

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. CB(1)718/17-18  
(These minutes have been seen  
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/PL/DEV

**Panel on Development**

**Minutes of meeting**  
**held on Wednesday, 20 December 2017, at 2:30 pm**  
**in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex**

**Members present** : Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, GBS, JP (Chairman)  
Hon Kenneth LAU Ip-keung, BBS, MH, JP (Deputy  
Chairman)  
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP  
Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, GBS, JP  
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, BBS, JP  
Hon CHAN Kin-por, GBS, JP  
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP  
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-ye, GBS, JP  
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP  
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP  
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, SBS, JP  
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH  
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen  
Hon CHAN Han-pan, JP  
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, SBS, MH, JP  
Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP  
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki  
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  
Hon HO Kai-ming  
Hon LAM Cheuk-ting  
Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding  
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  
Dr Hon CHENG Chung-tai  
Hon KWONG Chun-yu  
Hon Jeremy TAM Man-ho

**Member attending** : Hon KWOK Wai-keung, JP

**Members absent** : Hon WONG Kwok-kin, SBS, JP  
Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP

**Public officers attending** : **Agenda item III**

Mr Maurice LOO Kam-wah, JP  
Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning and  
Lands)<sup>2</sup>

Mr Raymond SY Kim-cheung  
Principal Assistant Secretary for Development (Planning  
and Lands)<sup>4</sup>

Ms Alice PANG, JP  
Project Manager (South)  
Civil Engineering and Development Department

Mr Raymond LEE Wai-man  
Chief Engineer (South)<sup>1</sup>  
Civil Engineering and Development Department

**Agenda item IV**

Mr Michael WONG Wai-lun, JP  
Secretary for Development

Mr Maurice LOO Kam-wah, JP  
Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning  
and Lands)2

Ms Jasmine CHOI Suet-yung  
Principal Assistant Secretary for Development  
(Planning and Lands)3

Dr CHEUNG Tin-cheung, JP  
Director of Buildings

Ms Lisa CHU Yuen-man  
Chief Building Surveyor/Mandatory Building  
Inspection 2  
Buildings Department

**Agenda item V**

Mr LIU Chun-san, JP  
Under Secretary for Development

Ms Doris HO Pui-ling, JP  
Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning  
and Lands)1

Mr Ivan CHUNG Man-kit  
Principal Assistant Secretary for Development  
(Planning and Lands)5

Mr Albert CHEUNG Ka-lok  
Assistant Director (Specialist 3) (Lands  
Administration Office, Headquarters)  
Lands Department

Ms Lily CHIU Lee-lee  
Chief Estate Surveyor (Acquisition)  
Lands Department

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

Mr Michael FONG Hok-shing  
Deputy Project Manager (West)  
Civil Engineering and Development Department

Mr CHAN Tze-ho  
Chief Engineer/West 4  
Civil Engineering and Development Department

**Attendance by  
Invitation** : **Agenda item IV**

Ir Wai Chi-sing, GBS, JP, FHKEng  
Managing Director  
Urban Renewal Authority

Mr Daniel HO Chi-wai  
Director, Building Rehabilitation  
Urban Renewal Authority

**Clerk in attendance** : Ms Doris LO  
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 Information paper(s) issued since the last meeting**  
(LC Paper No. CB(1)318/17-18(01) — Letter dated 30 November

2017 from Hon CHU Hoi-dick on site formation and infrastructure works for public housing development at Wang Chau

LC Paper No. CB(1)339/17-18(01) — Letter dated 8 December 2017 from Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-ye (on tree management)

Members noted that the above information papers had been issued since the meeting on 28 November 2017.

*[When the meeting commenced, the Deputy Chairman took the chair in the absence of the Chairman. At 3:13 pm, the Chairman resumed the chair.]*

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

(LC Paper No. CB(1)343/17-18(01) — List of outstanding items for discussion

LC Paper No. CB(1)343/17-18(02) — List of follow-up actions)

2. Members agreed to discuss the following items at the next regular meeting to be held on 23 January 2018:

- (a) PWP Item No. 196WC — Implementation of Water Intelligent Network;
- (b) PWP Item No. 355WF — Water supply to new housing developments in Sheung Shui and Fanling;
- (c) PWP Item No. 365WF — Siu Ho Wan Water Treatment Works Extension; and
- (d) PWP Item No. 201WC — Relocation of Diamond Hill Fresh Water and Salt Water Service Reservoirs to Caverns.

3. Referring to the letter from Mrs Regina IP (LC Paper No. CB(1)339/17-18(01)) concerning tree management and a related item on the "List of outstanding items for discussion" (LC Paper No. CB(1)343/17-18(01)), Ms Tanya CHAN suggested early discussion of the

relevant subject preferably before the coming rainstorm and typhoon season.

*(Post-meeting note: Due to insufficient meeting time, the Chairman suggested and members agreed that the Panel would continue the discussion on "Implementation arrangements for the Hung Shui Kiu New Development Area Project" (agenda item V of this meeting) at the next regular meeting on 23 January 2018.)*

**III PWP Item No. 163TB — Kwun Tong Town Centre Redevelopment — provision of grade-separated pedestrian linkages**

(LC Paper No. CB(1)343/17-18(03) — Administration's paper on PWP Item No. 163TB (Part) — Kwun Tong Town Centre Redevelopment — provision of grade-separated pedestrian linkages — Footbridge across Hip Wo Street near the junction of Hip Wo Street/Mut Wah Street)

4. At the invitation of the Deputy Chairman, Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)2 ("DS/DEV(P&L)2") briefed members on the funding proposal for upgrading part of PWP Item No. 163TB "Kwun Tong Town Centre Redevelopment — Provision of Grade-Separated Pedestrian Linkages" to Category A, at an estimated cost of about \$153.5 million in money-of-the-day ("MOD") prices, for the proposed construction of a footbridge across Hip Wo Street near the junction of Hip Wo Street/Mut Wah Street ("the proposed footbridge"). With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Project Manager (South), Civil Engineering and Development Department ("PM(S)/CEDD"), then briefed members on the project details, including a breakdown of the estimated cost and the programme.

*(Post-meeting note: A soft copy of the powerpoint presentation materials was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)384/17-18(01) by email on 21 December 2017.)*

5. 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.

Concerns over the high construction cost

6. Ms Tanya CHAN said that she would not oppose the proposal. However, she was concerned about the high construction cost (i.e. \$153.5 million) of the proposed footbridge with a main deck of just 39 metres long, and hoped that the Administration could try its best to lower the cost. Ms CHAN found that the cost levels of some footbridges constructed in recent years were on the high side, an example of which was the proposed Artist Square Bridge at the West Kowloon Cultural District with an exceptionally high unit cost (in terms of construction cost per square metre ("m<sup>2</sup>")), whereas the unit cost of a footbridge constructed years ago for connecting MTR Tsuen Wan West Station to MTR Tsuen Wan Station was much lower. While noting that the unit costs of footbridges would depend on various factors including technical difficulties and site conditions, she asked whether the unit cost of the proposed footbridge was at a reasonable level. Sharing similar views, Mr LAU Kwok-fan sought justifications for the high construction cost of the proposed footbridge.

7. In response, PM(S)/CEDD clarified that apart from the 39-metre long curved main deck, the estimated cost also covered the costs for the construction of two bridge arms of about 6 and 13-metre long respectively, a lift and a staircase, ancillary works (including footpath construction, drainage and utilities works, landscaping works, and related electrical and mechanical works) and environmental mitigation measures, etc. She remarked that the cost of the proposed footbridge also included the foundation. The cost of the foundation such as the number and depth of the piles was dependent on the underground conditions as revealed from the ground investigation. Moreover, the complexity in carrying out the construction works at heavily trafficked roads was another factor that had been taken into account in estimating the cost of the project. She added that only common construction materials would be used for the bridge structure. In all, she stressed that the unit cost of the proposed footbridge at about \$400,000/m<sup>2</sup> was based on the built up in the bill of quantities and comparable to that of similar government footbridges. Meanwhile, the Administration would make its best efforts on cost control during construction.

8. Mr Wilson OR queried whether the Administration had considered other design options of the proposed footbridge, such as placing the lift and staircase side by side to share the same space on the main deck and shortening the bridge arms, with a view to reducing the construction cost. Mr LEUNG Che-cheung opined that the Administration might explore other site options with a view to lowering the costs for the ancillary works. Given the high estimated cost, he personally would not support the proposal.

Admin 9. PM(S)/CEDD indicated that the Administration had prudently considered other construction options with a view to controlling the construction cost. Regarding the option mentioned by Mr OR, she explained about the technical constraint that the footpath along Mut Wah Street could not be widened sufficiently to accommodate the lift tower and the staircase if they were to be built side by side there. At the request of the Deputy Chairman, the Administration agreed to provide a further response to Mr OR's suggestion in writing.

Admin 10. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen said that he had not yet decided whether to support the proposal. He pointed out that the construction cost of the first phase of PWP Item No. 163TB, i.e. Yuet Wah Street Pedestrian Linkage, was only about \$95 million in MOD prices, and he requested an explanation from the Administration on the much higher estimated cost of the proposed footbridge.

#### Cost sharing with the Urban Renewal Authority

11. Given that the proposed footbridge would connect with a footbridge developed by the Urban Renewal Authority ("URA"), linking the Main Site and the Park Metropolitan of the Kwun Tong Town Centre ("KTTC") Redevelopment Project to form an integrated footbridge system, members including Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr WU Chi-wai, Mr Jeremy TAM, Dr KWOK Ka-ki and Mr Wilson OR asked (a) whether the Administration would request URA or developer(s) involved in the KTTC Redevelopment Project to share the construction cost of the proposed footbridge; (b) the estimated number of users of the proposed footbridge, and the proportion of those who would be residents of the Park Metropolitan; (c) the recurrent expenditure including the annual maintenance costs to be incurred for the proposed footbridge and its lift, and whether URA would bear the pro-rata share of such costs based on the proportion in (b); and (d) a comparison of the construction costs per m<sup>2</sup> of the two footbridges.



Admin 12. DS/DEV(P&L)2 explained that the proposed footbridge with the provision of a lift would enhance the connectivity between Yuet Wah Street and the neighbouring areas and provide a barrier-free and grade-separated access for the elderly, the disabled and users of the Kwun Tong Community Health Centre ("KTCHC") Building situated in the Park Metropolitan. He pointed out that more than 5 000 persons, with over half of them being elderly or disabled persons, were visiting KTCHC each day at present. As such, it was considered appropriate for the Government to bear the construction cost of the proposed footbridge, whereas URA would bear the construction cost of the footbridge that directly connected with the Main Site and the Park Metropolitan of the KTTC Redevelopment. The Administration agreed to provide a written response to further address the above issues raised by members.

13. Mr Jeremy TAM and Dr KWOK Ka-ki remained unconvinced by the Administration's explanation. Mr TAM pointed out that people going to KTCHC could use the existing at-grade pedestrian crossing instead. He and Dr KWOK held that as residents of the Park Metropolitan would be among the major users of the proposed footbridge, URA should be requested to share a corresponding portion of the relevant construction and maintenance costs. Dr KWOK was disappointed about the use of public money for the provision of a footbridge for the Park Metropolitan. Ms Tanya CHAN was also concerned if it would become a norm using public funds to construct footbridges for private developments if only community facilities were housed thereat.

14. DS/DEV(P&L)2 reiterated that the proposed footbridge would provide the Kwun Tong community with a more convenient access to KTCHC. Furthermore, the proposed footbridge would be connected with a pedestrian link at the podium of the Park Metropolitan, which was open to the public 24 hours a day and would enhance the connectivity between Yuet Wah Street and the neighbouring areas. Therefore, it was appropriate to implement the proposed project as a public works project with the construction cost borne by the Government. DS/DEV(P&L)2 pointed out that the proposed footbridge would be open for access by all members of the public, and it was not practical to differentiate the identity of potential users and separately identify the number of those who were residents of the Park Metropolitan.

15. Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok said that members belonging to the Business and Professionals Alliance for Hong Kong supported the proposal. He opined that as long as the proposed footbridge could enhance the

connectivity of KTTC for the benefit of the general public, it was appropriate for the Government to fund the construction costs. The Chairman also said that members belonging to the Liberal Party supported the proposal.

Implementation timetable and impact of the construction works

16. Mr HO Kai-ming stated that members belonging to the Hong Kong Federation of Trade Unions supported the proposal. Mr HO noted that the footbridge developed by URA would be completed soon around the fourth quarter of 2017. He queried why the Administration had not planned earlier for timely submission of the funding proposal of the proposed footbridge such that the commissioning of the two footbridges would tie in with each other.

17. PM(S)/CEDD replied that the Administration had maintained close contact with URA regarding the implementation timetable of the two footbridge systems. In view of the impact of the traffic on nearby roads during the construction period, the Administration considered more appropriate not to carry out the two footbridge projects at the same time. It had thus planned to commence the construction of the proposed footbridge in the second quarter of 2018 for completion in the second quarter of 2022.

18. Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok called on the Administration to take appropriate measures to minimize the impact of the construction works on pedestrians and the traffic during the construction period. The Administration took note of his view.

Provision of access facilities for the proposed footbridge

19. Mr LEUNG Che-cheung suggested that the Administration might consider replacing the staircase with an escalator to provide a more convenient and user-friendly access to the footbridge, notwithstanding that the latter would normally incur a higher cost. Mr Jeremy TAM made a similar suggestion.

20. PM(S)/CEDD responded that to meet the need of some footbridge users, a lift with a load capacity of 900 kilograms to accommodate up to 12 persons would be provided. A trip by the lift would take about two minutes. As regards the suggestion of providing an escalator, she advised that even with an escalator, a staircase would still be required in parallel as a standard provision; and if so, the Administration would have

to ensure that there would be enough space to accommodate a set of staircase and escalator on the footpath along Mut Wah Street, as well as it was a cost effective design. That said, DS/DEV(P&L)2 took note of members' views and undertook that the Administration would examine the feasibility of the suggestion of providing a set of staircase and escalator at the same time for the proposed footbridge.

Admin 21. Mr WU Chi-wai took the view that the existing at-grade pedestrian crossing should be removed to redirect pedestrians to use the proposed footbridge in order to enable vehicle-pedestrian segregation. He also said that if provided with an escalator, more pedestrians would use the footbridge. Mr WU further said that by cancelling the existing at-grade pedestrian crossing, the size of the traffic island in the middle of the three-way junction could be reduced to allow more room for widening the footpath along Mut Wah Street so as to make way for providing a set of staircase and escalator. Noted however with disappointment that the Administration had decided to retain the at-grade pedestrian crossing, Mr WU urged the Administration to re-consider this decision. He further requested the Administration to provide a written response on the width of the footpath along Mut Wah Street, and that of the residual footpath space after having constructed the staircase of the proposed footbridge, as well as whether it was feasible to provide a set of escalator and staircase for the proposed footbridge.

#### **IV Operation Building Bright 2.0**

(LC Paper No. CB(1)343/17-18(04) — Administration's paper on Operation Building Bright 2.0

LC Paper No. CB(1)343/17-18(05) — Paper on Operation Building Bright prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat (Updated background brief)

22. Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)2 stated that the Administration planned to launch Operation Building Bright ("OBB") 2.0 at a cost of \$3 billion to provide direct technical and financial assistance to needy owners in carrying out the prescribed inspection and repair works under the Mandatory Building Inspection Scheme ("MBIS"). The Urban Renewal Authority ("URA") would

administer OBB 2.0 as the Government's partner. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, he briefed members on the relevant details.

*(Post-meeting note: A soft copy of the powerpoint presentation materials was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)384/17-18(02) by email on 21 December 2017.)*

23. 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 item under discussion at the meeting before they spoke on the item.

#### Eligible buildings

24. Mr KWOK Wai-keung asked whether the Administration would consider increasing the proposed ceilings on the average rateable values ("RV") of participating buildings (i.e. not exceeding \$162,000 in urban areas (including Sha Tin, Kwai Tsing and Tsuen Wan districts) and \$124,000 in the New Territories (all New Territories districts excluding Sha Tin, Kwai Tsing and Tsuen Wan districts), so that more buildings could be covered. Mr LAM Cheuk-ting called on the Administration to consider covering middle-class residential buildings under OBB 2.0.

25. SDEV responded that the Administration had all along upheld the principle that maintenance was primarily the responsibility of building owners. On that premise and with a view to ensuring proper use of public resources, the Administration would focus on providing appropriate assistance to those needy owners in discharging their responsibility to properly maintain their buildings. Having regard to the fact that older buildings, especially those providing homes to the less well-off, were more prone to building neglect, the Administration had proposed setting the current average RV ceilings on participating buildings, within which around 80% of buildings aged 50 years or above would be covered. The Administration would review the ceilings from time to time in conjunction with URA with a view to maintaining the real value.

26. Mr HO Kai-ming pointed out that the owners of some aged "three-nil" buildings might have genuine difficulties in carrying out inspection and repair works for complying with MBIS notices due to their lack of organization ability and/or technical knowledge. He asked whether these owners could on their own accord seek to have their

buildings enlisted as Category 2 buildings under OBB 2.0 for the Buildings Department ("BD") to take follow-up actions.

27. In response, Director of Buildings ("D/BD") explained that Category 2 buildings were meant for the selection of buildings by BD out of those which had outstanding MBIS notices but the owners concerned had difficulties in coordinating prescribed inspection and repair works in the common parts of the buildings. BD would proactively select such buildings and determine the priority among the selected buildings for conducting works in default of the owners based on risk assessment.

28. Mr Abraham SHEK and Mr Frankie YICK respectively stated that members belonging to the Business and Professionals Alliance for Hong Kong and those belonging to the Liberal Party supported the implementation of OBB 2.0. Mr SHEK requested the Administration to provide an evaluation on the effectiveness of ex-OBB including a comparison of (a) the number of target buildings, (b) the number of applications received and the number of buildings involved, vis-à-vis (c) the final number of buildings that had received assistance under OBB, together with an analysis of the reasons for the shortfall between (a) and (c). SDEV undertook to provide the required information.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's supplementary information was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)577/17-18(01) on 7 February 2018.)*

#### Target beneficiaries and subsidy level

29. Mr KWOK Wai-keung welcomed the Administration's proposal to provide a higher rate of subsidy to elderly eligible applicants aged 60 or above at 100% of the cost subject to a cap of \$50,000 per unit. Yet, he queried if the subsidies under OBB 2.0 would also be given to those property owners who were leasing out the residential units for rental income.

30. Mr Jeremy TAM pointed out that it was not uncommon for some elderly people to transfer the ownership of their residential units to their children while they themselves were still living in the units. He sought clarification if in such cases, whether the higher rate of subsidy for elderly eligible owners aged 60 or above would still apply.

31. SDEV responded that to ensure that public resources would be allocated to those in greater need, it was proposed that the subsidies under

OBB 2.0 be primarily granted only to owner-occupiers of residential units. As such, property owners who had leased out the units for rental income would generally not be subsidized. For properties under the ownership of persons below the age of 60, including those cases where the ownership was transferred to the existing owners by their elderly parents aged over 60 and where the elderly parents were the primary occupants of the units concerned, the subsidies to be provided under OBB 2.0 would be 80% of the cost subject to a cap of \$40,000 per unit.

32. Dr CHENG Chung-tai urged the Administration to consider granting the higher rate of subsidy (i.e. 100% of the cost subject to a cap of \$50,000 per unit) also to eligible applicants who were issued with "Registration Card for People with Disabilities". Dr Fernando CHEUNG concurred with Dr CHENG's views. SDEV responded that the Administration would review the implementation of OBB 2.0 before inviting the second round of applications in around 2020. He took note of Dr CHENG's and Dr CHEUNG's views, and said that the Administration would consider members' suggestions during the review.

#### Implementation plan

33. Mr KWOK Wai-keung expressed concern that while more property owners would be willing to carry out repair works for their buildings with the financial assistance under OBB 2.0, the resulting increase in the demand for building repair and maintenance works would lead to increases in construction costs. He called on the Administration to adjust the pace of commencing repair works under OBB 2.0 to avoid causing negative impacts on the market.

34. Mr LAU Kwok-fan expressed support for the implementation of OBB 2.0. He suggested the Administration to consider making OBB 2.0 a regular scheme such that the repair works of the various eligible buildings could span over a longer period. Ms Alice MAK declared that she was a non-executive director of the URA Board. She expressed support for the implementation of OBB 2.0 and also concurred with Mr LAU Kwok-fan's suggestion.

35. SDEV responded that the Administration was mindful that a surge of demand for building repair and maintenance works might create undue pressure on the market. Hence, it was proposed that the commencement of the inspection and repair works for around 2 500 buildings to be funded under OBB 2.0 be appropriately spaced out over a five-year period. During the review in around 2020, the Administration would

consider the way forward, including whether to extend OBB 2.0 for a longer term or make it a regular scheme.

36. Ms Alice MAK called on the Administration to provide more financial support to URA where necessary, in order to help URA cope with the increased workload and expenses relating to the administration of OBB 2.0. Mr LAM Cheuk-ting and Dr Helena WONG also considered that the Administration should provide adequate financial support to URA for hiring independent consultants to conduct on-site inspections at participating buildings, thereby checking against any repair works which had not been carried out despite the subsidies granted.

37. SDEV responded that URA would meet from its own resources the associated costs of staffing, office accommodation and outsourced independent consultancy service fees for operating OBB 2.0. The relevant arrangements could be revisited in the review in around 2020. Managing Director, URA ("MD/URA") advised that URA had sufficient resources to cover the administration costs of OBB 2.0 at the moment.

38. Mr HO Kai-ming pointed out that URA would also be commissioned as the administration agent of the Fire Safety Improvement Works Subsidy Scheme ("the FSW Scheme") to be launched by the Security Bureau in 2018 to subsidize owners of old composite buildings to undertake fire safety enhancement measures. Mr HO therefore asked whether and how URA would facilitate property owners in applying for subsidies under both OBB 2.0 and the FSW Scheme. MD/URA replied that URA would make suitable arrangements to facilitate owners of eligible buildings to make applications for the two schemes in one go.

#### Monitoring of quality of works

39. Mr CHAN Han-pan and Mr Jeremy TAM enquired about the role of BD in monitoring the quality of works subsidized by OBB 2.0. In response, SDEV stressed that the subsidy of OBB 2.0 should be primarily used on inspection and repair works prescribed under MBIS. D/BD supplemented that under MBIS, it was a statutory requirement to engage a registered contractor ("RC") to carry out the repair works under the supervision of a registered inspector ("RI"), and the RI was not allowed to act as the RC at the same time. As part of the MBIS monitoring mechanism, BD would conduct audit checks on completed cases. If there were any irregularities which resulted in contravention of the Buildings Ordinance (Cap. 123) ("BO") or which were due to professional misconduct or negligence on the part of the RC or RI, BD

might instigate prosecution and/or disciplinary actions under BO against the RC or RI.

Measures to prevent bid-rigging

40. Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr LAU Kwok-fan, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Dr KWOK Ka-ki and Mr LAM Cheuk-ting expressed grave concern about possible corruptive practices and bid-rigging of the consultants or contractors in building repair and maintenance projects under OBB 2.0. Mr CHAN Chun-ying and Mr CHAN Han-pan called on the Administration and URA to provide more information and assistance to property owners in taking forward the repair works and following up on tender matters for consultancy and works contracts. Mr LAU Kwok-fan enquired about the measures to be put in place for OBB 2.0 for preventing bid-rigging in building repair contracts. Dr KWOK Ka-ki considered that the Administration should recommend consultants for the owners of buildings participating in OBB 2.0, thereby avoiding collusion between consultants and contractors. Mr LAM Cheuk-ting said that URA should extend the scope of the "Smart Tender" Building Rehabilitation Facilitating Services Scheme ("Smart Tender Scheme") to assist owners' corporations of private buildings in the procurement of consultancy services for carrying out the building repair and maintenance works.

41. Ms Alice MAK opined that there was no need to be overly worried that the implementation of OBB 2.0 would necessarily aggravate the problem of bid-rigging in building repair and maintenance projects, if proper preventive measures would be put in place.

42. SDEV reiterated that it would be more appropriate for the building owners to take primary responsibility in coordinating and organizing the building repair and maintenance works for their buildings. He assured members that apart from the regular efforts against bid-rigging in building repair contracts, new measures would be put in place for OBB 2.0. Owners of participating Category 1 buildings had to participate in URA's Smart Tender Scheme, which would provide pertinent information, including an assessment regarding the value-for-money of the returned tenders, to enable owners to make an informed decision in the repair works required for their buildings. All buildings joining OBB 2.0 would also be automatically registered for the RenoSafe Scheme operated by the Police, which would offer services including a hotline for enquiry and crime reporting as well as public education materials relating to building repair works, etc.



43. MD/URA advised that the current Smart Tender Scheme was applicable to procurement of works contracts only. URA was considering how best to provide additional information for owners to consider the reasonableness of prices for consultancy tenders. URA was also exploring in conjunction with stakeholders the feasibility of extending the e-tendering platform of the Smart Tender Scheme to cover the procurement of consultancy services.

44. Mr CHAN Han-pan requested the Administration to provide written response to further elaborate and convince members on how effective the existing measures as well as those to be put in place for OBB 2.0 for preventing bid-rigging in building repair contracts, including the Smart Tender Scheme, could combat the bid-rigging problem and eradicate collusion between consultants and contractors.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's supplementary information was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)577/17-18(01) on 7 February 2018.)*

45. Dr CHENG Chung-tai referred to the 30 suspected non-compliance cases of service providers as mentioned in paragraph 14 of Annex A to the Administration's paper (LC Paper No. CB(1)343/17-18(04)). He enquired about the number of bid-rigging cases in these non-compliance cases. SDEV and D/BD clarified that the suspected non-compliance cases were indeed related to the breach of statutory requirements under BO in relation to MBIS and the Mandatory Window Inspection Scheme, but were not concerning bid-rigging.

46. Dr CHENG Chung-tai requested the Administration to provide statistics on the number of suspected cases of bid-rigging received in relation to building repair contracts of OBB; among which the number of cases handled and the number of convictions made.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's supplementary information was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)577/17-18(01) on 7 February 2018.)*

47. Dr Fernando CHEUNG and Dr Helena WONG expressed support for the implementation of OBB 2.0. Dr CHEUNG asked URA to provide more support to the eligible owners by advising them on the reference costs for general building repair works. Dr WONG suggested URA to launch a contractors' performance rating system.

48. MD/URA responded that URA planned to launch a Building Rehabilitation Platform in the second half of 2018. The initiative aimed to provide a one-stop platform to owners and practitioners with the participation of relevant professional bodies, societies, government departments and enforcement agencies. Practical guidelines and standard tender and contract documents on procurement of consultancy and works contract, reference cost on typical building repair works, as well as a list of service providers were under development and would be provided on the platform in stages. MD/URA supplemented that URA should be mindful in the disclosure of costs on building repair works, taking in view the enactment of the Competition Ordinance (Cap. 619).

49. Mr CHAN Han-pan requested the Administration/URA to provide details of the support services to be provided to property owners through the Building Rehabilitation Platform to be launched by URA.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's supplementary information was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)577/17-18(01) on 7 February 2018.)*

**V Implementation arrangements for the Hung Shui Kiu New Development Area Project**

(LC Paper No. CB(1)817/16-17(08) — Administration's paper on implementation arrangements for Hung Shui Kiu New Development Area Project

LC Paper No. CB(1)343/17-18(06) Paper on the implementation arrangements for the Hung Shui Kiu New Development Area project prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat (Updated background brief))

Other relevant papers

- (LC Paper No. CB(1)1422/16-17(01) — Letter dated 26 June 2017 from Hon Steven HO on implementation arrangements for the Hung Shui Kiu New Development Area Project
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1422/16-17(02) — Administration's response to the letter dated 26 June 2017 from Hon Steven HO on implementation arrangements for the Hung Shui Kiu New Development Area Project (LC Paper No. CB(1)1422/16-17(01))
- LC Paper No. CB(1)332/17-18(01) — Submission from a deputation (關注洪水橋新發展區聯盟) dated 2 December 2017)

50. Given that there was insufficient time left for the discussion on this agenda item, the Chairman proposed the arrangement that members would be given time to speak and put questions on this item while the Administration would be required to give its responses not at the meeting but in writing after the meeting; and if unfinished, the discussion on this item would stand over to the next regular meeting of the Panel to be held on 23 January 2018. The Chairman also advised that he had already received two motions respectively proposed by Mr CHU Hoi-dick and Mr LAU Kwok-fan on this agenda item. He considered that the two motions were directly related to this agenda item, and he proposed that the two motions be dealt with at the next regular meeting. Members agreed.

Briefing by the Administration

51. At the invitation of the Chairman, Under Secretary for Development then briefed members that the Hung Shui Kiu ("HSK") New Development Area ("NDA") would be a major land supply for Hong Kong in the medium to long term, providing 61 000 additional housing units. It would be positioned as a "Regional Economic and

Civic Hub" for the North West New Territories ("NWNT") offering about 150 000 jobs. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Principal Assistant Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)<sup>5</sup> briefed members on the implementation arrangements including the special compensation and rehousing package for the HSK NDA project.

*(Post-meeting note: A soft copy of the powerpoint presentation materials was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)384/17-18(03) by email on 21 December 2017.)*

### Members' questions and concerns

#### *Overall land use planning*

52. Mr Jeffrey LAM was of the view that to develop HSK NDA into a "Regional Economic and Civic Hub" for NWNT and maximize the benefits of the related Transit-oriented Development planning, the Administration should consider relaxing the plot ratio and height restriction within the commercial core near the proposed HSK railway station to optimize land use, enable the formation of a critical mass of commercial activities, and accommodate a landmark building of an appropriate height. Mr LAM and Mr LEUNG Che-cheung enquired whether the Administration would consider dividing some oversized development sites near the proposed HSK railway station into smaller plots to allow developments of different scales.

53. Mr Frankie YICK considered that the sites reserved for education and related uses now situated next to the proposed HSK railway station should be relocated farther north to adjoin the sites for the Enterprise and Technology Park, such that these prime sites near the traffic hub could be released for other uses.

54. Mr CHU Hoi-dick asked how the Administration would address the concerns of the residents of Hung Fuk Estate over the planned location of a large refuse collection point right outside Hung Fuk Estate. He was also concerned about whether the Administration would accede to the request of the indigenous villagers in Kiu Tau Wai to adjust downward the height of the proposed high-rise developments in planning area number 19B fronting the village.

55. Mr Abraham SHEK opined that the Administration should reconsider prioritizing the planning for housing land uses in HSK NDA,

instead of aiming too high for self-sustainability of population and employment with a diversity of land uses.

*Village type development*

56. Dr KWOK Ka-ki surmised whether the Administration had increased the area of "Village Type Development" ("V") zones to favour the development of Small Houses at the expense of developing more public housing in HSK NDA, and hence he urged the Administration to illustrate how the respective boundaries of "V" zones and "Village Environs" within the area of HSK NDA had varied between 1999 and 2017.

*Housing mix*

57. Mr KWONG Chung-yu doubted why the public-to-private housing ratio proposed for HSK NDA (i.e. 51:49) had fallen short of that recommended in the Long Term Housing Strategy (i.e. 60:40). He further enquired about the specific ratio of public rental housing units, "Starter Homes" Pilot Scheme units and Green Form Subsidized Home Ownership Scheme units to be developed within the 69.44 hectares of "Residential (Group A)" land in HSK NDA.

*Transport infrastructure*

58. Mr Jeffrey LAM asked how the Administration would improve the transport network connecting the commercial core of HSK NDA and avoid possible traffic congestion. Mr KWONG Chung-yu also asked if the Administration had assessed the travel time between the proposed HSK railway station and those residential housing estates located far away from it.

59. Mr LEUNG Che-cheung was concerned about whether the road network in NWNT (such as Deep Bay Link) could cope with the anticipated traffic growth arising from HSK NDA. He called on the Administration to consider re-provisioning Tin Ying Road in the form of a tunnel, and to reserve suitable site(s) within HSK NDA to dovetail with the development of a new heavy rail directly connecting NWNT to the urban areas if required. Further, he requested the Administration to provide an update on the details of the study on the provision of the Environmentally Friendly Transport Services ("EFTS") serving HSK NDA, including whether a fully-automated and driverless rail system was feasible, and whether the proposed EFTS would run at ground level.

*Arrangements for affected households*

60. Mr LAU KWOK-fan indicated that Members belonging to Democratic Alliance for the Betterment of Hong Kong would consider supporting the HSK NDA project only if the Administration would agree to adopt a "rehouse first, develop later" approach in land resumption for development, and waive the income and asset test requirements for rehousing the affectees. Mr LAU and Mr LEUNG Che-cheung called on the Administration to relax the overly stringent criteria for consideration of lease modification under which the proposed site to be surrendered for in-situ land exchange should have an area of not less than 4 000 square metres.

61. Ms Alice MAK expressed that, while she welcomed the provision of public housing units under the HSK NDA project, she considered that the Administration should review the rehousing options and provide more acceptable packages that could cater for the specific needs of all affected residents, including those indigenous/non-indigenous villagers, and defer any clearance actions before coming up with the agreeable arrangements. Mr CHU Hoi-dick further asked if the Administration would provide a choice of in-situ rehousing for non-indigenous villagers affected by the HSK NDA project.

62. Mr Abraham SHEK queried if the Administration had assessed the possibility of judicial review applications to challenge decisions of the Government with regard to the resumption of private land for development on the ground of the stipulation under Article 105 of the Basic Law, and taking account of this considered following a different approach to encourage private participation in the development projects.

63. The Deputy Chairman opined that the Administration should step up efforts in making suitable arrangements and closely communicating with all indigenous and non-indigenous villagers affected by land resumption arising from developments to avoid disputes.

*Arrangement for affected brownfield operations*

64. Ms Alice MAK, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung and Mr KWONG Chung-yu enquired whether and how the Administration had actively engaged and sought the consent of the relevant stakeholders on the reprovisioning arrangements of brownfield operations affected by the HSK NDA project. They stressed that the Administration should

liaise with the operators of the affected brownfield sites on the reprovisioning arrangements either at multi-storey buildings ("MSBs") or other land-efficient means at suitable locations.

65. Mr Frankie YICK questioned whether, by indicating that "[w]e will not rule out the possibility of accommodating certain operations not practically feasible to move into MSBs on suitable open-air sites", the Administration was regressing in its effort to accommodate the existing 190 hectares of brownfield operations within HSK NDA. He asked about the respective number of the existing brownfield operations which would be moved into MSBs as well as those needed to be accommodated on suitable open-air sites.

66. Mr Frankie YICK further asked if the Administration would review the eligibility requirement of minimum 10-year operation at the same land lot under the extended ex-gratia allowance ("EGA") proposal to count also the years of operation before moving to another land lot within the same area. Given that sublessors who were not the business operators but had made investment on the brownfield sites would not be entitled to the extended EGA under the proposal, Mr YICK called on the Administration to review the relevant arrangement.

*Enhanced Conventional New Town Approach*

67. Mr KWONG Chung-yu enquired if there were any updated arrangements under the Enhanced Conventional New Town Approach since its announcement by the former Chief Executive. In respect of the granting of in-situ land exchange to private land owners, Mr CHU Hoi-dick took the view that the Administration should require the development of subsidized housing but not just private housing on the re-grant site.

*Provision of employment opportunities*

68. Dr KWOK Ka-ki and Mr CHU Hoi-dick requested the Administration to provide the following information: (a) an elaboration on how the Administration had projected that HSK NDA would provide about 150 000 jobs, setting out the details including the types of these jobs and when such job opportunities would become available in phases between 2024 to 2038; and (b) relevant industrial research report(s) to demonstrate how the economic activities in HSK NDA would create the job opportunities projected as sufficient for local residents.

*[At 4:29 pm, the Chairman ordered that the meeting be extended for 15 minutes.]*

Closing remarks

Admin 69. The Chairman requested the Administration to provide written responses to the questions and concerns raised by members above. The Chairman advised that he would allow about half an hour at the next regular meeting for those members who had not spoken on this item to do so and for dealing with the motions proposed under this item.

**VI Any other business**

70. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 5:12 pm.

Council Business Division 1  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
20 March 2018