV(W) and Project Manager (Hong Kong Island and Islands), Civil Engineering and Development Department, explained that HK2030+ aimed to examine the strategies and feasible options for the overall spatial planning, land and infrastructure development for Hong Kong as a whole beyond 2030. The Administration had completed a three-month public engagement exercise in April 2016 to collect public views on the proposed development and conservation strategies for Lantau. Over 23 000 feedbacks had been received from the public. The majority of public views were in general supportive of the broad direction of development of Lantau and the principle of balancing between needs for conservation and development. The Panel had discussed the proposed development strategy for Lantau in the 2015-2016 legislative session, and supported the staffing proposal for setting up a new Lantau Development Office.

26. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung said that there were diverse views among the public on the proposed development strategy for Lantau, which had not yet undergone thorough discussion and public consultation.

27. Ms Tanya CHAN did not support the proposed establishment of SLO. Referring to the Lantau Development Public Engagement Report (Executive Summary), Ms CHAN enquired how the Administration would handle the suggestions collected during the public engagement exercise, and whether SLO would take forward the new development proposals received from the public (paragraph 3.3.4 of the Executive Summary), including "using the lands in country park area for housing" and "providing a casino". At the request of the Chairman, the Administration would provide a written response to Ms CHAN's questions after the meeting.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's supplementary information was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)515/16-17(01) on 1 February 2017.)*

#### Transport infrastructure in Lantau

28. Mr Michael TIEN said that, taking into consideration the planned development in Lantau, such as the Tung Chung New Town Extension and the three-runway system at the Hong Kong International Airport, the resident population and working population in Lantau would increase significantly in the near future. The demand for transport services between Tung Chung and the airport would also increase. Mr TIEN suggested that a circular line making use of the railway of the Airport Express Line should be developed to link up the new railway station in Tung Chung East and the airport, so as to facilitate local employment and reduce external traffic. He enquired whether the proposed supernumerary directorate post of Chief Engineer/Lantau 3 in the proposed SLO could further explore the aforesaid suggestion.

29. Mr Holden CHOW shared Mr Michael TIEN's concern about the transport connectivity of Tung Chung. He said that the improvement of the transport infrastructure between Tung Chung and the airport would involve various parties, including the relevant government bureaux/departments, the Airport Authority Hong Kong, the MTR Corporation Limited, etc., and the dedicated multi-disciplinary SLO would be able to facilitate better coordination among various parties and holistic planning in taking forward various projects relating to the development of Lantau. He said that Members belonging to the

Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong supported the proposed establishment of SLO.

30. PS/DEV(W) took note of Mr Michael TIEN's proposal on the connection between Tung Chung and the airport. He said that the proposed SLO would study thoroughly different transport options to improve the transport connectivity of Lantau.

#### Improvement works in the villages in Lantau

31. Ms Alice MAK expressed support for the proposed establishment of SLO. She called on the Administration to improve the infrastructure facilities, such as road and sewerage systems, in the villages in Lantau. Director of Civil Engineering and Development replied that during the public engagement exercise conducted in the first quarter of 2016 for the proposed development strategy for Lantau, the Administration had received public views requesting timely improvement of infrastructure facilities in the rural areas. In fact, the Administration had been implementing local improvement/revitalization projects at Tai O, Mui Wo and Ma Wan Chung Village. He assured members that the proposed SLO would continue to take forward local enhancement works in Lantau, such as improvement works to roads/village access, car parking facilities, sewerage works, etc.

32. Responding to the enquiry of the Chairman, Mr Frankie YICK said that Members belonging to the Liberal Party supported the proposed establishment of SLO.

#### Study reports related to cross-harbour infrastructural development

33. The Chairman advised that he had received a proposed motion from Mr CHU Hoi-dick requesting the Administration to provide four study reports related to cross-harbour infrastructural development, namely the Green Island Link Preliminary Feasibility Study, the Railway Development Strategy 2000, The Third Comprehensive Transport Study, and the South West New Territories Development Strategy Review. The Chairman said that on behalf of the Panel, he would request the Administration to provide the aforementioned study reports, and therefore it was not necessary for Mr CHU Hoi-dick's motion to be proceeded with at the meeting.

34. Dr LO Wai-kwok expressed support for the Chairman's suggestion. Dr CHENG Chung-tai opined that the Chairman should allow the motion

proposed by Mr CHU to be dealt with so that members could express their positions on whether they supported the spirit of the proposed motion. The Chairman said that his making of a request to the Administration for the reports to be provided to the Panel was a more efficient way to handle Mr CHU's request.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's response to the Chairman's request for the reports was circulated to members vide LC Papers Nos. CB(1)382/16-17(01) and CB(1)400/16-17 on 30 December 2016 and 5 January 2017 respectively.)*

#### Submission of the proposal to the Establishment Subcommittee

35. Ms Tanya CHAN requested that the question of whether the Panel supported the submission of the staffing proposal to the Establishment Subcommittee ("ESC") be put to vote. The Chairman said that the purpose of the Panel's discussion on the staffing proposal was for the Administration to understand the views of individual members on the proposal. With this purpose in mind, he had invited each of the members who had spoken on the proposal to indicate their stance on whether they supported the submission of the proposal to ESC. The Administration was therefore well aware of individual members' positions on this matter and would take their positions into consideration when deciding whether it should submit the proposal to ESC. He considered that there was no need to put the question to vote.

36. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen and Mr SHIU Ka-chun said that they had not spoken on the staffing proposal at the meeting and the Chairman did not know whether they supported the submission of the proposal to ESC. Mr CHAN said he did not support the proposed establishment of SLO. Mr SHIU requested that the question of whether the Panel supported the submission of the staffing proposal to ESC be put to vote, so that he could let all attendees know about his stance on the question. Ms Tanya CHAN and Mr SHIU Ka-chun expressed strong opposition to the Chairman's decision. Ms CHAN requested that legal advice on the matter be sought. The Chairman said that legal advice was not required.

*[At 10:25 am, the Chairman ordered that the meeting be suspended for about five minutes. The meeting was resumed at 10:36 am.]*

*Motion proposed by Dr Fernando CHEUNG*

37. The Chairman advised that he had received two proposed motions from Dr Fernando CHEUNG and Mr CHU Hoi-dick respectively. The wording of Dr CHEUNG's motion was as follows:

(Translation)

"Given that the Civil Engineering and Development Department should adopt the principle of sustainable development for Lantau in establishing the Sustainable Lantau Office, it will therefore be necessary to commence the following studies/work in respect of Lantau as a whole: strategic study on the environmental assessment; baseline evaluation; study on its carrying capacities; traffic control; studies and measures on the preservation of history and culture; and work on the preservation of rural culture, and this funding application should be shelved until the Government has made known the respective posts of the officials responsible for the aforesaid work."

38. The Chairman said that the motion proposed by Dr Fernando CHEUNG was directly related to the agenda item under discussion. Members agreed that the motion be proceeded with at the meeting. The Chairman put the motion to vote and ordered a division. The voting bell was rung for five minutes. Seventeen members voted for, 20 members voted against the motion, and no member abstained. The votes of individual members were as follows:

*For:*

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung  
Mr CHAN Chi-chuen  
Dr KWOK Ka-ki  
Mr Alvin YEUNG  
Mr CHU Hoi-dick  
Ms Tanya CHAN  
Mr KWONG Chun-yu  
Mr Nathan LAW  
Dr LAU Siu-lai  
(17 members)

Mr WU Chi-wai  
Mr Kenneth LEUNG  
Dr Fernando CHEUNG  
Mr Andrew WAN  
Mr SHIU Ka-chun  
Dr CHENG Chung-tai  
Mr Jeremy TAM  
Dr YIU Chung-yim

*Against:*

Mr Kenneth LAU  
Mr CHAN Hak-kan

Mr WONG Ting-kwong  
Mr CHAN Kin-por



Mr Paul TSE  
Mr Steven HO  
Mr YIU Si-wing  
Mr LEUNG Che-cheung  
Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok  
Mr HO Kai-ming  
Mr Wilson OR  
Mr LUK Chung-hung  
(20 members)

Mr Michael TIEN  
Mr Frankie YICK  
Mr CHAN Han-pan  
Ms Alice MAK  
Dr Junius HO  
Mr Holden CHOW  
Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan  
Mr LAU Kwok-fan

*Abstain:*  
(0 member)

39. The Chairman declared that the motion was not carried.

*Motion proposed by Mr CHU Hoi-dick*

40. The Chairman said the motion proposed by Mr CHU Hoi-dick was that:

(Translation)

"This Panel claims a division in respect of whether it supports the establishment of the Sustainable Lantau Office."

41. The Chairman said, as announced earlier, he had decided that there was no need to put the question of whether the Panel supported the submission of the staffing proposal to ESC to vote, therefore the motion proposed by Mr CHU would not be proceeded forthwith. He further advised that, according to rule 22(q) of the House Rules, the Administration should consult the relevant Panel before a major and/or potentially controversial financial proposal was introduced into FC. However, it was not required that the Panel shall vote on the question of whether it supported the submission of the proposal to ESC/Public Works Subcommittee/FC. The Administration, in considering whether to submit the staffing proposal to ESC, should consider members' views and address their concerns and queries on various issues related to the proposal.

42. Mr Alvin YEUNG, Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung and Ms Tanya CHAN queried the Chairman's decision. Dr KWOK referred to Rule 77(13) of the Rules of Procedure, which stated that all matters for the decision of a Panel should be decided by a majority of the members

voting. He requested that the questions of (a) whether the motion proposed by Mr CHU Hoi-dick should be proceeded with at the meeting; and (b) whether the Panel supported the submission of the staffing proposal to ESC; be put to vote. Ms Tanya CHAN requested the Chairman to set out the justifications for not putting the questions to vote in writing.

43. The Chairman reiterated that he had invited each of the members who had spoken on the staffing proposal to state whether they supported the submission of the proposal to ESC. There was no requirement in the rules for the Panel to make a decision on whether it supported the submission of the proposal to ESC. Therefore, Rule 77(13) of the Rules of Procedure did not apply. The explanation for his decision would be recorded in the minutes of the meeting. He suggested that, if members so wish, they might refer the question of whether voting shall be conducted for financial proposals for consultation at Panel meetings to the Committee on Rules of Procedure for examination. If members disagreed with his decisions, they could propose a motion seeking to express no confidence in him.

44. Mr Alvin YEUNG asked whether the Chairman considered that all staffing/funding proposals to be discussed by the Panel in the future would not need to be put to vote. The Chairman replied that he would not make such a decision at this stage. He directed that the discussion on the agenda item be concluded.

**V PWP Item No. 3185GK — Re-provisioning of Transport Department's Vehicle Examination Centres at Tsing Yi**

(LC Paper No. CB(1)288/16-17(03) — Administration's paper on 3185GK —  
Re-provisioning of  
Transport Department's  
Vehicle Examination  
Centres at Tsing Yi

LC Paper No. CB(1)288/16-17(04) — Paper on the  
re-provisioning of  
Transport Department's  
Vehicle Examination  
Centres at Tsing Yi  
prepared by the Legislative  
Council Secretariat  
(Background brief))

Other relevant paper

(LC Paper No. CB(1)324/16-17(01) — Joint submission from deputations (公共巴士同業聯會、荃灣區旅運巴士同業聯會、香港區旅運巴士同業聯會、九龍區旅運巴士同業聯會、屯門區旅運巴士同業聯會 and 元朗區旅運巴士同業聯會) dated 15 December 2016 (Chinese version only))

45. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Head of Energizing Kowloon East Office, Development Bureau ("H/EKEO/DEVB"), briefed members on the Administration's funding proposal for relocating the existing Kowloon Bay, New Kowloon Bay and To Kwa Wan Vehicle Examination Centres ("VECs") of the Transport Department ("TD") to Sai Tso Wan, Tsing Yi. H/EKEO/DEVB said that the Panel had been consulted on the funding/relocation proposal at the meeting on 24 May 2016. At that meeting, Panel members did not support the proposal. Having regard to the concerns raised by Panel members at the aforesaid meeting on the traffic impact of the proposal on the adjacent road network, a supplementary traffic study on Tsing Yi had been conducted from September to November 2016. To meet the strong parking demand for heavy vehicles, the Administration had put forth in the present proposal that more such parking spaces in Tsing Yi would be provided. Details of the proposal and a summary of the supplementary traffic study were given in the Administration's paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)288/16-17(03)).

*(Post-meeting note: A soft copy of the powerpoint presentation materials was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)322/16-17(02) by email on 16 December 2016.)*

46. The Chairman reminded members that in accordance with Rule 83A of the Rules of Procedure of the Legislative Council, they should disclose the nature of any direct or indirect pecuniary interests relating to the subjects under discussion at the meeting before they spoke on the subjects.

### Traffic impact of the proposal

47. Noting that Tsing Tsuen Bridge would be one of the main routes used by vehicles travelling to/from the proposed new VEC and these vehicles would have to change to a dedicated left-turn lane to Tsing Yi Road West when arriving at Tam Kon Shan Interchange from Tsing Tsuen Bridge, Miss Alice MAK asked whether the commissioning of the new VEC would cause traffic congestion around the said dedicated left-turn lane; if yes, the measures to address this problem; if no, the reasons. Miss MAK also noted that the proposal included road widening works along the eastern side of Sai Tso Wan Road to allow two lanes towards the new VEC site (for incoming vehicles) and one lane away (for vehicles leaving VEC) as one of the traffic mitigation measures to accommodate the additional traffic generated by the new VEC. She enquired if (a) the road widening works could cope with the vehicular traffic leaving VEC; and (b) those who worked in the areas nearby (e.g. workers of the dockyards), being the main users of Sai Tso Wan Road, had been consulted on the proposed traffic mitigation measures.

48. H/EKEO/DEVB advised that the results of both the traffic study and the supplementary traffic study indicated that the design flow to capacity ratio of Tam Kon Shan Interchange (referred to as RA5 in the study) after the commissioning of the new VEC would be below 0.85, meaning that the traffic performance of this roundabout would be satisfactory. At the request of the Chairman, the Administration would provide a written response to Miss Mak's questions after the meeting.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's written response was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)509/16-17(01) on 27 January 2017.)*

49. With reference to slide 9 of the powerpoint presentation materials stating that the additional hourly traffic volume in Tsing Yi brought by the new VEC would be around 133 vehicles per hour, Mr Andrew WAN queried whether the figure referred to the traffic flow to VEC only, or the traffic flow to/from VEC. Given that the new VEC would primarily provide examination services to heavy or commercial vehicles, Mr WAN was worried that the relocation proposal would result in a significant increase in the traffic flow of heavy vehicles to/from VEC. Therefore, he asked whether (a) the traffic impact assessment conducted by the Administration had taken into account the impact of heavy vehicles on

the road network of Tsing Yi; and (b) the relevant trades had been consulted on the relocation proposal.

50. H/EKEO/DEVB advised that the traffic impact assessment conducted was based on the design maximum handling capacity of the new VEC (i.e. 1 000 vehicles per day) and covered the traffic flow to/from VEC. She also explained that, unlike incoming vehicles which might come earlier than their appointments and affect the traffic flow nearby, vehicles leaving VEC would be evenly distributed, therefore only the traffic volume to VEC was presented in the powerpoint presentation materials but not the number of vehicles leaving VEC. The Administration had also consulted the relevant trades on the relocation proposal, with some welcoming the proposal and some raising no objection to the proposal.

51. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung sought information about the measures to be undertaken by the Administration in case there was a serious traffic congestion around the new VEC.

52. H/EKEO/DEVB assured members that TD would attach great importance to the traffic conditions of the road network adjacent to the new VEC and take appropriate traffic mitigation measures if and when necessary. At the request of the Chairman, the Administration would provide a written response to Mr LEUNG's question after the meeting.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's written response was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)509/16-17(01) on 27 January 2017.)*

#### Parking spaces for heavy or commercial vehicles

53. Mr Frankie Yick said he supported the relocation proposal as far as the Administration could provide sufficient alternative parking spaces to the commercial vehicle affected by the said proposal. That said, he was concerned that there was no government policy on providing sufficient parking spaces for commercial vehicles, and many car parks for commercial vehicles were operated under Short Term Tenancies. When the sites of these car parks were resumed by the Government for development, the drivers of the vehicles concerned had to look for new parking spaces, the supply of which was scarce. Mr YICK also urged the Administration to re-provision the existing parking spaces at the project site before clearing the site for development. Concurring with the suggestion made by non-franchised bus trade groups in the joint

submission (LC Paper No. CB(1)324/16-17(01)) that VECs should be established in areas which were close to bus maintenance centres and logistics operations, such as Yuen Long and Tin Shui Wai, Mr YICK requested the Administration to take the opportunity of developing Yuen Long South and Hung Shui Kiu to consider the suggestion.

54. H/EKEO/DEVB replied that a site on Sai Tso Wan Road adjacent to the project site would soon be tendered for temporary vehicle parking purpose and would be in place before the existing temporary vehicle park on the project site was closed. As the adjacent site was situated on hillside, the Administration currently had no plan to develop the site for any other purpose. She stressed that the relevant government bureaux/departments were striving to provide sufficient parking spaces to meet the overall parking demand in Hong Kong.

55. Miss Alice MAK sought confirmation from the Administration that sufficient alternative parking spaces would be provided to the vehicles currently using temporary parking spaces at the project site and would be affected by the relocation proposal. Indicating support for the relocation proposal, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok expressed concern on the insufficient parking spaces for commercial vehicles and sought details about the reprovisioning arrangements for the existing temporary parking spaces.

56. H/EKEO/DEVB reiterated that relevant government bureaux/departments had been pressing ahead with initiatives to increase parking spaces for commercial vehicles, including providing such spaces at some development sites or night-time parking spaces on non-busy roads. At the request of the Chairman, the Administration would provide a written response to Miss Mak's question after the meeting.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's written response was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)509/16-17(01) on 27 January 2017.)*

57. Dr KWOK Ka-ki opined that, in view of the insufficient parking spaces for heavy or commercial vehicles across the territory, the Administration should consider providing parking spaces at the proposed new VEC. H/EKEO/DEVB replied that if parking facilities were co-located with the new VEC, the frequent vehicular flow brought about by the car park users would adversely affect the operation of the new VEC. Therefore, the Administration was considering another proposal, namely reviewing the feasibility of using the temporary queuing area

adjoining the new VEC for providing an additional 40 parking spaces during night-time when VEC was not in operation.

58. Dr KWOK Ka-ki remained of the view that his proposal was worth considering and asked if the Administration had conducted any feasibility study on the proposal of providing parking spaces at the proposed new VEC, such as by way of co-locating vehicle examination services and car parking spaces in a multi-storey building, and providing a separate vehicular ingress/egress for car park users; if yes, the details; if no, why such a study had not been/would not be conducted.

59. H/EKEO/DEVB explained that it would be both technically and operationally difficult for VEC users and car park users to share facilities at the same site. Project Director 1, Architectural Services Department (PD/1/ArchSD), added that, due to the geographical constraints of the project site, as well as the concerns over the additional vehicular flow to be brought about by users of the public car park, if any, on the operation of the new VEC, the Administration considered it not suitable to provide parking spaces at the new VEC. The Administration undertook to provide relevant information in response to Dr KWOK's request after the meeting.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's written response was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)509/16-17(01) on 27 January 2017.)*

### Environmental concerns

60. Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok enquired about the decontamination works to be involved for the three existing VECs and the measures that the Administration would take to prevent contamination at the new VEC.

61. PD/1/ArchSD explained that the preliminary assessment on the three existing VEC sites indicated that contaminants might be present. Once the three VECs were relocated, thorough on-site assessment would be conducted to ascertain if there was any contaminant present at the sites; if so, decontamination works would be carried out and the soil after decontamination would be used for backfilling within the sites.

62. Mr CHU Hoi-dick enquired about (a) the amount of the construction and demolition ("C&D") waste to be generated during the demolition of the three existing VECs and the construction of the proposed new VEC in Tsing Yi; and (b) how the waste would be reused on site.

63. PD/1/ArchSD replied that construction works of the new VEC would generate about 66 000 tonnes of waste, of which 24 000 tonnes would be reused, 30 000 tonnes would be delivered to public fill reception facilities, and the remaining some 12 000 tonnes, being non-inert waste, would be disposed of at landfills. To minimize the need for dump trucks to travel back and forth from the project sites and the amount of waste to be disposed of at public fill reception facilities, part of the inert C&D waste produced at the three existing VEC sites and the Tsing Yi site would be reused for on-site backfilling as far as possible.

#### Other concerns

64. Mr WONG Ting-kwong said that he supported the relocation proposal in principle. He asked about the future land use of the three existing VECs at Kowloon Bay, New Kowloon Bay and To Kwa Wan after these centres were relocated to Tsing Yi. Noting that under the existing vehicle examination arrangements, private cars were checked at TD-designated testing centres operated by private companies, while commercial vehicles were examined at VECs operated by TD, Mr WONG asked if the existing arrangements would continue after the commissioning of the new VEC. Mr WONG also urged the Administration to keep the cost of the relocation project as estimated, i.e. \$2,862.7 million, without overrun.

65. H/EKEO/DEVB replied that the existing VEC sites at Kowloon Bay and New Kowloon Bay were planned to be developed into commercial/office uses, while the relocation of the existing VEC at To Kwa Wan would make way for leisure development. Since the tendering exercise for the project had been completed, the project cost cited in the discussion paper was an accurate estimation. The construction works would commence once the funding proposal was approved by the FC. As regards the vehicle examination arrangements, they would remain unchanged after the commissioning of the new VEC.

66. Taking in view that the handling capacity would increase from 800 vehicles per day (the total for the three existing VECs) to 1 000 vehicles per day (for the new VEC), Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung enquired if the handling capacity of the new VEC could cope with the growth of commercial vehicles in Hong Kong due to the development of new towns and new hotels. Mr LEUNG further asked if the maximum handling capacity of the new VEC, i.e. 1 000 vehicles per day, could not cope with the demand for vehicle examination services, what action the



Administration would take to meet the increased demand. Mr LEUNG and Mr WONG Ting-kwong also sought information about the waiting time required for booking the vehicle examination services.

67. H/EKEO/DEVB advised that, according to the statistics of TD, the growth of commercial vehicles remained steady over the past few years. With an increase in the handling capacity by 25% (from 800 vehicles to 1 000 vehicles per day), the new VEC would be able to cope with increase in the demand for vehicle examination services arising from previous cancellation of services due to adverse weather or the steady growth of commercial vehicles in the future. Chief Electrical and Mechanical Engineer/Vehicle Safety and Standards, Transport Department ("CEME/VSS/TD"), added that the new VEC would have 30 vehicle inspection lanes and some of these lanes would not be fully engaged under current demand. It would be possible to enhance the handling capacity of the new VEC under better resource conditions. However, it was difficult to make an accurate estimation on the enhanced capacity of the new VEC at this stage. The Administration would provide information after the meeting about the action it would take to meet the increased demand for vehicle examination services. On the waiting time required for vehicle examination services, CEME/VSS/TD advised that when a user made a booking with VEC, the service would be arranged within 10 working days (for annual examination), or four working days (for re-examination).

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's written response was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)509/16-17(01) on 27 January 2017.)*

*[At 11:14 am, the Chairman suggested and members agreed that, in view of time constraints, the discussion on the item "PWP Item No. 3794CL — demolition of existing superstructures at Caroline Hill Road site, Causeway Bay" (Item VI on the agenda of the meeting) would be deferred to a later meeting.]*

#### Submission of the funding proposal to the Public Works Subcommittee

68. Ms Tanya CHAN asked if the Chairman would order the Panel to proceed to a division on the proposal after the Panel finished the discussion on the item. The Chairman replied in the affirmative. He put the question of whether members supported the submission of the funding proposal to the Public Works Subcommittee ("PWSC") for consideration to vote and ordered a division. The voting bell was rung for five minutes. Twenty members voted for, 21 members voted against

the question, and no member abstained. The votes of individual members were as follows:

*For:*

Mr Kenneth LAU (Deputy Chairman)	Mr WONG Ting-kwong
Mr CHAN Hak-kan	Mr CHAN Kin-por
Mrs Regina IP	Mr Michael TIEN
Mr Steven HO	Mr Frankie YICK
Mr YIU Si-wing	Mr MA Fung-kwok
Mr LEUNG Che-cheung	Ms Alice MAK
Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok	Dr Junius HO
Mr HO Kai-ming	Mr Holden CHOW
Mr Wilson OR	Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan
Mr LUK Chung-hung	Mr LAU Kwok-fan
(20 members)	

*Against:*

Mr James TO	Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung
Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung	Mr Charles Peter MOK
Mr CHAN Chi-chuen	Dr KWOK Ka-ki
Dr Fernando CHEUNG	Dr Helena WONG
Mr Alvin YEUNG	Mr Andrew WAN
Mr CHU Hoi-dick	Mr LAM Cheuk-ting
Mr SHIU Ka-chun	Ms Tanya CHAN
Mr HUI Chi-fung	Dr CHENG Chung-tai
Mr KWONG Chun-yu	Mr Jeremy TAM
Mr Nathan LAW	Dr YIU Chung-yim
Dr LAU Siu-lai	
(21 members)	

*Abstain:*

(0 member)

69. The Chairman concluded that the Panel did not support the Administration's submission of the proposal to PWSC.

**VI PWP Item 3794CL — Demolition of existing superstructures at Caroline Hill Road site, Causeway Bay**

(LC Paper No. CB(1)288/16-17(05) — Administration's paper on 3794CL — The Demolition of existing superstructures at Caroline Hill Road site, Causeway Bay)

*[At 11:14 am, the Chairman suggested and members agreed that, in view of time constraints, the discussion on the item would be deferred to a later meeting.]*

## **VII Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030**

(LC Paper No. CB(1)51/16-17(07) — Administration's paper on Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030

LC Paper No. CB(1)51/16-17(08) — Paper on Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030 prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat (Background brief)

LC Paper No. CB(1)288/16-17(06) — Letter dated 9 November 2016 from Dr Hon YIU Chung-yim)

### Other relevant papers

(LC Paper No. CB(1)57/16-17(01) — Joint submission from Save Lantau Alliance and 19 concerned groups dated 7 November 2016

LC Paper No. CB(1)80/16-17(01) — Submission from World Wide Fund For Nature Hong Kong dated 4 November 2016)

70. Secretary for Development ("SDEV") said that the "Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030" ("Hong Kong 2030+") was a vision-driven, pragmatic and action-oriented strategic plan to guide planning, land and infrastructure development, as well as the shaping of the built and natural environment of Hong Kong beyond 2030. The vision of Hong Kong 2030+ was to strengthen Hong Kong's position as a liveable, competitive and sustainable "Asia's World City". The Administration had launched a public engagement exercise

on 27 October 2016 for six months to collect views from the public on Hong Kong 2030+.

71. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Deputy Director of Planning/Territorial ("DD/T of PlanD") briefed members on the three building blocks, namely "Planning for a Liveable High-density City", "Embracing New Economic Challenges and Opportunities" and "Creating Capacity for Sustainable Growth", and the conceptual spatial framework proposed under Hong Kong 2030+. Details of the proposals were given in the Administration's paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)51/16-17(07)).

*(Post-meeting note: A soft copy of the powerpoint presentation materials was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)322/16-17(03) by email on 16 December 2016.)*

### Vision and planning goal

72. Mr CHU Hoi-dick said that, according to the Census and Statistics Department's latest population projections, Hong Kong's population was expected to reach its peak at 8.22 million by 2043. He queried why the maximum housing capacity of all developments under the proposed conceptual spatial framework of Hong Kong 2030+ was set at 9 million. In response, SDEV said that the figure of 9 million was not a population target, but only the possible housing capacity that could be generated under Hong Kong 2030+ if all the planned developments were materialized. Such a capacity could give a 10% buffer for the projected peak population of 8.22 million by 2043.

73. Citing the development of the North East New Territories New Development Areas as an example, Dr Fernando CHEUNG criticized that the Administration's planning and development strategy mainly focused on economic development, ignoring the consequence that many existing residents, farmers and small business operators were forced to leave their homes, farmlands and places of business in the course of development. Dr CHEUNG referred to the comments of Professor NG Mee-kam of The Chinese University of Hong Kong on Hong Kong 2030+, which said that the proposals under Hong Kong 2030+ failed to give consideration to promoting the development of the community and local economy.

74. SDEV referred members to an open letter written by the former Director of Planning which responded to some of Professor NG Mee-kam's views on Hong Kong 2030+. In particular, the letter explained the people-centric vision, planning goal and proposals of

Hong Kong 2030+. SDEV remarked that the Administration would listen to the views of different sectors of the community on the proposals under Hong Kong 2030+.

### "Age-friendly" planning and design

75. Noting that the proportion of the population aged 65 or above was projected to increase substantially beyond 2030, Mr Alvin YEUNG opined that the future spatial planning as well as land and infrastructure development should cater for the needs and improve the liveability of the elderly. He called on the Administration to take reference from overseas experience in the planning of communities with a large population of elderly people, such as implementing special road designs and traffic arrangements to enhance road safety. The Deputy Chairman opined that, instead of housing the elderly in the housing estates for the aged and separating them from young people, consideration should be given to building up communities where young people lived near their elderly parents.

76. DD/T of PlanD took note of Mr Alvin YEUNG's views on road designs and traffic arrangements catering for the needs of the elderly, and responded that Hong Kong 2030+ proposed adopting the concepts of "age-friendly" planning and design, and facilitating "ageing in place". Promoting an inclusive and supportive society through planning sensitively for all, irrespective of age and ability, was one of the key strategic directions relating to planning for a liveable high-density city proposed under Hong Kong 2030+.

### Land and housing supply

77. The Panel noted that the proposed conceptual spatial framework under Hong Kong 2030+ focused on future development with one metropolitan business core, two strategic growth areas (namely the East Lantau Metropolis ("ELM") and New Territories North ("NTN")) and three development axes. The proposed development of two strategic growth areas aimed to plan in advance to meet the outstanding land demand beyond 2030. Ir Dr LO Wai-kyok asked about the Administration's initiatives for meeting the land requirement for housing in the short and medium term.

78. SDEV replied that since taking office, the current-term Government had been increasing land supply through a multi-pronged approach and addressing the supply-demand imbalance by formulating

short, medium and long-term measures. As a result of the dedicated efforts over the past four and a half years, it was estimated that the various land supply initiatives would be able to provide about 600 000 public and private housing units in total. Among others, the Administration would develop housing sites identified in land use reviews, increase development intensity where planning term permitted, implement the development of ex-quarry sites, New Development Areas and new town extensions such as Tung Chung New Town Extension, so as to provide land for housing and other developments.

79. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung asked how the Administration had arrived at the estimation that an addition of about 200 hectares of land was required for housing in the long term, while the Administration had not set a standard for living space per person. He criticized that the Administration's practice of building stand-alone housing blocks on infill sites was contradictory to the vision of uplifting Hong Kong's liveability.

80. DD/T of PlanD replied that the figure of 200 hectares was a ballpark estimate of the outstanding land requirement for accommodating the long-term public and private housing demands. Following the Long Term Housing Strategy's methodology, the long-term housing land requirement had taken into account the projected domestic household growth, existing inadequately housed households, households affected by redevelopment, etc.

81. SDEV added that in 2015, the average living space per person for public rental housing and private housing was about 13 square metres ("m<sup>2</sup>") in terms of internal floor area and 20 m<sup>2</sup> in terms of saleable area respectively. The estimation of future housing land requirement had made reference to these data. The Administration also saw the scope to reinvent public space and enhance public facilities with a view to uplifting Hong Kong's liveability. To this end, Hong Kong 2030+ proposed to enhance the land and space provision for government, institution or community ("G/IC") uses and open space, by adopting higher ratios of 3.5 m<sup>2</sup> and 2.5 m<sup>2</sup> per person for the strategic planning of G/IC and open space land requirements respectively. This would help meet the public's aspirations for more community facilities and open space and enhance living space in general.

#### East Lantau Metropolis

82. Dr KWOK Ka-ki and Mr Nathan LAW asked about the estimated cost of the infrastructure works relating to the proposed artificial islands

in the central waters and other planning proposals under Hong Kong 2030+. Dr KWOK further asked about the proportion of residential developments in the future ELM for housing the elderly.

83. In response, SDEV said that Hong Kong 2030+ only proposed a conceptual spatial planning framework for Hong Kong beyond 2030. Taking into account the public views to be collected during the six-month public engagement, the Administration would formulate preferred spatial development option(s) for further technical assessments to broadly evaluate the social, economic and financial impacts thereof. The updated territorial development strategy would be finalized having regard to the findings of the technical assessments and public views. Proposals on individual works projects would be worked out after further planning and engineering studies and submitted to the Legislative Council for consideration in accordance with the established practice in the future. Therefore, it would not be scientific to make an estimation on the costs of the broad development proposals at this stage. SDEV further said that while the population of the proposed ELM could be about 400 000 to 700 000, the Administration had not set the proportions for different age groups. At the request of Dr KWOK Ka-ki, the Administration would provide supplementary information on the total estimated costs for conducting various consultancy studies for the proposed development of artificial islands in the central waters.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's written response was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)537/16-17(01) on 8 February 2017.)*

84. Given that there was a proposal about connecting ELM to Hong Kong Island West, Mr Nathan LAW enquired whether the Administration would give consideration to the development of the Kennedy Town and Mount Davis areas when planning for the development of ELM; and if yes, the details. At the request of the Chairman, the Administration would provide a written response to Mr LAW's question after the meeting.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's written response was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)537/16-17(01) on 8 February 2017.)*

New Territories North

85. Referring to the proposed Northern Link, which would be connected to the Lok Ma Chau Spur Line and support the development of NTN, Mr LAU Kwok-fan expressed concern that the existing crowdedness problem on the East Rail Line during peak hours might be further aggravated. Mr LAU said that before developing NTN, the Administration should first improve the transport infrastructure in the North District to enhance the connectivity of NTN. Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen said that the Administration should create more jobs in NTN, so as to help provide local employment, reduce long distance commuting, and ease the congestion caused by the growing traffic from the New Territories to the urban areas. Mr LAU suggested that the Administration should consider relocating some government offices in the urban areas to NTN.

86. In response, DD/T of PlanD said that the Administration would promote wider use of public transport and explore opportunities for strategic transportation initiatives and better connectivity between NTN and the urban areas, including examining possible new railway lines to enhance the accessibility of NTN to unleash the potential for development. The Administration would also enhance the spatial distribution of population and jobs through the creation of economic activities and employment nodes in NTN to create jobs for a range of skills, thereby bringing jobs closer to homes and lowering peak hours traffic demand. SDEV took note of Mr LAU Kwok-fan's suggestion on relocating government offices to NTN.

87. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen asked whether the Administration would consider resuming the land occupied by the Fanling Golf Course for housing purpose. DD/T of PlanD advised that through comprehensive planning and more efficient use of the brownfield sites and abandoned agricultural land in the New Territories, developing NTN would provide land for building new communities and developing modern industries and industries preferring a location near the boundary. The site occupied by the Fanling Golf Course had been granted under a Private Recreational Lease ("PRL"). The Home Affairs Bureau was conducting a review on the policy on PRLs. The Administration would take into account the outcome of the policy review in considering the way forward for the site.

88. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen further asked whether the development of NTN would involve large-scale resumption of farmland. DD/T of



PlanD replied that the land required for the development of NTN mainly included brownfield sites, abandoned farmland and government land.

89. The Deputy Chairman opined that in addition to planning for the future direction of land development in Hong Kong, the Administration should at the same time improve the infrastructure facilities of the villages in rural areas, such as the supply of fresh water and electricity, as well as the provision of road and sewerage systems. DD/T of PlanD replied that for the planning of NTN, the Administration proposed adopting a harmonious approach to foster urban-rural-nature integration. The comprehensive development of new towns in the New Territories could improve the existing rural environment through integrated provision of new infrastructure, public and community facilities, etc. to enhance convenience, connectivity and quality of life.

#### Tackling climate change

90. Mr CHU Hoi-dick and Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung referred to the Paris Agreement passed in the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, which aimed to strengthen the global response to the threat of climate change by keeping a global temperature rise in this century well below 2 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels and to pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase even further to 1.5 degrees Celsius. Mr CHU and Mr LEUNG asked how the conceptual spatial framework proposed under Hong Kong 2030+ could meet the relevant requirements under the Paris Agreement.

91. In response, Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)<sup>1</sup> and DD/T of PlanD said that "creating capacity for sustainable growth" was one of the building blocks of Hong Kong 2030+. One of the key strategic directions for this building block was to develop a smart, green and resilient city strategy. To promote sustainable planning and urban design, the development strategy to be adopted would focus on, among other things, minimizing demand for and use of land and other natural resources, promoting low-carbon smart economy and living, and reducing carbon emissions, so as to tackle the climate change.

*[At 12:33 pm, the Chairman ordered that the meeting be extended for 15 minutes to end at 1:00 pm, so as to allow more time for the Panel's discussion on the agenda item.]*

Study reports related to the "Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030"

92. Ms Tanya CHAN said that she had written to the Development Bureau requesting the provision of the reports of the technical feasibility study relating to the proposed transport infrastructure connecting ELM and Hong Kong Island, and that of the Siu Ho Wan development. She opined that the provision of these reports would facilitate a meaningful discussion by the Panel on the proposals under Hong Kong 2030+. She further suggested that the Administration should make available to the public the aforesaid feasibility study reports within six months after completion. Sharing Ms Tanya CHAN's views, Dr YIU Chung-yim commented that only topical papers, but not the full study reports, were available on the Hong Kong 2030+ website.

93. In response, SDEV confirmed that the Development Bureau had received Ms Tanya CHAN's letter requesting the aforementioned study reports, and the Administration would reply to Ms CHAN in due course. DD/T of PlanD said that 15 topical papers on various subjects had been uploaded to the website of Hong Kong 2030+ for public information. Relevant information and the conclusions/key findings of the study reports were already included in the topical papers.

Public consultation

94. Mr Steven HO expressed dissatisfaction about the Administration's briefing arrangement for the agriculture and fisheries sector on Hong Kong 2030+. In particular, he had written to the Administration in early November 2016 requesting a meeting with the aforesaid sector to brief them and gauge their views on Hong Kong 2030+. However, the Administration had yet to schedule a meeting with the agriculture and fisheries sector. Mr HO urged the Administration to respond to his request expeditiously.

95. Mr Steven HO asked whether the Development Bureau would take the initiative to coordinate among relevant policy bureaux for conducting a review on the compensation mechanisms for various parties affected by development projects, such as the ex-gratia allowance for fishermen, and the compensation for people affected by land resumption; and if yes, the details. He requested the Administration to provide a written response to his questions.

(*Post-meeting note:* The Administration's written response was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)537/16-17(01) on 8 February 2017.)

96. Dr YIU Chung-yim and Ms Tanya CHAN opined that the Panel should hold a special meeting to receive public views on Hong Kong 2030+. The Chairman advised that a special meeting of the Panel would be held in March 2017 to receive public views on Hong Kong 2030+. In response to Dr YIU's enquiry, SDEV said that representatives of the Development Bureau and concerned departments would attend the special meeting.

#### Town Planning Board

97. Mr CHU Hoi-dick urged the Administration to reform the appointment system for the Town Planning Board ("TPB") with a view to enabling public views to be duly reflected in the planning process. In response, SDEV said that the Town Planning Ordinance (Cap. 131) had set out the statutory procedures for handling plan amendments and planning applications, and members of the public could make representation to TPB to express their views accordingly. He said that reforming the appointment system of TPB was not under the study scope of Hong Kong 2030+.

### **VIII Any other business**

98. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 12:59 pm.

Council Business Division 1  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
24 February 2017