

# 立法會

## Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(3) 907/11-12

### Paper for the House Committee meeting of 15 June 2012

### Questions scheduled for the Legislative Council meeting of 20 June 2012

Questions by:

- (1) Hon IP Wai-ming (Oral reply) (New question)  
*(Replacing his previous question)*
- (2) Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit (Oral reply)
- (3) Hon WONG Kwok-hing (Oral reply) (New question)  
*(Replacing his previous question)*
- (4) Hon Fred LI Wah-ming (Oral reply)
- (5) Hon Frederick FUNG Kin-kee (Oral reply)
- (6) Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun (Oral reply)
- (7) Hon LEE Cheuk-yan (Written reply)
- (8) Hon WONG Yuk-man (Written reply)
- (9) Dr Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long (Written reply)
- (10) Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yee (Written reply)
- (11) Hon CHAN Hak-kan (Written reply)
- (12) Hon WONG Sing-chi (Written reply)
- (13) Hon James TO Kun-sun (Written reply)
- (14) Hon CHEUNG Kwok-che (Written reply)
- (15) Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing (Written reply)
- (16) Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun (Written reply) (New question)  
*(Replacing his previous question)*
- (17) Hon KAM Nai-wai (Written reply) (New question)  
*(Replacing his previous question)*
- (18) Hon Frederick FUNG Kin-kee (Written reply)
- (19) Dr Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long (Written reply)
- (20) Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yee (Written reply)

註 :

NOTE :

# 議員將採用這種語言提出質詢

# Member will ask the question in this language

## 北區的巴士路線

### # (1) 葉偉明議員 (口頭答覆)

新界北區居民多次向本人反映，該區嚴重缺乏直接往返九龍和港島的巴士路線，他們需要轉乘多次不同交通工具才可往返市區，平均車程長達80至100分鐘。他們又指出，現時沒有從九龍或港島直接抵達北區的通宵巴士路線，北區亦只有一條“A”線前往機場地區，對北區居民造成嚴重不便。就此，行政機關可否告知本會：

- (一) 由北區往返九龍及港島的巴士路線的詳細資料，包括巴士路線編號、出發站、終點站、每日的服務時間、每日的班次及行車時間，並以表列出該等資料；當局會否增加由北區往返九龍及港島的巴士路線；若會，詳情為何；若否，當局有何措施解決北區居民因缺乏對外巴士路線而過度倚賴鐵路往返九龍及港島的問題；
- (二) 當局會否考慮開辦或試辦一條九龍或港島至北區的通宵巴士路線，免卻北區居民需要在沙田轉乘其他交通工具的麻煩；若會，詳情為何；若否，當局能否因應北區的地理位置，檢討該區的深宵交通政策；及
- (三) 鑒於有北區居民表示，行走 A43號路線的專營巴士是北區居民往返機場的主要交通工具，但該路線班次疏落，收費昂貴，座位不足，車程更超過個半小時，當局會否多辦一條車費較低的“E”線行走北區至機場地區；若會，詳情為何；若否，當局有何措施解決行走北區至機場的專營巴士路線班次疏落和車費昂貴的問題？

## Bus routes serving the North District

- (1) Hon IP Wai-ming (Oral reply)

Some residents of the North District in the New Territories have repeatedly relayed to me that due to a serious lack of direct bus routes connecting the district with Kowloon and Hong Kong Island, they need to change to different means of transport several times in order to go to and return from the urban area, taking as long as 80 to 100 minutes on average to complete the journey. They have also pointed out that there is no direct overnight bus route running from Kowloon or Hong Kong Island to the North District at present, and there is only one “A” route to the airport area available in the district, causing serious inconvenience to the residents of the North District. In this connection, will the Executive Authorities inform this Council:

- (a) of the details of the bus routes connecting the North District with Kowloon and Hong Kong Island, including the route numbers, origins, destinations, daily service hours, daily schedules and journey durations of the bus routes and set out such information in a table; whether the authorities will increase the number of bus routes connecting the North District with Kowloon and Hong Kong Island; if they will, of the details; if not, the measures put in place by the authorities to address the issue of the North District residents over-relying on rail transport to go to and return from Kowloon and Hong Kong Island due to the lack of bus routes to other districts;
- (b) whether the authorities will consider introducing or running on a trial basis an overnight bus route from Kowloon or Hong Kong Island to the North District, so as to obviate the need for the North District residents to change to other means of transport at Sha Tin; if they will, of the details; if not, whether the authorities will review the policy on overnight transport for the

North District in response to the geographical location of the district; and

- (c) given that some residents of the North District have indicated that the franchised buses serving route A43 are their major means of transport to and from the airport, but the bus frequency of this route is low, fares are high, seats are not sufficient, and a journey lasts more than one and a half hours, whether the authorities will introduce a new “E” route charging lower fares to run between the North District and the airport area; if they will, of the details; if not, the measures put in place by the authorities to address the issue of low frequency and high fares of the franchised bus route running between the North District and the airport?

## 電訊營辦商的天台發射器所產生的危害

### # (3) 王國興議員 (口頭答覆)

據報，有住宅大廈天台被多個電訊營辦商安裝大量電訊發射器(下稱“發射器”)，而部分單位更被改裝成機房，全日不停運作。居民擔心發射器的電磁輻射影響健康，以及該等裝置和機器可能對樓宇結構及電力負荷構成影響。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 當局有否統計，現時有多少發射器安裝於住宅大廈的頂層及天台；有多少住宅大廈安裝多於一個發射器；現時當局審批在住宅大廈設置無線電基站的申請的程序是怎樣；當局會否諮詢相關政府部門(包括機電工程署、民政事務總署、屋宇署和建築署等)，以及在批准申請前進行實地視察，諮詢受影響的居民，以及評估電磁輻射對居民的影響等；如否，原因為何；
- (二) 現時當局有否限制住宅大廈發射器產生的輻射水平；如有，限制的水平是怎樣；如否，原因為何；過去3年，當局收到多少宗有關住宅大廈天台發射器及裝置的電磁輻射問題的投訴；當局在收到投訴後怎樣跟進，會否實地量度輻射水平，以及要求移走有問題的發射器；如會，過去3年因此而被要求移走的發射器及裝置共有多少個；及
- (三) 就上述提及的個案，當局為何批准多於1間電訊營辦商於同一個地點安裝多個發射器，將居民長期置於輻射之下；當局審批時有否考慮裝置多個發射器對居民及大廈帶來的影響；當局會否檢討現時審批安裝申請的機制(例如由多個相關政府部門合作處理申請、以醫學角度衡量電磁輻射對居民健康的影響、增加審批透明度和諮詢居民等)；如否，原因為何？

Hazards generated by rooftop transmitters  
of telecommunications operators

(3) Hon WONG Kwok-hing (Oral reply)

It has been reported that a large number of telecommunications transmitters (“transmitters”) have been installed at the rooftops of some residential buildings by various telecommunications operators, and some flats in these buildings have even been converted into machine rooms which operate non-stop round the clock. The residents concerned are worried that the electromagnetic radiation generated by these transmitters may pose health risks, and such installations and machines may affect the structure and electricity load of their buildings. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) whether the authorities compile statistics on the number of transmitters installed at the top floors and the rooftops of residential buildings at present; of the number of residential buildings with more than one transmitter installed; of the procedure for the authorities to vet and approve applications for the installation of radio base stations in residential buildings at present; whether the authorities will consult the relevant government departments (including the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department, Home Affairs Department, Buildings Department and Architectural Services Department, etc.) and conduct on-site inspections, consult the affected residents and assess the impact of electromagnetic radiation on the residents, etc. before approving these applications; if they will not, of the reasons for that;
- (b) whether the authorities at present impose any limit on the level of radiation generated by transmitters in residential buildings; if they do, of the limit on the level; if not, the reasons for that; of the number of complaints received by

the authorities in the past three years about the electromagnetic radiation emitted from rooftop transmitters and installations in residential buildings; the follow-up actions taken by the authorities upon receipt of such complaints, whether they will take on-site measurement of the radiation level and request removal of the transmitters in question; if they will, of the total number of transmitters and installations so removed upon request in the past three years; and

- (c) regarding the aforesaid case, why the authorities approved more than one telecommunications operator to install several transmitters at the same location and expose the residents to radiation over a prolonged period; whether the authorities took into account the impact of the installation of several transmitters on the residents and their buildings when they vetted and approved these applications; whether the authorities will review the current mechanism for vetting and approving these applications (e.g. various relevant government departments collaborating in handling these applications, assessing the health risk posed by electromagnetic radiation to the residents from a medical perspective, enhancing transparency in the vetting and approval of applications, as well as consulting residents); if they will not, of the reasons for that?



## 鯉魚門旅遊業的發展

### # (16) 謝偉俊議員 (書面答覆)

據悉，有鯉魚門商戶代表極為不滿政府在優化及加建鯉魚門旅遊配套設施(“鯉魚門海旁改善計劃”)方面的進展極其緩慢，窒礙鯉魚門的旅遊發展。有觀塘區議會議員向本人反映，觀塘區議會已一致通過支持該計劃的項目(例如2005年通過的碼頭工程項目及2009年通過的海旁發展項目)，但有公民黨其他地區的區議員在不同階段不斷就排污、水質改善、路基及防火等範疇提出問題，工程項目仍未能落實。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 有否評估鯉魚門海旁改善計劃工程項目延誤，將引致多少額外工程開支；如有評估，結果為何；如否，可否立即評估；
- (二) 有否評估上述政黨或其他政黨會否透過司法覆核環境影響評估報告等方法，阻礙落實鯉魚門海旁改善計劃；如有，評估結果為何；如否，可否馬上評估，並交代應對政策；
- (三) 有否評估延誤發展鯉魚門堤岸的旅遊配套設施(包括防波堤、海濱長廊、街貌美化工程及公眾泊岸設施等)會否削弱明年啟用的新郵輪碼頭的區域配套及協同效應；如有，評估結果為何；
- (四) 鑒於將於本年7月1日展開任期的新一屆特區政府擬擴大政府總部架構至5司14局，新一屆政府有否預留人手資源，及早理順各級議會層面的爭議，以盡快落實各項優化鯉魚門旅遊設施的項目；如有，計劃為何；如否，可否馬上制訂預留人手資源的方案；及
- (五) 面對上述層出不窮的新問題，政府有何折衷方法，避免各項優化工程再被拖延？

## Development of tourism in Lei Yue Mun

(16) Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun (Written Reply)

It has been learnt that some representatives of the commercial tenants in Lei Yue Mun (“LYM”) are gravely dissatisfied with the extremely slow progress made by the Government in the enhancement and construction of ancillary tourism facilities in LYM (“LYM Waterfront Enhancement Project”) (“the Project”), thus hindering the development of tourism in LYM. Some members of the Kwun Tong District Council (“KTDC”) have relayed to me that KTDC has unanimously supported the works under the Project (e.g. the pier works project approved in 2005 and the waterfront development project approved in 2009), but a member of another District Council, who is a member of the Civic Party, has continuously raised questions at different stages in respect of issues such as sewage, water quality improvement, road base and fire prevention, etc., and the works projects are yet to be implemented. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) whether it has assessed the additional expenditure on works projects caused by the delay in the Project; if it has, of the assessment findings; if not, whether it can assess immediately;
- (b) whether it has assessed if the aforesaid political party or other political parties would, by means of seeking judicial review of environmental impact assessment reports, hinder the implementation of the Project; if it has, of the assessment findings; if not, whether it can assess immediately and give an account of its policy to tackle this issue;
- (c) whether it has assessed if the delay in the development of the ancillary tourism facilities in LYM waterfront (including the breakwater, waterfront promenade, streetscaping and public landing facility, etc.) will undermine the

ancillary facilities in the district for the Kai Tak Cruise Terminal which will commence operation next year and the synergy effects to be brought about by the terminal; if it has, of the assessment findings;

- (d) given that the SAR Government of the new term, which will commence on 1 July this year, intends to expand the organization of the Government Secretariat to include five Secretaries of Departments and 14 bureaux, whether the Government of the new term will set aside manpower resources to iron out the controversies in the councils of various levels so that the various projects for upgrading the tourism facilities in LYM will be implemented as soon as possible; if it will, of the contents of its plan; if not, whether it will immediately formulate a plan for setting aside manpower resources; and
- (e) in the face of the aforesaid new questions which keep emerging, of the Government's way of compromise to avoid further delay in the various enhancement works projects?

## 保育中區警署建築群

### # (17) 甘乃威議員 (書面答覆)

上月有報道指出，香港賽馬會(“馬會”)把在中區警署建築群發掘出來的考古發現當垃圾拋棄，包括有重大歷史價值的半米字型地基，事件引起古物諮詢委員會委員及文物保育人士強烈不滿。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 中區警署建築群的考古發掘工作何時開始，至今發掘出多少件及有哪些考古發現，有否發掘出屬於香港第一代監倉的地基古物；
- (二) 是否知悉，馬會如何處置發掘出來的考古發現；有否為每一件發掘出來的古物進行拍攝，以及如何決定哪些古物獲得保留，哪些遭棄掉；
- (三) 當局有否為每一件發掘出來的古物進行記錄；
- (四) 是否知悉，協助馬會進行這次考古發掘工作及撰寫報告的專家的資歷為何；他們是否擁有在香港進行考古發掘的資格；及
- (五) 當局有否就這次考古發掘工作的進度，定期向古物諮詢委員會匯報；最近一次及下一次匯報是何時？

## Conservation of the Central Police Station Compound

(17) Hon KAM Nai-wai (Written reply)

It was reported last month that the Hong Kong Jockey Club (“HKJC”) discarded as garbage archaeological discoveries excavated at the Central Police Station Compound, including the foundation of a half double cross building, which is of significant historical value, and the incident has aroused strong dissatisfaction from members of the Antiquities Advisory Board (“AAB”) and heritage conservationists. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the commencement date of the archaeological excavation at the Central Police Station Compound, the number of items excavated since then and the archaeological discoveries; whether antiquities of foundations belonging to Hong Kong’s first generation of prisons have been excavated;
- (b) whether it knows how HKJC deals with the archaeological discoveries excavated; whether HKJC has taken photographs of each item of antiquities excavated and how HKJC decides which antiquities are to be kept and which ones are to be discarded;
- (c) whether the authorities have made a record of each item of antiquities excavated;
- (d) whether it knows the qualifications of the experts who assist HKJC in conducting this archaeological excavation and preparing the report; whether they are qualified to carry out archaeological excavation in Hong Kong; and
- (e) whether the authorities have reported regularly to AAB the progress of this archaeological excavation; when the last report was made and when the next report will be made?